



This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

- + *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
- + *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
- + *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
- + *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at <http://books.google.com/>

STICAL

DIA.

D.,

N.

HERZOG

THE
PROTESTANT
THEOLOGICAL AND ECCLESIASTICAL
ENCYCLOPEDIA:

BEING

A Condensed Translation

OF

HERZOG'S REAL ENCYCLOPEDIA.

WITH ADDITIONS FROM OTHER SOURCES.

BY

REV. J. H. A. BOMBERGER, D.D.,

ASSISTED BY

DISTINGUISHED THEOLOGIANS

OF VARIOUS DENOMINATIONS.

VOL. II.

PHILADELPHIA:
LINDSAY & BLAKISTON.

1860.

Entered, according to the Act of Congress, in the year 1856, by
LINDSAY & BLAKISTON,
in the Clerk's Office of the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania.

STEREOTYPED BY J. FAGAN.

PRINTED BY C. SHERMAN & SON.

W. H. LINDSAY & B. BLAKISTON
217 N. 3rd St.
PHILADELPHIA

EDITOR'S PREFACE TO VOL. II.

WITH feelings of sincere gratitude, I herewith submit to the public, the Second Volume of this **ENCYCLOPEDIA**. And an unreserved expression of this gratitude seems to me to be due, first of all, to the goodness of the Lord, who has sustained me in the prosecution of the arduous and responsible work, and next to the unanimous favor with which the results of my labors, as each Part appeared, has been received. Even when differences of opinion, such as will of course exist in regard to many of the important subjects treated in these volumes, have been occasionally expressed, and when defects, such as all past experience proves to be next to unavoidable in the preparation and publication of literary works, have been pointed out, it has been uniformly done, so far as I have seen, with a spirit of kindness which has made them as grateful as unqualified expressions of approbation. Candid criticisms will always be welcome, and so far as, upon more careful investigation, they may be found correct, shall receive due attention. Of course when the criticism itself is discovered to be faulty, it would be unjust to obey it in mere deference to its author.

As some impatience has been expressed with regard to the apparently slow progress made by this work, it is proper for me to ask attention to the following facts:—

1. To measure the result thus far reached *arithmetically*, must necessarily lead to an unfair estimate of what has been actually accomplished. Due allowance must be made for the rule of condensation, which is rigidly observed. And as it takes more time to prepare a scientific Review, which is published only once in three months, than a daily newspaper, one week's issue of which may contain more matter by far than the Quarterly, and as it requires a larger amount of toil to write a compact and well-digested short sermon, than a diffuse and superficial long one, so in the case of each Part of a work like this Encyclopedia. Even judging the case mechanically, the number of Parts already issued, contain as much printed matter as *twelve ordinary duodecimo volumes*. But when, in addition to this, it is remembered, that the two volumes of this work have actually absorbed seven large volumes of the original, containing nearly 800 pp. each, and that it required at least as much time (and more severe labor) faithfully to condense these seven volumes into our two volumes, as would have been needed to give a literal rendering of the entire original, it will be frankly conceded, I think, that all has been achieved that could be fairly expected. Our work has, in this view, really progressed at the rate of nearly two volumes a year: no mean pace this, as any who have ever engaged in a similar undertaking, will cheerfully testify.

2. Another fact for which I beg due consideration, is the great difficulty I have found in securing the services of efficient and reliable co-operators. This has proven a serious hindrance to the more rapid progress of the work, and often embarrassed me beyond measure. Besides having supervision of the work as it passed through the press, I had not expected to prepare more than one-fourth of the matter myself. By turning over the pages of the two volumes now issued, it will be seen that at least twice this amount of labor fell upon me.

Although many gentlemen to whom I applied for aid, are sufficiently conversant with the German language, to be able to use it for private literary purposes, few felt themselves to have sufficient mastery of it, to undertake the preparation of translations for such a work as this.

3. A third cause of delay has been found in the rate of progress made by the original Encyclopedia of Herzog. It will be obvious to those acquainted with the alphabetical difficulties of the case, that I have had to guard against following up the German work too closely, lest an article should be needed for the English work before its appearance in the German. Thus *Rechtfertigung* (Justification) and *Reich Gottes* (Kingdom of God) have but recently been published. The original has now, however, reached nearly to the end of the letter R, and of course the difficulty just named is diminishing as it approaches completion.

Independently, however, of all this, no effort is spared to push forward this work as rapidly as can be done, consistently with accuracy and thoroughness. Herzog's work now promises to be finished in the course of another year or eighteen months, and, a kind Providence favoring, the last Part of our condensed translation shall appear in no long time after that date.

In conclusion, I may be allowed to express my gratification at finding the plan of condensation, which has been adopted, gradually receiving the approval even of some who at first objected to it. In a letter recently received from a gentleman of high literary reputation, and superior German scholarship, and who is now preparing one of the longest and most important articles to appear in a future Part, I find the following remark: "Although the Article is a very valuable and interesting one, I propose to abbreviate it still further, especially after I reach page —, where the narrative properly closes. The remaining 25 pp. of the Article are only reflections upon his character in its various aspects. This part, I think, I might abbreviate one-half, if not more." The truth is, that the chief fault of many of the longer articles of Herzog is a diffuseness which greatly detracts from the value and availability of a book of scientific reference. This fault, at least, shall be studiously shunned in the condensed translation. Those turning to it for information, amid the press of studies, will not be compelled to plod through forty weary pages, to ascertain what might be furnished on five or ten.

THE EDITOR.

PHILADELPHIA, September, 1860.

THEOLOGICAL AND ECCLESIASTICAL ENCYCLOPEDIA.

C. [CONTINUED.]

Confession, change of, is the transition from one Church communion or denomination to another. The confession of faith, by which an individual becomes incorporated, as a member, with a religious denomination, must proceed from free conviction; likewise the member of a denomination must be free, so soon as his conviction changes, to follow it, and separate himself from the communion in which he is, and connect himself with that one, to which he has been attracted in heart.

Inasmuch as the Rom. Cath. Church regards herself as *the* Church, and not merely as a confession or party of the universal Church, she, in perfect consistency, regards every apostasy from herself as an apostasy from the Lord, as he is represented in the Pope and in the Church ruled by him. So long as the Romish Church predominated, she proceeded according to this view against every one who departed from or abandoned her, as a heretic or apostate (see especially c. 13, *de hæreticis* in VI. [V. 2], *Bonifacius*, VIII.; also the Art. *Apostasy*). A change in this respect has taken place, since the Protestant Church has won acknowledgment, and parity with the Romish, although the latter will not admit this equality, nor even acknowledge the Protestant Church to be a Church; wherefore the transition of a Rom. Cath. Christian to Protestantism is still condemned as heresy and apostasy. The Protestant Church, on the other hand, although she is convinced that she possesses the truth of the gospel in a form purer than any other Christian communion, is still far from denying the ecclesiastical character of the Romish Church, and therefore regards transition to the same not as a formal *apostasia a fide Christiana*.

The first result of the recognition of Protestantism was the freedom of transition of Roman Catholics to it, without prejudice to their social or political position and rights. This was also

allowed without limitation, in the religious peace of Augsburg, 1555, to the temporal States of the empire and their subjects, but not to the spiritual ones, on account of which rather, as the parties could not agree, King Ferdinand introduced into Art. 18 of that instrument, the so-called ecclesiastical reservation (*reservatum ecclesiasticum*), so that the clergy should lose their benefices by their transition. In this form it remained later, (*Instrum. Pacis Osnaburg.*, 1648, Art. V., § 14, 15, 23). The peace of Westphalia determined as to the subjects (*Instr. P. Osn.*, Art. V., § 36, 37), that the transition should be unhindered only in cases in which they enjoyed public or private religious instruction in the year 1624, but where this was not the case, such subjects, on changing their confession, should either voluntarily leave the country, or be compelled to do so by the rulers. Outside of Germany similar, or even severer ordinances existed formerly, and yet exist in single States, as in Spain, Portugal, France, Sweden, Denmark, and other countries.

Confessional changes were also, at times, required or interdicted by private injunctions, as in the case of bequests, wills, &c. That the requirement of a change of confession in a will, &c., is a *conditio turpis*, and therefore void, there seems to be no question; but it is not so unanimously agreed that, if the condition requires continuance in the confession to which the devisee belonged at the time of the bequest, it may not stand (see EICHORN, *deutsches Privatrecht*, § 79, Anm. h.). And yet this condition seems, no less than the other, to infringe upon religious freedom. If, therefore, the principle of personal liberty, in the matter of denominational change, may not be restricted, both of the conditions above named must be rejected.

Wherever the laws allow a change of confession, they are always in connection with such presupposition, from which it appears that the transition is a free one. They require, therefore, the necessary knowledge, and make this

dependent on a particular age (*annus discretionis*); and often, also, that the former pastor of the convert discharged his duty properly towards him (thus the earlier legislation of Austria, but only in favor of the Romish Church), or that the pastor had opportunity to persuade the convert back to his original faith.

The effect of a change of confession is the dissolution of the former Church connection; hence the loss of hitherto enjoyed ecclesiastical rights, as the result of declension from ecclesiastical duties, and the gain of such advantages as are secured by the new confession. Civil and political rights do not suffer from it, if there are no special laws against it. The transition to one of the three chief Christian denominations is generally secured from prejudice in Germany, by Art. 16 of the Act of Covenant. As regards the transition to Christian sects, this is often limited, in so far as either the members of the same have not full civil rights, or certain particularities exist for the same, which are not guaranteed to the new convert. (See, as regards the Mennonites, the Prussian edict of July 30, 1789. Decree of the Minister of Home Affairs, June 11, 1852, etc.) The full effect of change of confession by the clergy is limited sometimes (as in France, Austria, etc.,) in favor of the reigning Romish Church, in that the *character indelebilis* is recognised as belonging to them also by the state, and, therefore, a former priest is not allowed to marry. The transition from a Christian to a non-Christian confession was, until lately, forbidden by ecclesiastical as well as civil punishment. The canonical statute, that such apostates are to be proceeded against as against heretics (c. 13, *heret. in VI., cit.*), the Romish Church still attempts to enforce, although the civil law has changed (comp. v. (tit.) *Savigny*, System of present Roman law, Vol. II., p. 233). The laws of particular states differ from each other, some hindering conversion, others not. Frederick II. permitted it in Prussia (see *Preusz*, Frederick II., Vol. III., p. 220, 221), and the common law, Part II., Tit. XI. § 1, sq., is not against it. Frederick William III. forbid it (Rescript of Nov. 19, 1814, March 10, 1818, Cabinets-ordre, Dec. 21, 1834, etc.) But since the meeting of the provincial synods (except that of Prussia), in the year 1844-5, which declared in favor of the permissibility of transition, it has been allowed, according to the decree of March 30, 1847 (conn. with the patent of April 7, 1847, ministerial rescript of July 28, 1848). It is similar also in Saxony, according to the ministerial rescript of Dec. 29, 1849. The forms which are observed upon the change of confession are, after instruction, baptism, public confession of faith, etc. Whilst the Prot. Church generally receives to the Lord's Supper Roman Catholic converts upon their reception of the Protestant faith, the Romish Church requires, according to the circumstances, a more or less solemn abjuration. Thus, Lucius III. already decreed in c. 9, X. *hæreticis* (V. 7) every heretic coming to her "*errorem suum ad arbitrium episcopi regionis . . . abjurare et satisfactionem congruam exhibere.*" In France and Belgium, Protestant converts are first even rebaptized. Abjuration is followed by the removal of

the bann, under which the non Roman Catholic lies, according to the view of that Church.

H. F. Jacobson. — BECK.

Confession, in an ecclesiastical respect, designates the acknowledgement of sins, and this in a two-fold sense: in the wider sense, of repentance, or of penance as a sacrament; and in the narrower sense, of an avowal of such repentance, *confessio oris*, as a part of the Romish sacrament of penance. The Evang. Church, in part, retained the term to designate an act of preparation for the Lord's Supper. In correspondence with the gospel call to repentance, which is reiterated by all evangelical preaching, there arose a special penitential service, with a public confession of sin (*ἱξομολόγησις*, cf. Acts 19 : 18). This, according to IREN., *adv. hæc.*; TERTULL., *de pœnit.*; CYPR., epp. 10, 13, &c., consisted in a confession of sin, joined to penitential acts, made before the congregation, or the episcopal presbytery, with the request that they would pray for the reconciliation of the penitents to God and the Church. But this occurred chiefly in the case of open scandal, rarely for private sins; the custom of confessing private sins to special penitentiaries first arose in the 3d cent. In 390, however, the patriarch Nectarius, of Constantinople, was induced to abolish this office in the Orient (SOCRATES, *H. E.*, V., c. 19; *Sozom.* H. E. VII., c. 16), and allow each one to choose his own confessor. Still, private C. to particular priests continued, and ultimately prevailed over public C. The letter of Leo I. (459) to the BB. of Campania, contributed influentially to this result. In that (*ep.* 168, *ed.* BALLERIN.; 136, *ed.* QUESN.; cf. GRATIAN in c. 61 et 89, *dist. I. de pœnit.*), he rejects public C. as unapostolical, and recommends private C. as sufficient, and every way preferable. In the Orient, however, it continued a matter of personal choice. The *Conc. Cabilonense*, 813 (c. 33), declared: *Conf. itaque, quæ Deo fit, purgat peccata: ea vero, quæ Sacerdoti fit, docet, qualiter ipsa purgentur peccata* (cf. GIESELER, *Eccl. H.*, I., 306; II., 62, 349, &c.). GRATIAN (*l. c.*; *Can. XXXIII., q. III.*) collects the different views, and says: *utraque sententia fautores habet sapientes et religiosos viros.* PETER LOMB. (*Sent.* l. IV. *dist.* 17) says: *oportere Deo primum et deinde Sacerdoti offerri conf., nec aliter posse pervenire ad ingressum Paradisi, nisi adsit facultas.* These wavering opinions were settled by INNOC. III., in *Can.* 21 of the 4th Lateran Council, 1215, ordering that every Catholic Christian should, on pain of excommunication, confess all his sins at least once a year, about Easter. This was confirmed by Trent (*Sess.* 14, c. V. *de pœnit.*) In the primitive Church, sins were confessed either to God only, or to fellow Christians (James 5 : 16, &c.), who needed not be ordained clergy. But when sins came to be distinguished into *mortal* and *venial*, it was thought requisite to confess the former to priests. (For the view which obtained in the 12th and 13th cents., see Gieseler and P. Lombard, *l. c.*) The truly contrite are forgiven by God. They prove their contrition by *μετανοία, pœnitentia*. The idea of *pœna* being thus associated with the matter, various penances came to be imposed by the Church as a *satisfaction*; these corresponded to the character

of the sin (see *Penitential*). On the performance of these penances, the confessor pronounced the following form over the penitent: *Dominus absolvat te — Misereatur tui omnipotens Deus et dimittat tibi omnia peccata tua . . . et perducatur te ad vitam æternam, &c.* In the 13th cent., a more imperative form was used. P. Lombard (*l. c. dist. 18*) says: *Deus tribuit sacerdotibus potestatem solvendi et ligandi, i. e. ostendendi homines ligatos vel solutos.* T. Aquinas ascribes an operative efficacy to the matter, and his view is confirmed by the *Conc. Trid. Sess. 14, c. 6, de pœnit. ; can. 9, eod. and cap. 3.* This completed the Romish system of sacramental penance.

As a rule, C. must be oral or auricular, and only exceptionally by writing. It must include all sins, though in fatal emergencies a general confession is allowed. No compensation could be required by the priest, though it became an established custom to present free-will offerings (*nummus confessionarius*) at the time, as an alms, or for the maintenance of the Church and its services (HARTZHEIM, *Conc. Germ.*, T. I., 109; T. VI., 606). Upon the principles of the Romish Church concerning this subject, see: KLEE, *die Beichte*, Mainz, 1828; SIEMERS, *die sacr. Beichte*, Münster, 1844; BINTERIM, *Denkwürdigk.*, V., Th. 2 and 3.—The Greek C. differs from the Romish only in not so rigidly requiring auricular confession (AUGUSTI, *Denkwürdigk.*, IX., 214, &c.).

The Reformers all agree in declaring that C. in the Romish sense is no divine ordinance, and, therefore, that it must be conformed to the spirit of the gospel. Luther distinguishes a threefold C.; 1. that before God (Ps. 32: 5), the C. of faith; 2. that to our neighbor, the C. of love; 3. that of the Pope, with more varieties of sins than one can comprehend, and which is compulsory. But God does not force men to the true confession of sin, much less does he enjoin this (WALCH, *Luther's Works*, XI., 799). The Evangelical Symbols, therefore, reject a compulsory C., and leave it to Christians to confess as often and when they please, although private C. was still retained (see *Luther's Manual of C.*; Walch, *l. c.*, X., 2767; XI., 802; XIX., 105; XX., 59, &c.). Melancthon says: *absolutio privata sic necessaria est ut baptisma (loci theol. ed. pr., 155).* Calvin: *Jacobus liberum permittit delectum, ut ei confiteamur, qui ex eccl. grege maxime idoneus fuerit visus. Quia tamen pastores præ aliis ut plurimum judicandi sunt idonei, potissimum etiam nobis eligendi erunt, &c. (Instit. lib. III., c. 3, § 18, c. 4, § 12. Cf. Conf. Augsb., Arts. 11, 12, 25; Conf. Helvet., II., c. 14; Smalc. Art. III., art. 7, 8; Declar. Thoruniensis, de pœnit., § 2).* Accordingly, the Lutheran and Reformed Churches varied in their practice; in the former, private, in the latter, general, C. was made a preparatory to the Lord's Supper. In many Lutheran Churches, however, the latter practice has prevailed for the last century, whilst some Reformed theologians have advocated private C. (ENDEMANN, *instit. theol. dogm.*, Hannov. 1778; AUGUSTI, *l. c.* 183). At present the tendency is towards a restoration of private C., with evangelical modifications (see *Ztschr. f. Protest. u. Kirche* for Feb. 1847, p. 96, &c., for Aug. and Sept. 1852, p. 152, &c.; *Theol. Stud. u. Krit.*,

1852, p. 955, &c.; *Proceedings of the 5th Ev. Kirchentag*, publ. Berlin, 1852, p. 58, &c.; *Ev. K.-Ztg.* 1845, No. 77).

C. essentially includes *absolution* (LUTHER's *Smaller Cat.*); in private C., in the indicative or collative, in public C., in the declarative, form. But, notwithstanding its connection with the power of the keys, absolution is not performed as an act of jurisdiction by the confessor, since, in the evangelical system, this power is vested, not in an individual, but in the Church.

By ancient customs and rules, which were early incorporated into the canon law, the confessor was considered bound (*sigillum confessionis*) to keep any secret officially revealed to him (BASIL. *ad Amphil. ep. c. 24*; AUGUST., c. 19, Can. II., q. 1; LEO I., ep. to the B. of Camp., *l. c.* Comp. BINTERIM, *l. c.*, III., 309; UHLEIN, *de sig. confess.*, *Heidelb.*, 1823). This principle is virtually maintained in the Ev. Church, even where confession itself has been abolished.

H. F. JACOBSON.*

Confessor, Father. The Romish Church requires a confessor to be an ordained priest. The paternal relation between a convert and the personal instrument of his conversion is suggested in 1 Cor. 4: 15; Gal. 4: 19. This was afterwards transferred to the relation existing between a confessor and his confessant (c. 7-9, Can. XXX., q. I.; *Gratian* on c. 7, *cit.*). It was early assumed that the right of receiving confessions belonged to Bishops, in whose absence, however, they might be made, in extremities, to presbyters or deacons (BINTERIM, *Denkw.*, &c., V., 2, p. 183). Since 800, presbyters were authorized to receive them. As, in the Romish C., absolution involves jurisdiction, each C. had a distinct district assigned to him (cf. GIESELER, *Eccl. H.*, III., § 109, p. 88, n. 3; *CONC. TRID.*, s. 23, c. 15, *de ref.*, and s. 14, c. 7, *de pœnit.*). Every parishioner, therefore, is the confessant of the regular priest of his parish, without whose consent he may confess to no one else, excepting *in articulo mortis*. In cathedrals, however, penitentiaries are appointed, and special confessors are provided for nuns (*Conc. Trid.*, s. 24, c. 10, *de regul.*). But laymen are expressly forbidden to receive confessions, under any circumstances (BENED. XIV., *de syn. diac.*, lib. VII., c. 16, § 11). Ev. Churches, which retain the practice, allow non-officials to receive confessions and pronounce absolution (*Smalcald Art.*, *App.*, of the power of Bishops); and this is consistent with their denial of the sacramental nature of confession; but the rule is, that ordained clergymen hold confession as a preparatory to the Lord's Supper. Ancient laws prescribed that C. should be made in some exposed part of the Church; the Synod of Paris decreed (829) that nuns should make it at the altar, with some witnesses near (cf. HARTZHEIM, *Conc. Germ.*, III., 528, 598, 664). Even in the 16th cent., a *locus conspicuus*, &c., is prescribed (HARTZHE., VII., 174, 850). The first distinct traces of CONFSSIONALS are found in Italy, where the Synod of Consenza, 1579, and of Maffi, 1591, direct that every church shall have as many confessionals as it has confessors, but that they shall be so arranged as to be easily seen, and so that the confessant may be heard,

but not seen by the confessor. Soon after this, confessionals are found in Germany and the Netherlands, &c. (see BINTERIM, l. c., V., Th. II., 233; HARTZB., VIII., 688, 777; IX., 109). The confessant received a *shrove-ticket*, certifying to his having performed the duty; and the names of confessants were recorded in an appropriate register. H. F. JACOBSON.*

Confirmation. In the apostolic Church, the laying on of hands was connected with baptism, as the means of communicating the gift of the Holy Ghost. In comparing Heb. 6 : 2 with Acts 19 : 6, they may seem to be separate acts; and, according to Acts 8 : 12-19, this separation and the view that the laying on of hands was an apostolic, afterwards episcopal, privilege, may seem to be required. Meanwhile, on closer examination, these two passages much rather show in perfect agreement with Matt. 3 : 11, Luke 24 : 49, &c., and Acts 2 : 38, that baptism was incomplete without the laying on of hands and the gift of the Holy Ghost; wherefore Protestant polemics should never have allowed itself to accept the declaration, that these passages did not refer to the Holy Ghost, but only to the special gifts of the Spirit in apostolic times. If (Acts 8) baptism was possible without the communication of the Spirit, then, according to Acts 10 : 44-48, may this latter also precede, and baptism become merely the external symbolical completion of what really took place before. Thus also the communication of the Spirit is not connected with the transaction which the apostles completed, even though it generally appear (comp. Epp. to Timothy) connected with the office; only not with the episcopal, as distinguished from the presbyterial. Was baptism more freely administered, then it was equal to that of John the Bapt. (comp. Acts 8 and 19), and thus peculiar Christian baptism is still only completed by the complementary transaction of the laying on of hands. Baptism holds this relation also in the first centuries, only that the anointing with oil was early added. Tertullian describes it as extending through the three transactions, viz., baptism proper, anointing with holy oil, and the laying on of hands, so that the last is the culmination of the whole. The unity of the transaction is preserved in the three acts being bound to the person of the Bishop. The question concerning the validity of baptism by heretics gave occasion to the distinction and separation of both transactions, so far as the party, which would not repeat baptism, still made the laying on of hands necessary. Another occasion of the subsequent separation of the two transactions, was given by allowing the lower clergy to baptize, and restricting the laying on of hands to the Bishop. Jerome entered the lists in favor of baptism, as against the importance of the laying on of hands. Augustine contended against the sacramental effect of the same. Innocent I. makes a two-fold anointing, that of baptism, and that of confirmation. It was the interest of the hierarchical system which caused the decision in favor of the particularity of confirmation, and of the enhancing of its importance. It was this decision, also, which gradually developed the episcopal act of confirmation into the second sacrament, which was esta-

blished as such by the Synods of Lyons (1274) and Florence (1439). Baptism was nullified through the laying on of hands by the Cathari, from another point of view.

The sacrament of confirmation, which is called *confirmatio* from the act, *sigillum* or *consignatio* from the result, *chrisma* from the material, *impositio manuum* or *unctio* from the form, is, in the Romish Church, the second in order. The laying on of hands is superseded in it by the anointing, which fully agrees with the sacerdotal practice of the O. T., which is the basis of it. It is administered only by the Bishop, who performs it as occasion requires in the various places of his diocese; the ancient seasons also, Easter, Whitsunday, Emberdays, must yield to convenience and possibility. The high altar has been substituted, as the place of the transaction, for the earlier sacristy; and the forenoon instead of the evening. The subject for confirmation must be at least seven years old. A spiritual preparation is recommended, but not made as necessary as the external one of fasting, cutting off the hair, etc. He generally has a sponsor, and receives a confirmation name. The transaction, after a salutation and prayer, consists properly in this, that the Bishop makes the sign of the cross with the thumb of the right hand upon the forehead of the person being confirmed, using the chrism as the matter of the sacrament, and says: *signo te signo crucis et confirmo te chrismati salutis*, after which follows a slight blow upon the right cheek, and the salutation of peace (of doubtful significance). The effect of the sacrament is the communication of the Spirit for the *augmentum* and *firmitas justitiæ*, as equipment for the battle of life, and, in contrast with baptism, as the introduction to the proper activity of *gratia gratum faciens*. The sacrament is not absolutely necessary; and, as giving a *character indelibilis*, is not to be repeated.—The Greek Church has substantially the same sacrament, but permits every priest to administer it, and that immediately after baptism.

Confirmation was rejected as a sacrament by the Protestants from the beginning, for the two-fold reason, that it lacked the signs of a sacrament, i. e., the institution by Christ and special command, and because it detracted from baptism. The Reformers did not stop with rejecting it as such, but they also sought to substitute something of an evangelical nature in its stead—the catechization of youth, and an evangelical act of confirmation. Though the latter was adopted at first only by a minority, it must not be concluded that there was a fundamental opposition to it by the majority; the difficulty of its introduction and adoption explains itself from the great opposition to the Romish sacrament, and any approximation to it. It was practised, however, in Pomerania, Geneva, &c. The transaction is everywhere divested of a sacramental character; the intercessory laying on of hands takes the place of anointing with oil, and the act itself is regarded as a confession of faith. A difference in this procedure between the Lutherans and Reformed scarcely existed. The Church of England took a peculiar position, which approximates nearest to the Romish, in that it allows only the Bishop or his delegates

to administer it. *Chemnitz* gave the Evangelical idea of confirmation its comprehensive expression. The ceremony, however, did not only not extend itself further, towards the end of the 17th cent., but even went out of use where it existed, with but a few exceptions. Its continuance was preserved by pietism. After several attempts (as by *Heinsius*, in Frankfort on the Oder), *Spener* re-established it in Frankfort on the Maine (1666). Its re-introduction into the Protestant Church was now so rapid, that it seemed as if a universal desire existed for it. Several Churches introduced it; the government approved, and then law made it binding; this was, in general, the way it spread. Still, it required the whole of the past and part of the present century to make its re-introduction general; and it was not done everywhere without opposition. The Reformed Church, undistinguished from the Lutheran also here, accommodated itself (entirely only later) to the ruling spirit. *Spener's* idea is not quite the old Protestant one. In his view, confirmation is the renewal of the baptismal covenant, and has, first of all, an awakening significance. Its reference to the congregation receded into the background decidedly; wherefore, he did not insist upon its publicity. An opposition between this view and that of the Reformers, according to which the most important point was catechization, can only be made when this act of awakening in some way prejudices the sacrament of baptism. If the awakening consists entirely in the becoming conscious of the grace of baptism, it corresponds with what catechization should effect. A knowledge of the faith was the least that, at first, must be required, as against the deadness of good works; personal appropriation is only the complete attainment of the same end. The danger, it is true, was near of again separating the new birth from baptism, and making it to be a second transaction, only not a sacerdotal sacramental, but a human self-active one. This has also been the history of the apprehension and practice of it during the last century, and to the present time.

The universal presupposition of Protestant confirmation is special preparatory catechisation. The rite itself is divided into two parts—confession of faith, and the laying on of hands. Confession may, however, again be divided into three parts: examination, confession proper, and vows. The pietistic and rationalistic tendency gives prominence to free examination, whilst the purer churchly view either entirely excludes this, or transfers it from the rite itself to the conclusion of catechization. The laying on of hands has not a sacramental, but an intercessory character; and is, therefore, only relatively different from any other ecclesiastical blessing. As to the age of those confirmed, the Protestant Church from the beginning regarded the 12th or 14th year as the lowest. The time of administering the rite is generally Palm Sunday, Quasimodogeniti, or Whitsunday, whence the catechization occurred during Lent. The publicity of confirmation has become the rule. As a general thing, the formal ceremony of confirmation in the Protestant Church must remain,

to a certain extent, an *adiaphoron* (cfr. *Augusti, Denkwürdigkeiten u. s. w.*, VII.).

WEIZSÄCKER. — *Reck.*

Congregation, the, of the faithful, of Christians (*ecclesia*), in the widest sense, includes all who are united by a common faith to Christ, as their Redeemer and Lord, and with each other; in a narrower sense, a local part of the Church. Ordinarily, the word designates the congregation of some particular place. Thus in this article. Unity of faith begets communion. Thus arose the earliest Christian churches, of which the first converts then received charge (Acts, 14 : 23; Rom. 16 : 5; Tit. 1 : 5; 1 Cor. 14 : 15. Cf. *Clem. Rom.*, ep. I., *ad Cor.*, c. 42). But the Apostles were far from limiting the activity of the congregation to their officers (comp. 1 Thess. 5 : 12; Heb. 13 : 7, 17, 24; 1 Cor. 14 : 33, 40, with 1 Cor. 12 : 7, &c.; Eph. 4 : 7, 11, &c.; John, 14 : 23; Heb. 2 : 11, *et al.*). All the members, therefore, must labor for the upbuilding of the spiritual house, and share the responsibility of the furtherance and maintenance of the Church. They even participated in the Apostolic Synod, mentioned Acts, 15 : 12, 22, &c. (see also 1 Cor. 6; Matt. 18 : 16, 17; 1 Cor. 5 : 1, &c.; 2 Cor. 2 : 6; 2 Thess. 3 : 6, 7, &c.). They also conduct the entire public worship (Col. 3 : 15–17). But the harmony which originally existed between the C. and its officers was soon disturbed by the transfer of the O. T. idea of the priesthood to the N. T. Thus the terms *priest* and *called* (*κληροποι*) were limited to the officers, whilst the rest were only *λαός*, the people, who were denied a share in managing the Church (see *Jurisdiction*). Even spiritual offices were filled by the Bishop. The law of the N. T. (1 Cor. 12 : 7) is annulled by the canon of the Lateran Council, 1215; *Discernimus ut laici eccl. tractare negotia non præsumant*; and 1 Cor. 14 : 34 is paraphrased by Alex. IV. thus: *Inhibemus quoque, ne cuiquam laicæ personæ liceat publice vel privatim de fide cath. disputare* (c. 2, § 1, *de hæc. in VI^{to} V.*, 2). In opposition to a universal priesthood, the Rom. Cat. (P. 11., *de ord. sacr.*, c. 46, &c.) says, it is only *interius sacerdotium*, which presents its sacrifices on the altar of the heart; that all eccl. functions proceed from the clergy, the *eccl. docens*, of which the people form the *object*, not the *subject*. The clergy represent Christ's prophetic, priestly, and kingly office—they constitute the actual congregation (PHILLIPS, *K.-Recht*, I., § 8, p. 47, &c.).

It was a part of the business of the Reformation to correct this error, and restore the ev. conception of the C. Luther earnestly insisted upon this (L.'s Works, WALCH, XVI., 2777; XIV., 288; XIX., 1190. Comp. *Melanchthon*; CALVIN, *Inst.*, IV., c. 4, § 9, c. 9, § 3, c. 19, § 25, &c.). The management of the C., it was contended, belonged to all the members, not to the officers alone; for all participated in the three-fold office of Christ (Luther, l. c., IX., 701). There must of course be offices for the proper maintenance of order, &c.; but these may exist in full unison with the general apostolic principle laid down above. It was in accordance with this principle, therefore, that the Reformers re-organized the C. The form of the organization was

three-fold, corresponding to as many spheres of jurisdiction: consistorial, presbyterial, synodal (see Articles). The earlier Ref. and Luth. directories refer external and internal matters to the C., whilst later Lutheran directories (except some more recent ones) limit its functions to the former. Ordinary matters are transacted by the pastor and consistory (comp. Anglican Church).

JACOBSON.*

Conring, Hermann, regarded as the most learned of the noted scholars of the 17th cent., was b. Nov. 9, 1606, at Norden, E. Friesland. In his 14th year he entered the university of Helmstädt, of which he subsequently became the chief ornament. In 1632 he took the chair of Nat. Philosophy in H., and, in 1637, entered the medical faculty. Whilst he excelled as a general scholar, his association with Calixtus and Hornejus led him to devote his learning chiefly to the defence of the claims of Protestantism to independent existence as a part of the universal Church, and the maintenance of its theological tenets. Some of his writings were called forth by the Westphalian peace, and the conversion to Popery of his particular friend and admirer, Baron J. Chr. v. Boyneburg. In several others, he followed Calixtus († 1656) in the advocacy of union measures, or, at least, of greater harmony between the Lutherans and Reformed. He also made valuable contributions to other departments of ecclesiastical literature.¹ He died Dec. 12, 1681.

HENKE.*

Consalvi, Ercole, the last shoot of an old Roman family, was b. at Rome, June 8, 1757, educated in the college at Frascati, and the Acad. Eccl. in Rome, where he excelled in scholarship. In 1781 he entered the Roman prelacy, and, after displaying his zeal and acuteness in several important stations, became *Uditor di ruota* in 1792. A decided opponent of revolutionary movements, he excited the animosity of the republican rulers of Rome, and barely escaped violence through the aid of the Cardinal of York. After the death of his patron, Pius VI., the conclave, assembled in Venice, appointed him prosecretary. He was thus introduced to Pius VII., who made him Secretary of State, which office he held until June 17, 1806. His greatest work as Secretary was the conclusion of the concordat with France, July 15th, 1801. His subsequent resistance to the demands of Napoleon, led to his dismissal against the Pope's wish. From this time until Napoleon's fall, C. found but little rest. But, immediately upon the Pope's return to Rome, C. hastened to him, and was appointed his legate, to negotiate

with the confederate princes at London, and then to represent him at the Congress of Vienna, where he rendered valuable service to his master. Returned from Vienna, he filled the office of Cardinal Secretary until the death of Pius VII., Aug. 20th, 1823. He devoted himself energetically to the reconstruction of the Romish State upon the principles of monarchical absolutism, in conformity with a *motuproprio* of July 6, 1816, but not with the desired success. His chief strength lay in negotiating concordats, for which his pliant policy seemed specially adapted (RANKE, *Staatsverwaltung d. Card. Cons., &c.*, I. (1832), 624-765). Leo XII. (Sept. 23, 1823) at first deprived C. of all his offices but the Secretaryship of Breves. For a season he left Rome, but was soon recalled by Leo, and appointed Prefect of the Propaganda. This office he held but ten days, when he died, Jan. 24, 1824. It is somewhat remarkable that he did not receive priestly consecration until late in life. (Comp. BARTHOLDI, *Züge aus d. Leben d. Card. C.*, Stuttg., 1824; RANKE, *l. c.*)

MEJER.*

Consilia evangelica, as distinguished from *præceptis*, are, in the Rom. Church, such moral rules as are not obligatory upon every Christian. But when once assumed, they must be kept. Their observance secures superfluous and transferable merit, and elevates to a higher degree of holiness than could be strictly required. Such rules were early supposed to be found in the Bible (HERM. PAST., *Simil.* III., 5. 3; ORIGEN, *ad Rom.*, III., quotes Luke 17 : 10; Matt. 25 : 21; 1 Cor. 7 : 8). The doctrine was soon extended to vows of *chastity, poverty, and obedience*, with appeals to Matt. 19 : 11, &c., 21; Luke 14 : 26, &c. (TH. AQUINAS, *Sum.* II., 1, Q. 108). Gradually twelve such "counsels of Christ" were discovered, including, beside the above, Matt. 5 : 29, 35, 39, 42, &c. The three named above, however, were thought *præcipua et substantialia perfectionis consilia*.

These works of supererogation were zealously assailed by the Reformers. So far from going beyond, man was continually failing in his duty (AUGUSTANA, Art. VI.; APOLOGIA, c. VI.; FORM. CONC. Art. VI.). They repudiated the distinction between *C. ev.* and *præceptis*, as resting upon a pernicious confusion of ideas. The moral law, as the objective idea of the good, of the will of God, must ever be the absolute norm of human willing and doing. And, as nothing can be too small to be defined as duty by that law, so no act can be so high as to exceed its demands. As there are no ethical *adiaphora*, so

¹ The extent and variety of his labors in the sphere of religion will appear from the following list of his works: *De constit. episcop. German.*, 1647.—*De conciliis et circa ea summæ potestatis auctoritate*, 1650. In his *Defensio eccl. protestantium adv. duo pontificiorum argumenta* (Helmst. 1654), he controverted these two propositions: 1. Where there is an unbroken succession of Bishops and presbyters from the Apostles down, there is the true Catholic Church; but Rome has this, hence, &c.; 2. Where such a succession is wanting, the true C. cannot be found; but Protestants are without it, hence, &c.—*Fundamentorum fidei Pontificiæ conclusio*, Helmst., 1654. This last called forth several replies, to which he published rejoinders.—*Epist. de electione Alex. VII. papæ*, 1655.—*Animadv. in fratrum Wallen-*

burgiorum Conringii, &c., 1663.—*De scriptoribus*, XVI., p. Chr. n. sæculorum commentarius. *De Germanorum imperio Romano.*—*De angelis; de momento contriv. de gratia et prædest.* *De sudore Chr. sanguineo.* *Epist. ad Augustinum ducem de nova S.S. versione Germ.*, 1666.—*Vindicatio suorum in ep. etc. de S. Ebraico codice doctorum ab iniquissimis culumatis M. Wasmuth*, 1667.—*G. Calixt. nostrum röv vadv et cujus eruditionem, &c.* GÖSEL's large ed. of his *Opera* (Braunsch., 1730, 6 vols. fol.) omits 48 books on medicine, and most of C.'s theological writings. A worthy biography of him is also still wanting. Many of his letters, &c., are publ. in J. D. GRUBER's *Anecdota Boineburgica, &c.*, Hannov., 1745; and in J. BURCKHARDT's *Hist. biblioth. Aug., quæ Wolfenb. est*, Lpz., 1744, &c.

also no *opera supererogativa*: and an imaginarily higher morality, laying claim to such, must, apart from its lack of humility, actually become a lower grade of virtue, a neglect of duty, and immorality. Of course, in order to perceive what is duty for each one in *concreto*, circumstances and individual position must be carefully considered. To these the first quoted Scriptures refer (1 Tim. 5 : 23 is of a wholly different character). But there is no intimation in them of higher or lower duties. This conception is forbidden by the spirit which must ever actuate the Christian. He must be constrained by love, or a faith working by love, which leads him to embrace the entire law of God, and make it in all things the norm of his life (Rom. 13 : 10; Col. 3 : 17; Luke 16 : 10). Who then shall exempt him from any part of duty; or pronounce compliance with it a work of supererogation? Unable to answer this argument, Rom. theologians were long quiet upon the subject, until MÖHLER (Symbolik) not merely defended the dogma, but charged the Reformers with incapability of seeing that Christians could meet the higher claims of morality. This called forth the refutations of Baur and Nitzsch (see also RORRE, Ethik, III., 91; DE WETTE, Chr. Sittenl. III., 45; FLATT, chr. Moral, p. 12, &c.; THIERSCH, Vorl. über Kathol. u. Prot., II., 166, &c.).

SCHWARTZ.*

Consistorial Church Government. *Consistories.* The Reformation having produced the separation of the Evangelical from the Romish Church, made it necessary that the former should effect a distinct organization. Luther had not contemplated a rupture of his former connection; up to 1555 he thought of retaining the old episcopacy, whilst Zwingli and the Reformed had separated more quickly from the Rom. Church. This, combined with other circumstances, gave rise to a difference of church government, styled respectively the Consistorial and Presbyterial forms. In Saxony, the energetic interference of the government was soon felt to be necessary. In 1520 already, Luther, in his address to the *German Nobility*, had exhorted the estates to assist in renovating the gospel. In 1526 he applied to the elector personally to institute a visitation of the churches and schools (see *Ch. visitation*). The execution of the rules then adopted was, however, prevented by various difficulties; in matters relating to marriage and excommunication, they were also defective. The "Articles of Smalcald," 1537, pointed out the necessity of special courts for matrimonial affairs. Hence the Elector required of the Wittenberg theologians an "opinion," which was drawn up in 1538, under the title "der Theologen Bedenken von wegen der Consistorien, etc.," by Jonas and Bugenhagen, and examined by Luther and Brück. In this, it is proposed that for "ecclesiastical, matrimonial, and other affairs," consistories should be appointed, whose members — "*Judices, Commissarii, Archidiaconi*, etc." — should have power to summon parties before them, and pass and execute judgment. For a jurisdiction so extensive, four consistories seemed to be needed. The Elector, however, in 1539, determined to institute at Wittenberg but one con-

sistory, composed of two clergymen and two laymen, to have jurisdiction in matrimonial affairs only. In 1542, however, the execution of Church discipline in general was also referred to it, and another consistory established at Zeitz and Zwickau. The Protestants, being still desirous of a reunion with the Rom. Church, were also quite ready to acknowledge the episcopal office and functions. In this mind, the "*Reformatio Wittenbergensis*," of 1545, was drawn up by Melancthon, in which the consistories, as ecclesiastical courts, were confined to matters of discipline and marriage, whilst the government of the Church remained in the hands of the Bishops. But these plans were defeated by the resistance of the Bishops themselves. In consequence of this, the governments assumed episcopal rights and duties, deputing them to the consistories. The latter, from Church courts, now became Boards, invested by special commission, and within fixed limits, with the "*jura episcopalia*." In their origin then, these cv. consistories were Church-Boards; for they had been instituted according to the wish of the representatives of the Church, by governments belonging to the Church, and acting in its name, with a jurisdiction confined to affairs of the Church. Their officers, also, were churchmen, and representatives of the clergy and the congregations. Nor did their character as "*judicia ecclesiæ*" change, until, the supreme authority in Church and State having been united in one hand, and an intermixture of the two having been thus brought about, they also assumed a civil-ecclesiastical nature. The estates, assembled at Leipsic in 1547, ordered that "the consistories should be so reformed that they might administer *spiritual* and *secular* matters." The appointment of clergymen and laymen to the consistories was also already interpreted to mean, that in them both *Church* and *State* were represented. Besides this, some matters within their jurisdiction were no longer regarded as ecclesiastical, but as civil in their nature, which were not, however, withdrawn from them, as they were regarded as Boards of a mixed character. Hence the Saxon Ch. constitution of 1580 declares that the "consistories, as not having jurisdiction in matters of religion and conscience merely, but also in secular affairs, such as marriage, the property of the churches and schools, the support and conduct of the clergy, etc., should be equally represented by the Church and State." The principle thus admitted, and the Ch. government constructed upon this basis, necessarily weakened more and more the ecclesiastical character of the consistories, and at last co-ordinated them with the merely secular boards of the State. This consequence, however, owing to the conversion of the Elector, Fr. Augustus, to the Rom. Church, which led to a permanent separation of the *jura episcopalia* from the person of the sovereign, was never reached in Saxony. But even here, the confusion of civil and ecclesiastical affairs increased, rather than diminished; for there were constant conflicts of jurisdiction between the ecclesiastical and civil courts, and the members of the consistories, also, were regarded as mere servants of the State. In other Churches, especially that of Prussia, the confu-

sion became still greater. These consistories soon rose to the highest favor in the other evangelical countries, and were generally introduced, as is evident from the Ch. constitutions of the 16th cent. In some states they were introduced in the 17th cent., as in Hesse, 1599, 1610; in Waldeck, 1676-80. In the Mark Brandenburg, the episcopal government at first maintained itself. The same is also recognised in the Ch. constitution of 1540 for the older diocese of Brandenburg. In the latter, however, jurisdiction is assigned to a consistory. In the dioceses of Havelberg and Lebus, a consistory was established on the Saxon model in 1543, and, in 1573, their Ch. government was completed, according to the principles prevailing in Saxony. In the duchy of Prussia, where the spiritual episcopate continued up to 1587, two consistories were established. In the Brandenburg-Prussian states there was, from the beginning, a strong tendency to territorialism, which at last increased so far that the consistories were, in 1804, abolished for East Prussia, and, in 1808, for the other Prussian states, and their functions transferred to mere State authorities. From this subjugation to the State, the Church was gradually liberated after 1815. The law of April 30, 1815, restored the consistories, which, however, were not regarded as real Church-Boards, since, being composed of Protestant and Rom. Cath. members, they administered also the rights of the sovereign concerning the *sacra* of the Rom. Church, and had a general supervision of the cultus of all other religious parties. By the enactment of Dec. 31, 1825, they were constituted pure Protestant Boards. Their duties, however, still continued to be of a mixed civil-ecclesiastical character. For these frequent changes in the Protestant Church of Germany, its consistorial Ch. government is no little to be blamed. This mode of Ch. government has its evident advantages, as it gives unity to the administration of the Church, and furnishes also, in the person of the common head—the Protestant sovereign—an index of the intimate relation of civil and ecclesiastical affairs. Its one-sided application, however, is injurious, since it destroys the independence of the Church, degrades it to a mere institution of the State, and withdraws all participation in the government of the Church from the congregations. But these evils were not designed by its founders, who wished the consistory to be one among other organs through which ecclesiastical affairs were to be administered. The congregations, the colleges of the elders or other officers, the representatives of united congregations, synods for smaller or larger districts, were not to be deprived of their functions in the government. The administration of discipline, also, and not merely that of its temporalities, was to belong to the congregation. But when, subsequently, the words of the Lord in Matt. 18: 17, *εἰπὲς τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ*, were interpreted as having reference only to the consistory, all discipline in the Luth. Church declined, as a necessary consequence.—Nor did the consistories at first set aside the meeting of synods. These latter were abolished by the Saxon Ch. constitution of 1580, which substituted for them the general synods of the consi-

tories. The fundamental idea of the consistorial government consists in this, that in virtue of it the *jurisdictio ecclesiastica*, previously in the hands of the Rom. Bishops, i. e., the entire administration of Ch. government as a *jus episcopale*, passed over into the hands of the Protestant governments, especially of the sovereign; in so far, namely, as such a Ch. government still existed in the Prot. Church, without detriment to its principle of liberty of conscience, and its objects did not belong to the clerical office, as *jura ordinis*, nor to the congregations, as *jura collegialia*. According to the confessions, Ch. constitutions, and other writings of the Reformers, the *jus episcopale* embraces 1, ecclesiastical legislation; 2, ecclesiastical supervision; 3, appointment to offices; 4, Ch. property. These rights, or rather duties, were, however, to be exercised with the co-operation of the Church. Hence special Church-Boards were appointed, who were charged with the administration of them, in the name and with the authority of the sovereign, in so far as the latter had not reserved them to himself. These reserved rights, pertaining generally to legislation, and certain provisions and dispensations, are submitted to a special superior Board, composed of the counsellors of the sovereign, generally the ministry of justice and of the police. This led to a confusion of Church and State, which subsequent measures were intended to remedy, without, however, any great success. The consistories are subordinate to the superior Boards, whether these are a Spiritual Ministerium, Superior Consistorium, or Superior Ch. Council. They are the chief organs of the administration of ecclesiastical affairs. Hence the Prussian constitution says: "Among the Protestants, the rights and duties of Bishops belong to the consistories;" whence, it is evident that the consistory, just as a Bishop, is placed over the congregations of a district—diocese—as its spiritual authority. Its particular constitution and sphere of labors depend upon the provisions of the different consistorial and Ch. constitutions. A layman, skilled in executive affairs, is generally at its head.—The labors of the consistories embrace the general direction and supervision of the Church and its institutions, such as schools, etc., a limited legislation, the granting of various dispensations, jurisdiction in matrimonial affairs and Ch. discipline, etc. In Saxony, up to 1831, the consistories had charge of 1, doctrine and public worship, the churches, Ch. institutions and schools, their respective officers—examination, ordination, installation; 2, the administration of ecclesiastical penal jurisprudence in its various branches. After 1831, these labors were materially circumscribed. The members of the consistories are appointed by the sovereign.

See Jacobson, über d. Gründ. d. Verschiedenh. d. luth. u. ref. K. Verfass., in *Schneider's* deutsch. Zeitschr. f. christl. Wissensch., 1852, No. 49. De Wette, Luther's Briefe, *Reyscher* u. Wilda, Zeitschr. für deutsch. Recht, Vol. IV. Richter, K. Ordnungen d. 16 Jahrh. Luther's Werke, von Walch, Vol. X. Weber, syst. Darstell. des im K. Sachsen geltend. K.-Rechts. Heppel, die Einführ. der Verbesserungspunkte in H.-Kassel, 1849. Carl Curtze, Gesch. d. ev. K.-verfass.

des Fürstenth. Waldeck. *Mylius, Corp. Constit. Marchic. Bretschneider, Corp. Reform.*, Tom. III. *J. H. Böhmer, jus eccl. Protest.*, lib. I. *Köhler, Handb. der kirchl. Gesetzgeb. f. d. Gr.-Herzogth. Hessen.*

II. F. JACOBSON. — *Reinecke.*

Constance, Council of (from Nov. 5, 1414, to April 22, 1418). The Council of Pisa (1409), the first of the three ecclesiastical assemblies of the 15th cent. from which a reformation of the Church in head and members was expected, at least apparently prevented schism in the Church. It summoned two popes before it as the highest tribunal of the Church, deposed both, and raised Alexander V. to the papal chair. He soon died, and the cardinals elected in his stead Baldassar Cossa, who called himself John XXIII., who was a worthless character, crafty and daring, licentious, and capable of any crime, covetous of money in order that he might use it as a means of power, in short, a man who was better qualified to be a brigand than a successor of Peter. But the two deposed popes, Gregory XII. (Angelo Carraro) and Benedict XIII. (Pedro de Luna), did not resign their dignity; the former resided at Rimini; the latter had his adherents in Spain and Scotland. Thus there was a triple-headed papacy, to the scandal of the world. Pope John, as if he ridiculed his promise of reform, practised usury with his dignity, and dragged all those abuses to view which were so bitterly complained of. He was then suddenly robbed of almost all the Church States by the treachery of his hitherto confederate, King Ladislaus of Naples, and, in his extremity, could apply to no one for help but to Sigmund, king of Rome. He made a general council on free territory the condition of assistance. In a weak moment, the Pope allowed him to choose the place, and the free city of Constance was selected. Circulars and messages were issued by both jointly, inviting to the Council, which was to be opened on Nov. 1, 1414; Gregory XII. and Benedict XIII. were also summoned to appear. John soon repented that he fulfilled the dangerous wish of the protector of the Church, especially as Ladislaus soon afterwards died suddenly. In the hope, meanwhile, that he would be able to control the Council by money, cunning, and the Italian prelates whom he brought with him, he entered Constance on Oct. 28, 1414. A brilliant court surrounded him; 1300 horses were counted in his retinue. He was protected by the city and the Roman king; he also secured the protection of Duke Frederick of Tyrol. The Council was opened on Nov. 5 by the Pope in the cathedral, and held its first session Nov. 16. On Christmas night King Sigmund, the advocate of the Council, also appeared. By degrees 29 cardinals, 3 patriarchs, 33 archbishops, 150 bishops, more than 100 abbots, a larger number of professors and doctors of theology and of law, more than 500 monks of different orders, besides a crowd of envoys and representatives, of princes and nobles, assembled together from all Christian lands. An ecclesiastical assembly became, at the same time, a European Congress. The number of strangers in Constance at different times was between 50,000 and 100,000. More

interest was taken in tournaments, festivals, buffoons of all kinds, and prostitutes, than in speeches, prayers, masses, and processions. Those who complained of the degenerated and divided state of the Church, and of the necessity of reform, were mostly the professors of the universities, the doctors, and monks. Here, as at Pisa, the longing after the ideal of the original apostolic Church expressed itself, and the leading speakers were there and here the same. Cardinal Pierre d'Ailly (see the Art.) and Jean Charlier de Gerson distinguished themselves among the French; the latter appeared in the name of the University of Paris as its chancellor, and as the envoy of his king. Cardinal Zabarella ranked as first among the Italians. They spoke boldly and with animation, as organs of the new unshackled tendency, and with learning which, although trammelled by the scholastic systems, still compelled the crowd of the unlearned to remain silent. Gerson was soon distinguished as the soul of the Council. It had three chief problems to solve: the removal of the schism, the examination of the doctrines of Wickliffe and Huss, and the reform of the Church in head and members. That the latter would and should proceed from the limitation of the pontifical power, the curials knew well; this thought made the Council uncomfortable to them and the pope. Already the organization of the Council plainly indicated the position which it would take. Pope John calculated on the customary voting by poll; the crowd of Italian Bishops and of those who were poor and dependent upon him, whom he brought with him, were to secure him a majority. But, with the same foresight, the Council determined upon another order. Four corporations were constituted, according to the four great nations: the German — to it belonged the Hungarians, the Poles, the Danes, and Scandinavians — the French, the English, and the Italian; each consulted for itself. To these the Spanish came later, after the removal of Benedict XIII., as a fifth. Each nation chose for itself a committee, which changed monthly; in each a majority decided. A committee mediated between them, and they voted by nations then in the public sessions in the cathedral, so that the Italian members alone by their number could obtain no decree of the general Council. Further, according to the proposition of the Pope, only the cardinals, archbishops, bishops, prelates, and generals of orders, should have a deciding vote. Still, it was left to the option of each nation to admit also the doctors, the lower clergy, princes and their envoys, into their assemblies. Just in this, however, consisted the chief power of the anti-papal party. The question which was first to be settled by the Council, seems in itself to be significant. Sigmund was for reform; it was the first concession, that he allowed the adjustment of the schism to precede. A motion was made to persuade all three Popes to voluntary resignation. The Italians not unjustly urged, that a Pope elected by one Council (certainly only indirectly) could not be deposed by another Council; that Benedict XIII. and Gregory XII. were already deposed at Pisa. Pope John desired the present Council to be re-

garded only as a continuation of the one at Pisa; it asserted, however, its independence and freedom. The party of d'Ailly and Gerson prevailed, always actively supported by King Sigmund. Already, in Feb. 1415, a complaint against John was laid before the Council, in which his vices and crimes of all kinds were recounted; but it was as yet suppressed, to avoid public scandal. Sigmund was more active than all others to influence him voluntarily to resign. And the Pope really agreed to the humble reading of a formula of abdication, and to the bull of assignment of March 6, in the hope of securing a re-election; but both contained the condition, that the other Popes do the same. He cautiously avoided any other proposition. But when, on March 10, the motion for the selection of a new Pope was made, and the most bitter charges were made against him anew; and further, when Sigmund allowed the gates to be guarded, in order to prevent his departure, then fear in him outweighed all hopes. The Pope, disguised as a groom, escaped from the city in the dusk of the evening, with the secret assistance of Duke Frederick. Sigmund respected the security pledged to the Pope by the city and king of Rome, as little as he did that to Huss. As soon as the Pope was in safety, he summoned the cardinals and the officers of the court to himself, and complained that Sigmund ruled the Council, and threatened him. He succeeded in causing discord in the Council; and, although only a few followed him, still the opposition of the college of cardinals now arose. The fifth session of the Council, on April 16, 1415, constitutes an epoch. At it the doctrine of the leaders was made a decree, viz., that a Council regularly convened in the Holy Ghost, which represents the militant Catholic Church, receives its authority directly from Christ, and that every one, no matter what his rank may be, even the Pope, is bound to obey it in everything that refers to matters of faith and the extirpation of schism. On May 14, 1415, the Council solemnly pronounced the suspension, and, on May 29, the deposition of the Pope. He himself approved the decision; for when Duke Frederick, who had fallen under the ban of the empire and of the Church, was compelled to submit, and was punished, the Pope also fell into the hands of Sigmund. He was strictly watched for a time in a castle near Constance, where Huss was also imprisoned, and afterwards in Heidelberg. The French court alone expressed its disapprobation of the treatment he received. Gregory XII., an old man of 90 years, voluntarily resigned his power July 4, 1415; but Benedict XIII. opposed the transactions of the Council, and of Sigmund also, with unyielding stubbornness. He was pronounced deposed on April 1, 1417, but he continued to assert that the true Church was with him at Peñíscola. The trial and the judgment against the doctrines of Wickliffe, against Huss and Jerome (see Arts.), which in the meantime occurred, cast a dark shadow over the friends of reform and their protector, Sigmund. Gerson and d'Ailly opposed the doctrines and statutes of the Church no less than the Bohemians; but the scholasticism of Paris triumphed in the eyes of the world over

the evangelical teachers of the Bohemians. Since 1415, a *collegium reformatorium* was constituted; but, during two years, nothing was done for reform. On the contrary, the vices of sensuality, simony, and abuses of all kinds, continued undisturbed even under the eyes of the Council. The only decree with reference to the moral discipline of the clergy, was a confirmation of the canonical statute concerning dress and tonsure. After the deposition of the three Popes, Sigmund, at the head of the Germans, whom the English always faithfully followed, demanded reform before the election of a new Pope. The cardinals, however, declared it necessary first to give to the Church an undoubted chief; the Italians and Spaniards were always with them, together with d'Ailly and Gerson. The French were also won over; even the English were added, and many bribed prelates of the Germans. Thus Sigmund was compelled to yield, not, however, until he and his adherents solemnly protested that they were not responsible if there was no reform. There was now an end to the previous unity. The dictatorship of the Roman king over the Council, and his design of decreasing the incomes of the clergy in favor of the rulers, embittered the rich prelates against him. It is true that, when he conceded the priority of the election of Pope, conditions were added which might afford security, if the future Popes observed them. At the 39th session, the important decree *Frequens*, concerning the holding of Councils was passed, according to which they were to be repeated first in five, then in seven, and afterwards in ten years. In the case of schisms, they were to pronounce judgment. Then eighteen articles of reform were determined upon, concerning which the future Pope would have to agree with the Council, "or the deputies of the nations." They referred to the reform of the head of the Church, i. e., the reduction of the revenues of the exchequer in the reservations, expectances, annates and spoils, indulgences, the jurisdiction, etc. For the Council regarded the wealth of the court as the root of its degeneracy, whilst it condemned the doctrine of Wickliffe and Huss, which affirmed the same thing concerning the whole Church. The conclave was held in the exchange of Constance, and the election committed to 23 cardinals, to whom were joined 30 fathers of the Council, 6 from each nation. The jealousy of the nations prevented an election during the first two days. On the third day the Germans, from love of peace, abandoned the election of one from their midst, and also influenced the others to elect an Italian. The result was that on Nov. 11, 1417, Cardinal Odo Colonna was elected Pope, and called himself Martin V. He gave no evidence in the Council of possessing superior talent, but was regarded as a temperate, moderate, and experienced man. He became exceedingly avaricious, and it was soon felt that he was a Colonna. It foreboded evil for reform that, on the following day, he issued rules of chancery which differed little from those of his predecessors. He replied to the expostulation for reform, that reforms needed to be maturely considered. Then he appointed a commission of 6 cardinals, who should negotiate

with the legates of the nations. Sigmund's influence was at an end; the fathers were wearied; instead of one Œcumenical Council, there were five national councils. The Pope concluded concordats with the Germans, French, and English, but not with the Spaniards; the Italians were agreed with him. The governments of France and England did not confirm the concordats. The German was accepted only by Sigmund (published May 2, 1418, see *v. d. Hardt*, I., p. 1055), but not by Poland, Hungary, and the northern countries. Moreover, it was only concluded for 5 years, and the concessions of the Pope were ambiguous, and were not performed. Further radical reform was postponed to a future Council, which the Pope called in 5 years at Pavia, consequently in Italy. Martin however, in order to satisfy his oath, published also a series of articles of reform, which, however, were either only promises, or so conditional and uncertain, that they were of no effect. At the 45th and last session, April 22, 1418, he proclaimed by a bull that he closed and dismissed the Council at its desire. King Sigmund was indemnified for his expenses with a tenth of all the ecclesiastical possessions of his kingdom. The Pope left the city with great pomp—the king quietly, and greatly in debt; the greater part of the members were discouraged and dissatisfied.

Compare Magn. Œcum. Constant. Concil. etc. op. *H. v. d. Hardt*, VI. Tom., Franc. et Lipa., 1700; *Bourgeois du Chastenot*, Nouv. hist. du Conc. de Const., Paris, 1718; *Mansi*, Collect., T. XXVII. et XXVIII.; (*Ulr. Reichenthal*) Costn. Concil. gedr. 1575; *Stumpf*, Beschreib. d. Conc., gedr. 1541; *L'Enfant*, Hist du Conc. de Const., 1714, 1727; *Royko*, Gesch. d. K.-vers. zu Costn., 1784; *v. Wessenberg*, die groszen Kirchenvers. d. 15. und 16. Jahrh. 1840, Th. 2, p. 69–267; *Fr. v. Raumer*, die Kirchenversaml. zu Pisa, Kostnitz und Basel, im histor. Taschenb. Jahrg. 1849, p. 46–113; *Aschbach*, Gesch. König Sigmund's, Th. 2; *Neander*, Ecol. Hist. Dr. G. Voigt. — *Beck*.

Constantine the Great and his Sons. Constantine the Great, whose life and reign mark one of the greatest crises in the history of Christianity, was the son of Constantius and Helena, and was born A. D., 274, at Naissus, in Upper Mysia. His mother, made by tradition to be a British princess, was rather of humble birth (*Zosim.*, II., 8, *ἡ δὲ βασιλίσσης γυναικὸς οὐ σιμνῆς*, *Eutrop.*, X., 2, *Const. ex obscuriori matrimonio*. Ambrose calls her *stabularia*.) She was at first only the concubine, and then the wife of Constantius; and there is nothing incredible in the report that, in her old age, she went as a Christian pilgrim to the holy places in Palestine, which she richly ornamented, and always greatly revered (*Eusebius*, *De Vita*, III., 42–45; *Manso*, 3d appendix). Constantine, who was highly gifted in body and mind, and trained as a soldier, won his first martial laurels in Egypt, under Diocletian. At this time, the empire in the West was ruled by Maximian and Constantius, in the East by Diocletian and Galerius; and when, in 303, the two Augustus laid aside the purple, and the two Cæsars took their places, Constantine accompanied his father to Gaul. After his father's death, C., proclaimed

emperor by the army (306), notwithstanding his doubtful birth, became, like his father, the brave defender of the western and northern boundaries of the empire against the barbarians. Also following the example of his father, he procured freedom of worship for the Christians of his province, whilst in the Orient the first act of toleration was only granted in 311. Maxentius made himself master of Italy in the complications which immediately followed. After the death of Severus (307), and of the Eastern emperor, Galerius, as also after the fruitless attempts of Maximian to regain power, the united empire was divided into the Western dominion of Constantine and Maxentius, and the Eastern of Maximian and Lucinius. Here Constantine's noble career of triumph commences. His first victory was that over Maxentius, a cruel and lazy sensualist, which was ended by his death in the Tiber, 312. Eusebius compares his destruction with that of Pharaoh (*De Vita*, I., 38). The victor, received with public rejoicing at Rome, secured his power by gifts and favors (I., 41, sqq.), and, being fond of display, he closed the first decennium of his reign with a festival (*ibid.*, I., 48). That he was then already biassed in favor of the Christians, is shown by the edict of tolerance published by him at Rome, 312, and, in connection with Lucinius, at Milan, 313 (*Eus.*, *H. E.*, X., 5; *Lact.*, *De mort.*, c., 48). In 320, Maximian was seized with a dreadful sickness, which, according to Eusebius, compelled him to recall the law against the Christians (*De Vita*, I., 58, 59, and concerning Maximian's end, c. 57). Lucinius stood, therefore, now alone in the Orient, and, although he was the brother-in-law of Constantine, he did not long remain at peace with him. The outbreak of the second contest for supremacy was occasioned more by Constantine than by his opponent, as Eusebius affirms (I., 50–55); and Zosimen charges him with a breach of promise (II., 18, *Κατὰ τὸ συνθηκὴς αὐτῷ περὶ τὰ συγκαταμένα φανερώσας αὐτοῦ*). Lucinius surrendered himself at the battle of Chalcedon, 324, and was killed. The victor celebrated his triumph with unnatural cruelty. The promising Crispus, Constantine's son by his first marriage, was unjustly suspected of assailing the reputation of his step-mother, Fausta; the Emperor put him to death, 326 — an indelible stain on his character. This crime — Eusebius is silent about it — as also the murder of Fausta herself, of his nephew, eleven years old, and of other friends, as the philosopher Sopater (*Zos.*, II., 28; *Eutrop.*, X., 8. *Comp. Manso*, *Life of C.*, p. 64, sq.), indicate the wild passions of jealousy and ambition. C. now appeared at Rome, crowned for the third time with the glory of a conqueror (*Euseb.*, *De Vita*, II., 19, I., 46).

Thus far extends the predominantly warlike part of his life. As to his approach to the Christian religion, the evidences are more external than internal. He received from his father a platonic heathenism. The philosophical idea of a highest divinity (*oratio ad sanctorum coelum*, cp. 9), perhaps also the preference for the worship of Apollo (*Eumen.*, *Paneg.*, cp. 21; *Euseb.*, *De Vita*, II., 50), so far as this externally resembles the worship of Christ, offered a point of con-

nection. Further, it is related that, before the war with Maxentius, 311, Constantine beheld, in the afternoon and above the setting sun, a bright cross, with the inscription *Hac vince* (τοῦτο νίκα); and that in the following night Christ appeared, and directed him to use this sign in the war; whereupon he had a banner made with a cross on it, called later *labarum*, λαβυρον. (*De vita*, I., 28-32, and the *Excursus* in the edition of Heinichen.) This story, which Eusebius assures us he long after received from the Emperor himself, but which is only hinted at by Lactantius (*De mort.*, ep. 44), and given by later writers (*Sozom.*, I., 3; *Nazar.*, Paneg. const., cp. 14) as a vision, was not a miracle, neither does it appear to be a mere fable (*Burckhardt*, p. 394). If we suppose that Constantine saw a sign of the cross in the clouds, and had thereupon a vision which explained it, then it is credible that this occurrence, confirmed by the subsequent victories, converted him, not, as Eusebius will have it (cp. 32), to Christianity, much less to its moral principles, but to a superstitious confidence in the sign of the cross, which may have served to draw him gradually to the Christian religion (*Gieseler*, Ecol. II., I., 120, n. 25; *Neander*, II., p. 11). From this time forward, the cross adorned the helmet of the Emperor, and the statue erected in Rome after his triumphal entry, and the *labarum* was carried by chosen soldiers in the war against Licinius, who protected it in a wonderful manner (*De vita*, II., 9). It is remarkable that the triumphal arch, erected to the Emperor after the victory over Maxentius, bore originally the inscription, *nutu J. O. M.*, viz., of Jupiter, which words, according to Burckhardt (p. 363), may have been changed into *instinctu divinitatis* in 315. The jealousy of Constantine against Licinius and his anti-Christian procedure, could and must have increased his sympathy for the smaller but firmly united party. Nevertheless, he continued to call himself *Pontifex maximus*, and to join in heathen customs (*Zosim.*, II., 29). The coins struck by Constantine bear heathen emblems, and it is a question whether these disappeared after 323 (*Gieseler*, l. c., opposed *Burckhardt*, p. 391). After the murder of Crispus and Fausta, so *Zosimus* (II., 29) and *Sozomenus* (I., 5) report, the Emperor sought to be freed from his anguish of conscience through heathen priests, and only after these declared that they possessed no expiation for so great crimes, did an Egyptian from Spain direct him to the sin-atoning power of the Christian faith. This account also indicates his religious halting, but later criticism (comp. *Burckhardt*, p. 402) has questioned its historical credibility.

After Constantine attained to sole supremacy, he proceeded on the whole as a Christian emperor. We will pass by his thorough reforms and regulations in civil and political affairs, such as the division of the empire into prefectures, and their management, the transformation of the army, and the ingenious organization of the different offices, which afterwards passed over to the Byzantine empire. The ecclesiastical changes followed rapidly and in a crowd on each other. The free exercise of religion, indemnification for sustained losses, and civil re-

cognition were already secured by the decrees of 312 and 313 (*Lact.*, cp. 48; *Eus.*, II. E., X., 5. 7). The next laws of the years 315, 316, 319, 321, and 323, approve admission to public offices, free the clergy from municipal burdens, by which they were made equal to the heathen priests, facilitate the liberation of Christian slaves, allow Christian legacies to churches, and restrain the hostility of the Jews towards the Christians (see the passages of the *Cod. Theod.*, lib. XVI., in *Manso*, p. 95, and *Gieseler*, l. c.). The observance of Sunday by cessation from municipal occupations, was first commanded in 321. These regulations were extended, since the supremacy, over the whole empire. For it excludes the pernicious effects which the reigning impiety and the persecution of Christianity brought upon the whole empire, and shows the necessity of the true worship of God. The Emperor did not wish to force any one to receive the Christian faith. But, in the first place, it was necessary to indemnify the Christians for the evil which they had endured. Wherefore, it was ordered that all exiles, &c., be allowed to return to their homes, and take their former position and possessions. Those who were deprived of military dignity, were allowed to resume it, or obtain an honorable discharge. Degraded freeborn citizens returned to their former rank. The confiscated property of martyrs, or of those who died in exile, was to be restored to their relatives, or, if there were none, it was inherited by the Church; but there was no indemnification for a lost usufruct. The exchequer must also restore the possessions which were unlawfully acquired, especially churchyards and the burial places of martyrs (*Ibid.*, II., 30-41). More positive favors were soon added to this indemnification. No Jew was allowed to hold a Christian as a slave (IV., 27). The unchristian law against the childless was abolished (IV., 26). Senatorial and consular offices, and even the dignity of governor, were often given to Christians (II., 44, IV., 1. 28). The Emperor gratified his fondness for building to the advantage of the Church. He caused or aided in the building of splendid churches at Jerusalem over the grave of Christ (*De vita*, III., 25-29: comp., however, *Socr.*, II. E., I., cp. 13), at Bethlehem, and on Mount Olivet, etc. (*De vita*, III., 51-53).

By all these measures, Constantine desired only to invite to Christianity, not to compel. He was prevented from immediately oppressing heathen worship partly by the principles of his government, and partly by his own sympathy for it. A prohibition against the private sacrifices of the governor had only a limited effect (*De v.*, II., 44). It is true that, in 328, the scandalous worship of Venus at Aphaca, in Phœnicia, was abolished, the temple of Esculapius at Ægea destroyed, and an end made of the unnatural worship at Heliopolis, and its mysteries exposed (*Ibid.*, III., 54. 55): the Emperor, however, may have thought himself obliged, even by his duty of moral supervision, to remove these corruptions. The destruction of other sacred places by Christian mobs may have been unpunished. Eusebius (II., 5, IV., 23, 25) also mentions a general prohibition

against soothsaying, erection of images of the gods, and sacrifices generally, towards which, also, a later law of Constantine points; but we do not, at least, find that it was ever carried out.

Constantine came thus unavoidably to participate in the internal affairs of the Church, especially in its dissensions with heretics. The principle which influenced him to take so decidedly the Catholic side, was that of ecclesiastical unity, which allowed him to see in the smaller factions only unlawful separations from the unity of the Church. With this principle, he opposed the Arian agitation (see *Nice, Arianism*, and *De vita*, II., 64-72).

The last 3 years of Constantine's reign, after the removal to Byzantium (330), were filled with ecclesiastical and family cares. After conquering the Scythians and Sarmatians, 332, he took advantage of a Persian embassy to obtain mild treatment for the Christians there (*De vita*, IV., 8-13). What Eusebius, IV., 17, 22, relates about his increasing devotion, and the regular exercises in prayer and reading the Bible in the palace, is certainly exaggerated. It is more probable that he addressed the people concerning God, providence, and divine judgment (IV., 29), as this gave him an opportunity to work upon the crowd and gain applause. His intercourse with the bishops increased; they were frequently his attendants and guests, although all heathens did not disappear from the imperial presence. The Christian rules of living were more rigidly enforced in the army. Heathen and Christian soldiers must equally observe Sunday, Friday, and the other festival days; the heathen soldiers were even to repeat a prayer on Sunday, in which the Deity is invoked and supplicated to preserve the empire and the Emperor (*De vita*, IV., 18-22, 23, 24). In 336, and shortly after the Synod of Tyre, the Emperor celebrated the festival of his 30 years' reign by consecrating the church of the Redeemer at Jerusalem, in the presence of many bishops from all the provinces. After that he was occupied with the marriage of his son, Constantius, and with the division of the empire among his three sons (comp. *Burckhardt*, p. 378). About Easter, 337, he was taken sick; visited first the baths at Helenopolis, and then, feeling that his end was near, went to Nicomedia. Here, according to his own request, he received the laying on of hands from the Arian Eusebius of Nicomedia (comp. *Heinichen*, Excurs., V.), and after "the necessary instruction," also baptism, and died on the last day of Whitsuntide week, 337, at noon. The senate ranked him among the gods, according to custom. That he was baptised by an Arian is not surprising, after his later conduct in the Arian controversy. His corpse was brought to Constantinople, laid out in state, and interred, under the direction of Constantius, according to the wish of the deceased, in the church of the Apostles, with the highest honors (*De vita*, IV., cp. 61-70).

His great merit consists not only in his elevating Christianity out of persecution and distress, but also in inaugurating a Christian state. That the Church was injured by the sudden transition to public favor and worldly distinction, cannot be laid to his blame; but he is to

be blamed for forsaking the way of freedom and taking the first steps towards the pernicious assumption of ecclesiastical dominion. Heathen authors, like Victor and Zosimus, call him greedy of praise, vain, and unreliable; and that they do not err is shown by his whole court-life, his public conduct, and his intercourse with the clergy. Even Eusebius (IV., 16) is a witness to this, if it is true, that Constantine had coins struck, on which he was represented as engaged in prayer. The Emperor recognised himself as an instrument of providence, which recognition raised his natural selfishness to despotic self-love, and his surroundings confirmed him in it, especially as he no longer had enemies to contend with. He possessed religious excitability, but lacked moral firmness entirely, and he continued to serve himself, even in taking care of the Church.

If we may complain that the first Christian Emperor did not possess a purer character, we may do so in a still higher degree as regards his sons and successors. None of them inherited the father's spirit and energy, none of them did special credit to the rigid Christian nurture which they received (*De vita*, IV., 51, 52). By the will of Constantine, Constantine II. and Constance inherited the West, together with Africa, while Constantius received the oriental prefecture, with Constantinople. As to Constantine II., we have only to say that he sent Athanasius back to Alexandria, according to the last wish of his father; and soon after made war against his brother Constance, who, after 340, ruled alone in the West. Both brothers now found their glory in frivolously transgressing the limits of civil power, which Constantine in a measure observed. Constantius already, 341, prohibited superstition and sacrifices; a second law, 346, interdicted, in the name of the Emperor, the visiting of temples, and could not be rigidly enforced in the West only on account of the strong attachment of Rome to the ancient cultus (*Cod. Theod.*, XVI., 10, 2 and 3). After the assassination of Constance (350), during the campaign against the usurper, Magnentius, Constantius stood alone, and prohibited all sacrifices, 353 and 356 (*Cod. Theod.*, XVI., 10, 4), on the pain of death; he even went so far as to regard the violation of it as a crime against the majesty of the Emperor (*Ammian. Marc. XIX.*, cp. 12). Rome and Alexandria continued to resist, but elsewhere the temples were plundered and destroyed. These measures, which advanced the downfall of heathenism but little, met with some disapprobation among learned Christians, but no powerful opposition; and there are not wanting those who, like Julius Maternus (*Liber de errore profanarum religionum*, about 345), invite to the use of force. The Emperor, with similar self-will, took part in dogmatical controversies. Constance stood with the Council of Nice, and succeeded, 349, in re-installing Athanasius. Constantius, on the other hand, led the Arians at a series of Synods, employed fear and favor, broke, however, at last with the strict Arians, and sought in vain to determine the true medium of the semi-Arian stand-point (see *Arianism*). In the mean time, the Emperor, together with Constantius, Gallus

and Flav. Julianus, was engaged in dangerous wars with the Franks, Alemanni, and Persians. He died Nov. 3, 361, in Cilicia. The reign of Constantius dims the glory of that of his father Constantine; it contained partly the shadows of the later Byzantine dominion, and partly enables us to regard as historical the subsequent reaction in favor of heathenism, accomplished by Julian. (Comp. *Gibbon's Decline, &c., of the Rom. Emp.*; *Manso, Das Leben Constant., &c., Breslau, 1817*; *Burckhardt, die Zeit Constant., &c., Basel, 1853*; *Zosimus, Hist. Eccl.*; *Eusebius, Hist. Eccl., De vita Const., De laudibus Const.*)

GASZ. — Beck.

Constantinople and its Patriarchate. Ancient Byzantium on the Thracian Bosphorus, founded as a colony, according to tradition, 656 B. C., by Byzas, king of Megara, possessed the double importance of a favorable commercial location, and great political influence. After being subject to Persian, Macedonian, and Gallic supremacy, and for a time also connected with Athens, it fell at last to the Roman empire, and recovered itself from every loss, even from the consequences of the conquest and total destruction under Septimus Severus (A. D. 196). Since the middle of the 3d century, and still more under Diocletian, the centre of the Roman empire was no longer in Rome, but in the eastern regions of Illyricum. The idea of founding a second metropolis on this side of the empire, was, therefore, already historically prepared before Constantine seized and realized it, with the strong determination which marked his acts. Sozomen. relates (*Hist. Eccl., II., 3*) that Constantine, after conquering or making peace with his outward enemies, resolved to build a city equal to Rome, and call it by his name. He first selected the site of ancient Illium, together with the landing place of the Greeks, and marked the circumference and limits of a city. But a vision influenced him to decide in favor of Byzantium, which place was immediately greatly enlarged, and surrounded with a wall. This took place in 326. The Emperor employed immense means to build his residence and the city. Grand churches and palaces, gifts of lands to distinguished families, innumerable treasures of art and statues taken from Italy and Greece (*Euseb., Vita Const., III., 48, 54*), gave this new Rome, or Constantinopolis, the appearance of a residence. Many hundred statues were erected on the same place, and the Emperor did not neglect to immortalize himself by erecting a colossal gilded statue (*Burckhardt, die Zeit Constant., p. 469, 472*; *Manso, Leben Constant., 7 Beil., p. 308*). Eusebius (*De vita, IV., 58, 59*) calls the church of the Apostles the oldest church built by Constantine, and Sozomen. (*II., 3*) calls the church of St. Michael *ἐν ταῖς ἑσπέραις*. Sozomen. explains the sudden rise of Constantinople from the Christian piety and benevolence of the inhabitants, which tolerated no heathen temples, except in Julian's time (comp., however, *Burckhardt, p. 474*), and converted many heathens and Jews. This onesided religious design was certainly foreign to the founder; but, in that he raised his rebuilt Byzantium to equal consideration with Rome, and transferred the internal arrangements of the latter, together

with the senate, to it, he certainly designed to give the new-founded state which recognised Christianity a new centre, that should not yield to the old in splendor.

The first age of the metropolis is made known to us more exactly by the descriptions of Chrysostom. The number of inhabitants was then 100,000, of which many were Jews, and at first also heathens. The reigning cultus was a mixture of Roman, Greek, Christian, and heathen customs and immoralities. The female sex passed over from ancient dependence and seclusion to unbounded licentiousness (comp. *CHRYSTOST., ed. Montf. tom. XI., p. 112, 153, 464*; *IX., p. 93, 198, 199*; *VI., p. 45, 100*).

We pass to the history of the *Patriarchate*. Constantine, by his division of the empire, laid the foundation for the metropolitan government, which unfolded itself at the same time, and for the union of the dioceses into larger hierarchical organizations. Of the metropolitans in the Orient, those of Alexandria and Antioch were the most distinguished; next to these, those of Ephesus, Cæsarea, and Jerusalem. Their limits do not entirely correspond with the present division into prefectures, as the above-named cities all belonged to the prefecture of the Orient, and none to that of Illyricum. This made it the more important, in carrying through an organization of the Church, to have regard to the political point of view, so that the principle might prevail as much as possible, that the ecclesiastical arrangement follows the political (*Conc. Chalcedon., can. 17*). The Bishop of Constantinople, who, to this time, stood under the metropolitan of Heraclea, is indebted to this political consideration for his sudden elevation. It was an important step gained, when the second Œcumenical Council of 381 decreed (*can. 3*) that the episcopate of Constantinople, because this was new Rome, should occupy the highest rank with that of Rome, by which also the title *Patriarch*, which was afterwards bestowed upon the metropolitans of the first order (Alexandria, Antioch, Jerusalem, Rome), was naturally secured to it. The Council of Chalcedon (451) went still further. It demanded, in *can. 28*, for the Patriarch of Byzantium equal honors (*τὰ ἰσα πρεσβεία*) with him of Rome, thus contradicting literally the decree of Nice. The Patriarch was also to extend his supervision over the dioceses of Pontus, Asia, and Thracia, ordain subordinate metropolitans, call provincial synods, and be the last appeal in the Orient in important Church affairs (comp. *Petri de Marca, De Const. Patr. institutione diss., p. 194, sqq.*). The right of ordination was practically still further extended. The Concilium Quinisextum (692) repeated the entire contents of this Chalcedonian canon. It was of importance to the emperors to maintain this decree. Justinian declared the Church of his residence as the head of all others with Rome, and confirmed the position of the Patriarch over the provincial synod (see *Gieseler, Eccl. II., I., 341, 370, etc.*). However, in spite of all the preference which this episcopal chair continued to enjoy, many things co-operated to keep its authority within certain bounds. First, the Greek Oriental Church tolerated no concentration, which could have become similar

to that developing itself in the West, and thus found a Byzantine papal system. *Second*, the unequal and inconsequent relation to Rome injured the independence of Constantinople. *Third*, the free activity of the patriarchate was greatly circumscribed by the ambition of the Emperor.

The succession of the Bishops of Constantinople is tolerably complete; a very uncertain tradition traces it even back to the Apostle Andrew (*Randurii Imper. Orient.*, I., p. 187, ed. Par. Fabric. Bibl. Gr., VI., p. 707, and in the Edit. of Harl., VIII. p. 101). A mere glance at the names gives evidence of the restlessness of the time, for it presents not a small number of such Patriarchs, who, like Ignatius († 878), Calistus (1350 and 1355), Philotheus (1354 and 1363), were deposed and restored by the change of circumstances. Without regard to the first uncertain centuries, *four* periods can be distinguished; the first from Constantine to the Photian controversy (861), or to the entire separation from the West, under Cæcilius (1044); the second to the interregnum of the Latins; the third to the conquest of the city by the Turks (1453); and the fourth to the present time. The last Patriarchs under Christian dominion, Josephus II., Metrophanes, and Gregorius Mammas, took part yet in the Council of Florence (1439, sq.); and Bessarion (see the Art.) received later (1463) the title, not the office, of a Patriarch. The Turkish conqueror, Mohammed II., found the episcopal chair at Byzantium vacant, but approved the election of Georgius Scholarius, or Gennadius, perhaps the same person who shortly before, as layman, labored for the union in Florence, but afterwards seems to have abandoned it.

In the following centuries, the Christian hierarchy of Constantinople suffered not less from its moral declension than from Turkish oppression. The Patriarch surrounded himself with a *permanent synod* of Bishops and spiritual dignitaries, and assumed spiritual and civil jurisdiction over his adherents. The Churches of Alexandria, Antioch, and Jerusalem remained in the connection and subordination hitherto existing. The Sultan confirmed or deposed the superiors elected by the Synod, and soon learned that the highest office paid well. The Christians themselves were guilty of the most shameful simony, and in the 17th cent. one recreant succeeded another. (As to the court, costume, income, mode of election, etc., comp. *Heineccius*, *Abbildung der alten u. neuen griechischen Kirche*, Th. I., p. 46, sq., Th. III., p. 49, sq.; also *Martini Crusii*, *Turcogr.*, p. 120, sq.; Thomæ Smithi *de eccl. Gr. statu hodierno in ejus opusculis*, Roterod., 1716; *Geib*, *Darstellung des Rechtszustandes in Griechenland während der türk. Herrschaft*, Heidelb., 1835.) Whilst, moreover, the papacy sometimes attempted to interfere in these external relations, the Church of Byzantium was also touched by Protestantism. First the Lutheran theologians of Tübingen entered into negotiations with the Patriarch Jeremiah II. (1574); then Calvinism was represented in Cyrillus Lucaris (see the Art.), who even occupied the Patriarchal chair in 1621. But both these attempts failed; ecclesiastical Greece

would be reformed and renewed only in and by itself, not in connection with Protestantism, and an opportunity to this was soon after given by the establishment of the Russian Church.

Constantinople again lost a part of its former central importance by the independent organization of the Greek Church in Russia. The city is at present one of the most populous of Europe, having 800,000 inhabitants, of which about one-half are Turks, 130,000 Greeks, 250,000 Armenians, 6000 pure Hellenists, 20,000 Jews and foreigners of all nations. Every foreign congregation, the Russian, English, Scottish, Lutheran, has its own chapel; the Roman Catholics have even 9 churches, and efforts are now being made for making better provisions for Protestant worship. The relation of the Turks to the Christians has been greatly improved during the last decades, and under the rule of the present tolerant Sultan. On the other hand, the Greeks resist as strongly as ever all Protestant influences; less so, the Armenian Christians, who have here a Patriarch of their own. Many of the existing 14 Greek churches, which are mostly named after the Virgin and other saints, were built in the Byzantine age, although, as is known, the church of Sophia is used as a mosque, and the Blachernian church no longer stands. The Patriarch, and with him "the holy synod," possesses still, in addition to his spiritual dominion, a partial temporal and civil supervision over the *Rajahs*. The "holy synod," composed formerly of 12, afterwards of 6, archbishops, and a number of counsellors, constituted the ecclesiastical tribunal, which also decides civil controversies and cases of discipline in the congregation, administered the finances, and, under the confirmation of the Sultan, elected its head. As to other ecclesiastical occupations, the inspection of cloisters and of instruction, etc., was committed to a department, which formerly was connected with the synod, composed of two corps of officers. A Church commission was also for a time active in promoting the ecclesiastical life. The residence of the Patriarch was frequently changed, but has been for a long time in Fanar, at the church of "All Souls." This Patriarch not only participated, in connection with the synod, in the election of the other 3 subordinate Patriarchs, but he also could control it. The extent of his dioceses was greatly limited by the Greek insurrection of 1826. The Greek clergy of Constantinople took an active part in the contest for freedom, and their co-operation cost the Patriarch Gregorius his life. Upon the separation from Turkey, an assembly of metropolitans and Bishops, 1833, at Nauplia and Syra, declared the Church of Greece to be hierarchically independent, and transferred its management to a permanent synod. Wearisome intrigues and embarrassments followed; but the Greek government of 1844 confirmed the step, in that it besides allowed the complete ecclesiastico-dogmatic confederation of the Hellenic Church with the Church of Constantinople to continue; and finally, in 1850, the Patriarch was compelled to recognize the independence of the Hellenic Church government. The jurisdiction of the latter, therefore, only extends at present over

European Turkey and the Ionian Islands, as also over the non-united Greeks in Galicia, Slavonia, and Bucovina. The present Patriarch was elected in the fall of 1853, and was confirmed by the Sultan. (Comp. v. *Hammer*, Constantinopel u. der Bosphorus, Bd. I., 1822; *Wiggers*, Kirchliche Statistik, I., p. 176; *Description de Const. ancienne et moderne*, Const., 1846; *Rigler*, Die Türkei u. deren Bewohner vom Standpunkte Constantinopels, Bd. I., Vienne, 1852.)

GASZ. — Beck.

Contarini, *Caspar*, b. 1483, of a noble Venetian family, was by birth entitled to the highest official dignities of Venice. After a complete education, he commenced his public career under the fairest auspices. In 1521, he was sent as ambassador to Charles V., on his first arrival in Germany. At Worms, Luther made no favorable impression on C. Though the two held fundamentally similar views, C. could not understand Luther's character and plans. C. accompanied Charles V. to Spain, and, after the taking of Rome, reconciled Clem. VII. with Charles. His intellectual gifts, and moral firmness and integrity made him universally prominent. But he early displayed, also, deep and decided religious feelings. In Venice he was the centre of the spiritual movement (represented by the oratory of *Sti. Amoris*) of that period, against the religious frivolities of Rome. In 1535, Paul III. suddenly made him a cardinal, hoping thus to secure his great influence for Rome. C. accepted, but maintained his independence (see *Ranke's Popes*, I.). At first, circumstances seemed to favor his principles. In 1537, Paul III. called a Commission upon Church Reform. Something had to be done, and it seemed best to charge the most influential of those interested, with the matter. A liberal opinion was reported. Paul III. received it kindly, but did nothing. Paul IV. (once a member of the Commission) had it put in the *Index* (1559). It is to this day an offence to Romish historians. C.'s letters to Paul III. prove his large share in the action. The opinion exposes the excesses of papal power, the practice of simony, and the infringements upon Christian liberty. But the effort to correct these evils in their source came a century too late. In 1541, C. attended the Diet and Conferences of Regensburg (see Art.) as papal Legate. His instructions, though seemingly liberal, hampered him by their ambiguity. It was hoped, however, that he might draw the Evangelicals into a union upon dogmas, which might subsequently be construed in favor of Rome. Articles were prepared, which set forth evangelical views in Romish terms. C. approved of them. Protestant writers charge him with deceit in this; but his course was assailed in Italy, and Francis I. endeavored to excite Paul's suspicions against him. His defence against these attacks prove how deeply the questions of the day exercised his mind, and his decided opposition to prevalent Romish views. He especially insists upon the doctrine of justification by faith. Then came stricter orders from Rome, which he closely followed. He advised the Emperor, when the proceedings were closed, not to allow them to be resumed, but to refer all to the Pope, who might

submit the question to a General Council, or make some other satisfactory disposition of them. In a second opinion he somewhat harshly charged the German Bishops with retarding the work of reform by their violent measures. It seems that, though convinced that existing abuses should be corrected, he still hoped to have this effected by beginning with the papacy; and he had no sympathy with the national character of the German Reformation. This may be accounted for by his high aristocratic position. Even his doctrinal views were modified by this fact. He thus exemplifies the inmost difference between an Italian and German notion of a reformation. C. was spared the pain of seeing his hopes put to shame. He died in Bologna, 1542, just when the inquisition was compelling many of his friends to flee from Italy, leaving behind him the character of a man who acknowledged the truth, and desired the good, though unable to break through his natural mildness and social circumstances. His works were publ. in Venice, 1589 (the tract on Justification changed. It is genuine in the Paris ed., 1571). (See *POLUS's letters*, III.; *PLANCK*, Prot. Lehrbegr., III.; *RANKE*, Popes, I.

WEIZSÄCKER.*

Conversion is a moral change of mind, and consequent adoption of a course of life opposed to that previously pursued; a change of disposition and behavior, especially with reference to our relationship to God. The term is used to designate both the beginning of this change or renewal, and its progress in sanctification, just as the corresponding term (though derived from another figure) "*regeneration*" is used in a narrower and wider sense. But this mode of speech springs from the fact that C. is a process, every step of which is a repetition of the beginning. Thus C. involves *repentance* and *faith*. These, though ideally distinct, are not separated in actual experience, and either may be the more prominent, according to the state and character of the individual subject. But each always includes the other as antecedent or result; i. e., a man cannot *turn from* unrighteousness without having inwardly *turned to* righteousness, and the reverse. These are the most general modifications of C. in its beginning and progress. Let us now note both more closely. *Repentance* is aversion to sin, and its inward renunciation. Sin is, essentially, self-exaltation against God, mistrust, unbelief, and consequent disregard and disobedience of God's will, law. *Repentance*, therefore, involves the sinner's abasement before God, restored confidence, *faith*, obedience. The spread of this act over the man's entire life constitutes sanctification.—The matter becomes still clearer if *psychologically* considered. C. has its root in the centre of man's personality, in the heart, the fundamental tendency of which is changed. It develops itself, however, in the usual modes of the soul's life, and thus acquires a definite form. Thus, repentance appears chiefly as a *knowledge* of (personal) sin, i. e., as a consciousness of opposition to the will of God, or a consciousness of guilt, of the interruption of our relation to God, of separation from him, of exclusion from fellowship in his love, of condemnation. This is a living, active conscious-

ness, and produces a *sense* of sorrow, concern, of grief at sin as sin, as ingratitude and unfaithfulness to God, as a proud departure from him, and resistance to his holy law, and as an alienation of our *will* from him — and all this with regard both to the past (contrition), as to the future (aversion). — But this entire process derives its power from the corresponding process of *faith*. The *knowledge* of sin, above named, springs from the knowledge of the love of God, as manifested to the sinner; for without this, especially as seen in the work of redemption, man would have been unable to know himself as being in antagonism to God, and under condemnation — to exercise confidence in God — to resolve to yield to him; contrition and aversion would never have been wrought effectively in man. But, reversely, *faith*, as a humble, cordial appropriation of the love of God, can find place only as these parts of repentance really exist, so that faith is a living, decided surrender to God, with a firm purpose to live only by his grace, through which communion with God and all included blessings are secured. And this leads to cheerful and unqualified obedience to the will of God.

But this psychological process presupposes the operation of a *divine causality*. C. is no mere personal act of man (Jer. 31 : 18). Here three questions arise: 1. What are the *divine acts* in C.? They are the presentation of the law (God's will) and conviction of guilt. With these God arrests man's conscience, and brings him to a sense of his sin. Thus God works *elenchthically* upon the sinner's heart, causing the divine wrath against sin, and the sinner as such, to be reflected in man's spirit, and become a moral power there. But inseparably connected with this divine act, producing *repentance*, is that by which God would work *faith* in the soul, viz., the clear revelation of his purpose to restore, pardon, and reconcile the sinner to himself, and the personal appeal urging the sinner to take hold of saving grace, as he has been made to feel the need of it and long for it. These acts of *illumination*, *calling*, and *justification* beget *faith*, a hearty assurance of God's love to the sinner, a firm reliance in, and sincere giving up unto, God. They also, in proportion to the thoroughness of C., stir up and deepen true repentance; whilst, reversely, those divine acts which beget repentance prepare the way for enlightening and inviting grace. 2. By what *means* are these twofold operations wrought? Mainly by the *Word of God*, as that in which God draws near to man, revealing his will and ways to us, and our duty to him. Hence, this *Word* is divided into *Law* and *Gospel*. The substance of the law is contained in the decalogue, which, as expounded and developed by prophets and apostles, is the authentic and complete declaration of God's will. The *Gospel* is the sum of all the divine promises and proffers of salvation, and it sets forth the workings of God's grace to sinners from the fall to the culmination of that grace in the incarnation of the eternal Word, and his atoning sacrifice for sin. In him, as the son of God and the son of man, the Law and Gospel meet, in a perfect living exemplification of both. In him, therefore, the *holiness* of love, as abhorring sin, and its *mercy*, as res-

cuing the sinner, appear in inseparable union. Hence, the Gospel includes the power of the Law. But the Moral Law is not thus rendered superfluous, inasmuch as it is indispensable to conviction and conversion, and as a norm of a holy Christian life. But the Gospel bears witness of this grace in incorporated visible acts, also — in the *sacraments* (see Art.). 3. *What is the relation between the divine causality and man's act?* The question already denies that God's working excludes man's activity, or that man is merely *passive*; both God and man work (Phil. 2 : 12). God's working encourages man to work, by pointing to the all-sufficient *power of God*. Man co-operates in his salvation by the power of God which works in him, by yielding himself unresistingly to it. Because God works, man can and should also work. The personal God addresses a personal, self-determining moral agent, arousing him to free action, restoring sinful, captive (Rom. 7 : 14) man to Christian liberty, in the contemplation of its highest activity. Thus salvation is brought so near to man, by outward means and inward influences, that if man accepts it he cannot boast, and if he rejects it he has no excuse. And as, if man accepts, God continues to work in him, his free self-determination becomes ever more decided and energetic. The divine influence becomes an indwelling principle, the incitement an impulse. The self-determination of the soul, now united to God, combines with the determining grace of God. The truth upon this subject, therefore, lies midway between the doctrine of an absorption of the human will by the grace of God, as being alone active, and that false synergism which places man's will on a level with grace, as though it could act independently of the incitements and helps of grace. (See THIRSCH, Vorl. ü. Kathol., &c., 24; NITZSCH and BAUR against Möhler; THOMASIVS, d. Behehntn. d. ev. luth. K., &c.; SARTORIUS, Lehre v. d. heil. Liebe, 2. Th.) KLING.*

Copiatæ (κοπιᾶν, *laboro*; or κοπάζω, *quiesco*; or *καίρομαι*), Lat. *fossore*, *fossarii*, were officers who saw to the decent burial of the dead (ΕΡΙΦ. *expos. fid.* c. 21). They are also called *vespillones*, *lecticarii*, νεποδάντοι. They appear simultaneously with the *Parabolani*, and were reckoned with the clergy (PSEUDO ILLER. *de sept. ord. eccl.*; *Primus* (from below) in *clericis Fossariorum ordo est*, &c.). Their number varied. Theodos. the younger reduced them from 1100 to 950 for Constantinople. Anast. again appointed 1100. In Constant. they formed a separate college, called *Collegiatai*, *Decani*, and enjoyed certain immunities. (See Cod. Theod. XIII., 1, 1, &c.; Cod. Justin., I., 2, 4; BINGHAM, *Antiq.*, III., 8; AUGUSTI, *Archæol.*, XI., 239.)

HAGENBACH.*

Cordus, *Euricius*, a distinguished humanist and Latin poet of the 16th cent. Having early come under the influence of the reformatory movements, he spent several years, until 1523, in Erfurt. In 1521 he accompanied Luther to Worms. In 1524 he was appointed city physician to Brunswick. Here he continued to pour out his epigrams in favor of the new measures. In 1527, Landgr. Philip called him to the new university of Marburg, as prof. of medicine. In

1534 he accepted a call to Bremen as medicus and professor, where he died in 1535, aged 49 years. His writings as naturalist and physician are meritorious, but he excelled in satirical Latin verse. (See KÄHLER's *vita Eur. Cordi*, Rinteln, 1744; *Ersch u. Gruber*, Th. 19, p. 285-91). HENKE.*

Corinth was the chief city of *Achaia propria*, at the rise of Christianity. Paul went to it from Athens on his second missionary tour, remained there one and a half years, and, aided by Silas and Timothy, founded a Church composed of Jewish, but mainly heathen, converts. Schisms occasioned by divers views upon the obligations of Judaism, personal attacks, and the carnalities indulged by many converts, called forth three epistles (the first lost, cf. 1 Cor. 5:9) from Paul, and led him to revisit C. (see *Paul*). C., under the Romans the capital of Corinthia, lay upon a beautiful fertile plain, on the S. E. point of the bay of Corinth, at the foot of the hill on which the citadel Akrocorinth was built. The origin of the city dates back to the earliest traditions. Its old name was Ephyra, which poetry retained (OVID, *Metam.*, II., 240; VIRG., *Georg.*, II., 264; PROPERT., II., 5, 1). The name was changed (after a king, Corinthos) in connection with the division of rule between Sicyon and C., at the time of the Argonaut invasion. The Dorians put an end to the Æolian dominion, and introduced various political changes, substituting an oligarchy for the monarchy. Then came the tyrants, after whose overthrow (540 B. C.) a free constitution, a Timocratic, was established. During the Peloponnessian war, C. usually joined Sparta against Athens. After the expulsion of the Macedonians, C. (243 B. C.) joined the Achaian league, which led (146 B. C.) to its overthrow by the Roman general Mummius. For a century it lay waste, only some temples and the citadel remaining, until Cæsar (46 B. C.) restored it as *Colonia Julia C.* Its earlier bloom speedily returned. The new city (see PAUSAN., II., 1, &c.; STRABO, VIII., 378, &c.) was a regular square of 40 stadia on the north side of the citadel, with walls on three sides. Magnificent temples and public buildings, partly raised out of the old ruins, partly new-built, adorned it, especially the market-place. The road to the Akropolis, with various bends, 30 st. long, led past temples, altars, and statues, and on the citadel stood the splendid temple of Venus, adorned with a panoplied image of the goddess. Akrocorinth was thought the strongest fortress in Greece. Presenting a perpendicular front on the north, its approaches from all other sides were steep and well fortified. Its situation secured to it extensive commerce, and made it the port and highway of the natural and artistic products of the Orient and Occident. Thus it became populous and rich, but also luxurious and corrupt to a proverb. Sensuality prevailed, and was fired by the worship of Venus, and the institutions of the Hieroduloi, brought over from Phœnicia. This led more to the cultivation of the arts than the sciences. Its architecture (the C. columns, &c.), sculptures, vases, &c., are celebrated. But time has wasted all these. All that remains of its former glory is a pile of miserable houses amid ancient ruins, inhabited

by sickly wretched people, who move like shadows along its streets. (See H. WILKENS, *Specim. antiq. Cor.*, &c., Brem., 1747, 4to.; J. E. WALCH, *antiq. Cor.*, Jen., 1761, 4to.; WAGNER, *rer. Cor. spec. Darmst.*, 1824, 8vo.; PAULY, R.-Encl., &c., II., 642-49. For mod. comp. HASSEL, *Handb.*, &c., III., 1, p. 673; PONQUEVILLE, *Expéd. scient. de Morée*, Paris, 1836.)

ARNOLD.*

Cornelius à Lapide (van d. Steen), a renowned Romish exegete and Jesuit, b. 1568, at Boehaff, in the see of Liege, became public lecturer upon the Bible at Löwen, and then at Rome, where he died March 12, 1637. He wrote extensive commentaries upon the whole Bible, the Psalms and Job excepted. These were often publ. in Paris, Antwerp, &c. The Venice ed. of 1740 fills 11 folios. They are rich in materials selected from the fathers, but are diffuse, allegorical, and mystic, and are loaded with insipid tropological and anagogical remarks. The latest ed. Lyons, 1838, 11 vols., 4to. His best com. are those on the Pentat. and Paul's Ep. (R. SIMON, *hist. crit. des princip. comment.*, &c., Rotterd., 1693; MEYER, *Gesch. d. Schriftausl. Götting.*, 1804, 3 vols.) K.*

Coronati quatuor, the traditional title of the four brothers, Severus, Severianus, Corpophorus, and Victorinus, who suffered martyrdom (304) under Diocletian, by having crowns with sharp nails forced into their heads. Their remains are said to rest in the church *Sanctorum quatuor*, &c., in Rome. HERZOG.*

Corporale, a linen cloth (Luke 23:53) on which the host (i. e., *corpus Chr.*) and cup are set, to keep them from touching the surface of the altar and tabernacle. At first it was large enough to envelope the elements (hence its name *palla*, *ελεηρον*). HERZOG.*

Corpus Catholicorum and **Corpus Evangelicorum**. Thus were designated the united Rom. Cath. and Protestant States, respectively, of the German empire, each of which formed themselves, during the progress of the Reformation, into a corporation for the protection and promotion of the political interests of their respective Churches. Although the first title does not occur until in the 17th cent., and Rome never formally admitted its corporate existence, the *C. Cathol.* was, in fact, formed in 1524, at the conclusion of the Regensburg league; and from that time continued silently to exert considerable influence. The *C. Evangel.* consisted of a college of delegates of the Ev. States of Germany, called forth to counteract the movements of the *C. Cathol.*, and further the political interests of Protestantism. It originated at the Diet of Spires, 1529. It was also called *C. sociorum Augustanæ confess.* (See FABER, *Europ. Staats-Cantzley*, XVII. Th. (1711), 248; LIII. Th. (1729), 252, 335; MOSER, *Teutsches Staats-Recht*, X., 468, Lpz. u. Ebersdorf; v. BÜLOW, *Gesch. u. Verf. d. Corp. Ev.*, &c., 1795.)

NEUDECKER, HEPPE.*

Corpus Christi is the Romish festival of the transubstantiation. It arose soon after the settlement of the tedious controversies upon that doctrine (1215), in accordance with the visions of several women of the convent of St. Cornelius, at Liege, who several times saw a full moon,

exceedingly bright, excepting a dark shade on one side; and, having prayed for an interpretation of the vision, received in answer, that the moon was the Church, and the shade the want of an important festival in honor of the sacrament of the altar. The vision was communicated to several Bishops and others, who seized the idea, and favored the institution of such a festival. Accordingly, Urban IV. (1264) ordered its observance, and his bull was confirmed by Clem. V. (1311). It was not generally kept until 1316. The procession seems to have been first ordered by John XXII., 1317. Th. Aquinas was the author of the service prescribed by Urban IV., and is thought by some to have originated the festival (*Binterim*, V., 1, p. 279-89). The festival is kept on the Thursday after Pentecost, in evident reference to Maunday Thursday (on which (as the bull says) so many other facts were commemorated, that this object could not find place) and to Trinity Sunday, on account of the mystical bearing of the host to the Trinity. Its great objects were to disgrace heretics and confirm the faithful. — The associated *procession* is styled *solemnissima*, because the host is borne along in it; and, as the festival occurs in the season of flowers, there is the richest display of these (*Conc. Trid.*, s. XIII., c. 5). — The doctrinal objections to the festival are thus set forth by Hillebrand: 1. *Quod illo festo mutilatio Eucharistiæ et communio sub uno confirmetur, dum Christus in Monstrantia non nisi sub uno specie proponitur.* 2. *Quia hoc festo Corpus Christi solum ostentui est, cum tamen Christus ideo instituerit, ut distribueret et manducetur.* 3. *Quia hoc festo panis benedictus cultu sæpius afficitur, adeoque triticus Deus adoratur, quæ est manifesta ἀπολαρψία.* (See AUGUSTI, Denkwürd. III., 304.)

GRÜNEISEN.*

Corpus juris civilis is the title of several collections of civil law, made by Justinian and others, and which form not merely a book of common law, but a source of authority for the whole Church. The *Corpus* embraces: 1. *Four books of the institutions of Justinian.* The contents are arranged in titles, with an introduction and paragraphs. It is thus quoted: § *Hic igitur generaliter* (1) *J. de justit. et jure*, I., 1. 2. *Fifty b. of digests or pandects.* also publ. by Justin., in 533, and arranged under titles, and under these the excerpts thus quoted: *Fr(agn.)* or *l(ex)* *Juri operam daturum* (1) § *cujus merito* (1) *D. (κ. ff.) de justit. et jure*, I., 1. 3. *Twelve b. of the Justin. codex*, of 534, containing the constitutions since Adrian, quoted: *C(onstit.)* or *l(ex)* *Cunctos populos* (1) §. *Hanc legem* (1) *C(odicis)* *de summa trinitate* I., 1. 4. Later imperial constitutions (*novellæ leges*, 529-582, from Justin. to Tiber. II.) were collected by private persons, and a collection of 168 still later ones was included in the *Corpus juris*. They are quoted: *Nov.* I., c. 1. To these other imperial edicts, the Apost. canons, &c., were added. These collections, especially the *Codex* and *Nov.*, contain the most various directions concerning the relation of Church and State, as well as the entire Church itself. Hence canon law was the more closely connected with Roman law, because in the newly organized German states, the latter was the per-

sonal or national law of the Church. See SAVIGNY, *Gesch. d. röm. Rechts im Mittelalter*, I., § 40, 2. Ausg.: EICHORN, *deutsche St.-u. Rechtsgesch.* I., § 46.) The principles of canon law, especially when they favored the authority of the State, were assailed in the Reformation, and by some the *Corpus jur. civ.*, was preferred to the *C. jur. can.* Thus by Luther (Walch, X., 510, &c.) and Melancthon. The study of the latter was even forbidden (SCHMINCKE, *monum. Hassiaca*, II., p. 650). But this had no influence on the Ev. Church, which retained its preference for the *C. jur. civ.* H. F. JACOBSON.*

Corrodi, Henry, a Neologian of the last century, was the son of a retired Swiss minister. After finishing his studies, he secured ordination, but bodily infirmities debarred him from the pulpit. In opposition to the mystic-pietistic orthodoxy of his father, he imbibed from Steinbrüchel, canon in Zurich, neological views, making Christianity a system of morality. He also came under Gessner's influence. Through both he was enabled to visit German universities. In Halle he became intimate with Semler, and zealously embraced the rationalism and humanitarianism there taught. In 1786 he became prof. of Moral Philos. and Natural Law in the Gymnasium of Zurich, where he died in 1793, æt. 41. His numerous, mostly anonymous, writings were devoted to the advocacy of the neological views he had embraced. His principal work is *d. krit. Gesch. d. Chiliasmus*, 1781, &c., 4 vols. It is rich in material, and instructive, but uncritical in its execution, and full of digressive attacks upon mysticism and orthodoxy. SEMISCH.*

Corvey. This renowned Benedictine abbey, which lay near the town of Hörter, at the entrance of the Schelpe into the Weser, possesses importance for the Christian Church, in having been for a considerable period, during the middle ages, one of the most active patrons of learning, and also the first missionary institution in Germany. In it were trained many distinguished men, who spread Christianity among the rude Saxon and other heathen nations in the north of Europe, especially among the Scandinavians. It owes its origin to *Bathilde*, consort of Chlodewig II., founded about 664, and called by writers of the middle ages *Corbeja aurea*, or *vetus*, cloister *Corvey*, near Amiens, in Picardy. Here many noble Saxons found a home, the families of whom were placed among the Franks by Charlemagne, to become acquainted with Christianity and the morals of the people. The regular employment of these Saxon youths, thirsting for knowledge, awakened the idea, in the mind of Abbot *Adalhard* the elder, of founding a cloister in Saxony. A similar idea had been entertained by Charlemagne. After Adalhard had taken up the Emperor's plan, having consulted often with the Saxon pupils of his cloister, to his great joy a certain youth, named *Theodrad*, declared that he knew a most desirable location on his father's estate, which he hoped could be obtained gratuitously. Thus encouraged, Adalhard sent several older monks with the youth to Saxony, where they found the desired reception, and (816) at once commenced the new institution in a retired part of the

"Sollinger Wald." According to some writers, this country was then called *Hetha* or *Hechi*. The first settlement of this pious fraternity is still remembered at Newhouse, by the names, Meadow of the Abbots, Valley of the Cloister, Plain of the Monks, and Woods of the Cloister. Many hindrances opposed the progress of this enterprise. The settlers were scarcely able to procure the necessities of life from the soil. They were disappointed, also, in the expectation of aid from the French Corvey. Through the malice of enemies, Adalhard, his brother Wala, and all his adherents, had fallen into disgrace with the Emperor, Lewis the Pious. A. was banished to a small island, where he passed several years in seclusion (PERTZ, *Monum. Script.*, II., p. 529). Before leaving Corvey, however, he gave the government of the cloister to a pupil, *Adalhard* the younger, who endeavored to act and rule in the spirit of his predecessor. But little could be done for the sister institution in Saxony that was encouraging. After the death of Benedict of Aniane, his bitterest opponent, A. the elder was recalled from his banishment by the Emperor, and reinstated into his former dignity (Oct., 821). He at once sent relief to his suffering brethren in Saxony. He visited them himself, and was soon convinced that the new institution must be removed to a more suitable place. After his return to France, he went to the court of the Emperor, there personally to obtain permission to remove the cloister to a more friendly spot. The Emperor granted his request the more readily, inasmuch as he saw that by its prosperity, the success of Christianity among the Saxons would be made the more certain.

After A. had made the requisite arrangements at Corvey, he undertook a journey into Saxony, accompanied by *Paschasius Radbertus*, *Ansgar*, *Wilmar*, *Autbert*, and other monks. He was received with joy by his brethren. After a short deliberation, he selected a situation for the new cloister, upon the opposite banks of the Weser, on the property of the princely Villa *Hüxori* (Höxter), which, as was generally believed, Charlemagne had intended for said purpose. Forthwith the building was commenced, and prosecuted with such zeal that, in the autumn of 822, the overjoyed monks were enabled to forsake their solitary abode in Sollingerwald. They were accompanied by a large multitude, and moved in solemn procession, with the sacred relics of their church, into the newly-erected cloister. At the consecration by Bishop *Badurad*, of Paderborn, it was dedicated to the blessed Stephen, and received its name from the parent institution in Flanders, *New Corvey* (*nova corbeja*). A solemn mass, in the presence of the assembled multitude, closed the services of this memorable day. (PERTZ, *Mon. Script.*, II., p. 579; I., p. 577.)

The Emperor looked with favor upon this first cloister established in Saxony in his reign, took it under his special care, granted to it all the rights and privileges of the French Church, and richly endowed it. His example was imitated by many renowned Franks and Saxons, so that the institution rose rapidly, and became opulent. Thus highly favored, the Benedictines

were soon enabled to devote themselves exclusively to their own spiritual development, and the spread of Christianity. Adalhard witnessed all this with gratitude, and made New Corvey his abode, only occasionally visiting his former home. Inasmuch as he desired to be buried at the old institution, when he found age and infirmities beginning to press him, he imparted to the Saxon friars at Corvey his fatherly blessing, recommended to them his nearly allied *Warinus*, a son of the powerful Count Ekbart and Ida, as his successor, and departed for Corvey in France, attended by Ansgar, Authert, and other monks; where he died in peace, Jan. 2, 826.

Thus far A. had presided over both cloisters as abbot. After his death, his brother *Wala* succeeded to this honor in Old, while in New Corvey, according to his wish, *Warinus* was elected abbot, and confirmed by the Emperor. Though this separation was at first received with regret, and reluctantly accepted, the two cloisters long maintained intimate fellowship. Scarcely a year passed without mutual visits and communications. But New Corvey was more favored by emperors and queens than the parent institute, and rose to still higher renown and credit. Besides the presents already cited, it received from the Emperor, Lewis the Pious, the right of coinage, and the possession of Höxter, Eresburg, and Meppen, and other important grants. Count *Gerold*, having retired from the world and entered the cloister, before his death, in 851, bequeathed to it his rich possessions. But of far more importance was the transfer of the remains of the blessed martyr Vitus from the church of the Abbey of St. Denis, in France, in 836. After this, the Saxons showed themselves much more liberal towards the cloister than ever, believing that the prosperity and superiority of the German over the Francoonian power depended on the possession of these holy relics (PERTZ, *l. c.*, and *Wigand*, *Hist. of Corvey*, I. p. 67). It was maintained by those of Corvey, that Lothaire, in gratitude to St. Vitus for the victory gained (844) over the Slavic king, *Gestimulo*, bestowed on them the island *Rügen*. This is not only improbable, but it may be shown that the documents are spurious, and that the oldest statements on these points, as found in the annals of Corvey (PERTZ, *Mon. Script.*, T. III., p. 3, 840, 860), are interpolations. The known facts seem to be these: As the result of early attempts to convert the Slavonians, the island *Rügen*, seized by the Carolingians, was made tributary to Corvey, and, on its refusal to pay tribute, documents were forged to prove the claim.

The Abbot *Warinus* died Sept. 20, 856. Since then, until 1750, sixty abbots ruled over Corvey, many of whom were renowned for their learning, earnest piety, and pure zeal for Christianity. Instead of following the history of Corvey in detail, we shall confine ourselves to the presentation of events which immediately concern the Christian Church. The bloom of this institution was reached under the powerful rule of the Saxon emperors. Under their powerful protection, the school, early established and first directed by Ansgar, acquired an extensive reputation. The most renowned families sent thither

their sons. At one time, about 24 teachers imparted instruction in the sacred writings of the O. and N. T. Besides Latin and Greek, the sciences, especially medicine, mathematics, and astronomy, were diligently cultivated. As the desire for intellectual improvement in Saxony spread so rapidly, the keen and zealous abbot, *Adelgar* (from 856 to 876), found himself necessitated to establish a second school, exclusively for Greek and Latin, which stood under the control of the first, but soon rivalled it. Corvey also became an example to other cloisters in piety and discipline—the wonder of all Germany, and the promoter of religion and learning, the teacher of the whole north. Contemporaries vie with each other in their praises of it. Of the large number of renowned men who received their training at Corvey, and who rose to high honors in the Church, we mention Ansgar, Rimbert, Adelgar, Hoyer, and Unni; Bruno of Köln, Thiagrin of Halberstadt, Bruno of Verden, Wigbert of Hildesheim, and Folkmar of Paderborn; and the zealous missionaries, Autbert, Adaldag, Ansfried, Nithard, Stephan, Otger, and Adelverd, some of whom found a martyr's grave.

Whilst these extended the fame of this institution by their labors abroad, many of those remaining labored successfully as teachers and authors. Adam of Bremen says (*lib. I., c. 32, 35*), that he received from Corvey the younger a collection of short cloister notices, which he called *computus*, besides the life of the blessed Rimbert, and the historical work of *Bovo I.*, Abbot at Corvey (880–90), a contemporary of Archbishop Rimbert. *Widukind*, with others, wrote the excellent history of the Saxons (*Res gestæ Saxonicae*, PERTZ, *Mon. Scr.*, T. III., p. 408–467), which reached down to 968. About the time of Henry IV., the monk Bernhard composed an *Oratio inveciva in imperatorem Henricum IV.*; also, about 1082, *Isibort* of *Amelunxen* a *Breviarium rerum memorabilium*. In 1206, Abbot *Thietmar*, assisted by Maurus, wrote *Annales Corbej. recentiores ad a. 1206* (LEIBNITZ, *Script.*, II., 297). Others devoted their talents to theology. *Arnulph* (982) composed a metrical work on the Proverbs of Solomon, and *Eberhardus* a commentary on the Pentateuch. *Robert*, *Meinholt*, *Roger*, and others took part in the controversy on the *Lord's Supper*, against the supposed heretical views of *Berengarius*.

This literary zeal was greatly aided by the library, which contained important MSS., collected from the earliest times; among others, the first five books of the *Annals* of Tacitus were found, and now preserved in the *Medicæ* library, at Florence (TACITI, *Opera* ed. J. A. ERNESTI, præf., I., p. 5). But with all these advantages, it could not withstand, after the death of the influential abbot, *Wicbold* († 1174), the unfavorable influences of the times. In the numerous feuds and wars, in which the German power suffered no little, the Abbey lost many of her rich incomes and possessions. To these evils were added internal dissensions and relaxed discipline. Cardinal *Nikolaus Cusanus* (from Cues, in Treves, † Aug. 11, 1464) found it in such a deplorable condition, both as to morality and science, that he fell on his knees, and,

with his face on the ground, exclaimed: "*O sancta tellus, quæ tot genuisti apostolos et episcopos, sit dominus in secula benedictus!*"

The severest shocks the cloister experienced were during the thirty years' war, in which the library and the archives were scattered, the buildings much injured, many possessions taken away, and the tithes and other incomes impaired. The abbots, after the peace of Westphalia, exerted themselves to gather together that which was scattered, and to rescue as much as possible of that seemingly lost; but of all their former possessions, they recovered only a small district of 5 square leagues, containing about 20,000 inhabitants.

The abbots at Corvey stood directly under the Pope, and were reckoned among the German powers, and among princely abbots had a final vote. In 1794, Pius VI. created the princely abbey into a Bishopric. But, as it was hemmed in on all sides by Paderborn, Hildesheim, and Mainz, its jurisdiction was confined to its own narrow bounds. In 1803, the Bishop, by the decision of the deputation, lost his temporal dignity, and the secularized lands, with the bishopric of Fulda, was given as an indemnity to the principality of Nassau-Orange; whereupon, in 1807, it was united with the provinces of the newly created Westphalian kingdom, and after its dissolution, 1815, was transferred to the king of Prussia. After 1822, it constituted a principality of 6 sq. leagues, with 24,000 inhabitants. At the new diocesan arrangement of the Prussian monarchy, in 1821, the Pope dissolved the bishopric, and the chapter, consisting of one dean and ten prebendaries, was united with the chapter at Paderborn. The commodious abbey, now changed into a princely residence, is situated in a pleasant and fruitful valley, and presents, with its numerous residences, an imposing appearance. The beautiful Gothic church is built in the form of a cross, the interior handsomely finished, and the numerous monuments commemorate powerful landgraves and lords who are buried there.

A full and critical history of Corvey has not yet appeared. True, there are not wanting many sources, yet the greater part require thorough sifting as to the facts related. Among the old, but not critical, works, are to be mentioned *Joh. Letzner's* *Chronicles of Corvey*. Hamburg, 1593, 4to. *C. F. Paullini's* (MS. preserved in the library at Wolfenbüttel) new, complete history of the ancient cloister Corvey, in five books, 1683, in fol. *C. F. PAULLINI's* *Theatrum illustrium virorum Corbejæ Saxonicae*, Jena, 1686, 4to. *Sketch of Cloister Corvey*, by *Joh. Fried. Falcken*, Braunschweig, 1738, 8vo. *Codex traditionum Corbeiensium Diplomatarium nec non registrum abbatis Sarachonis*, ed. Jo. FR. FALCKE, Lips., 1752, fol. The original history of the princely abbey Corvey, and the cities of Corvey and Höxter, by PAUL WIGAND, Vol. 1, Pt. 1, 2, Höxter, 1819, 8vo, reaches only to 1146. (Comp. *Ersch and Gruber*, XIX., p. 392; KLIPPEL's *Researches*, &c., Bremen, 1843 and 1845).

G. H. KLIPPEL. — *Santee*.

Corvinus, Antonius (Rübener), a prominent Reformer in the north of Germany. b. Feb. 27, 1501, in Warburg. (not Marburg). Little is

known about his youth or conversion. In 1523 he was driven, on account of his adherence to Lutheranism, from the cloister Loccum, where, as in *Riddagshausen*, he received his training. From thence he went to Wittenberg, where he prosecuted his studies without coming into personal contact with the principal men of the Reformation. In 1526 he was at Marburg, when efforts were made towards founding the new university, but was never professor there. At the recommendation of Amsdorf, leader of the Reformation in 1528, he was called to Goslar, as preacher at St. Stephan's, where he zealously labored to the close of 1531; when, owing to the unhappy turn of the Reformation at Goslar, and personal persecutions, he went to *Witzenhausen*. Here he served the ministry for a number of years, but was frequently at Marburg, and was employed by the Landgrave in nearly all the most important transactions, as at the disputation between Melancthon and Bucer, 1535, and the Smalcald convention, 1537.

In 1539, an important field of usefulness opened for him in Göttingen and Kalenberg. At the commencement of the Reformation, Duke *Erich* the elder reigned there, a man of an upright disposition; but, as a fellow-soldier of the Emperor Maximilian, rough and severe; without taste for higher interests; averse to the Reformation, as the friend of Charles V.; and, through the influence of his first wife, he strove to keep down the movement in his principality. His first wife died without issue. In 1525, he married *Elizabeth*, daughter of *Joachim I.*, one of the bitterest foes of the Reformation. Elizabeth, favorably impressed, perhaps by the patience of her mother, more so by her brother, the Margrave *John of Küstrin*, who visited her at Münden, 1538, when Corvin preached for the first time in Münden, formally passed over to the Evangelical Church in the same year. *Erich*, who remained in the Romish Church, did not hinder her, and ordered that Corvin, at the request of Elizabeth, and by the permission of Philip of Hesse, should come over from time to time to preach and administer the sacraments. From this time Corvin gained in influence. In 1539 he reformed Nordheim, and gave to the city a Church government. Immediately after the death of *Erich*, July 26, 1540, at the diet of *Hagenau*, Elizabeth having become regent for *Erich II.*, the introduction of the new doctrine became the chief aim of her life. At her side stood *Just. Waldhausen*, her chancellor, recommended by Luther; *Burcard Mithob*, her physician, a friend of Melancthon, allied to Corvin; above all, Corvin himself, who at first remained at *Witzenhausen*, but, at the end of 1541, or beginning of 1542, removed to the province, and engaged in her service, and was called as superintendent of Kalenberg-Göttingen.

In the fall of 1540, the estates were consulted in *Pattensen* concerning the Reformation, and consented to receive the Word of God. An edict to this effect was published. The ceremonies at first remained unaltered; but the pure gospel was preached. The change was first to be made internally; this accomplished, the outward soon followed. About Whitsunday, 1542, appeared the form of Church government drawn

up by Corvin, in German: then, Nov. 4, *canonistic* rules, also rules for the Church revenue. These were to be introduced by a visitation. This was undertaken by Corvin, with the assistance of selected clergy and laity, in Göttingen, 1542, in Kalenberg, 1543.

Meanwhile, Corvin zealously assisted in carrying on the Reformation at *Hildesheim*, whither he was sent with *Winkel* and *Bugenhagen*, by princes of the Smalcaldian confederacy. He assisted in drawing up the ecclesiastical discipline, and introducing the Reformation into *Braunschweig-Wolfenbüttel*. Then he returned to his own country, and labored actively in furthering the good work. Although all opposition had not disappeared, yet the whole land seemed to be permanently reformed. *Erich II.*, whilst engaged in the Emperor's camp, in fighting against the Evangelicals, returned to the Roman Church. Many preachers had to fly. Corvin, with *Walther Höcker*, were seized (Nov. 1, 1549) in Pattensen, by Spanish soldiers, and taken to Kalenberg. He spent three years in prison. Elizabeth's intercession had no effect. C. suffered patiently for the cause of the gospel which he had served so zealously. Towards the close of 1552, *Erich II.*, through the influence of the Margrave Albrecht of Brandenburg-Kulmbach, was regained for the side of the Evangelical party, and Corvin was released from his confinement. But the rigor of the prison consumed his energies. Already sick, he was brought to Hanover, where he died April 5, 1553. He lies buried before the altar of the church St. George and James.

Corvin does not belong to the creative spirits of the Reformation, but to the circle of men who assisted in proclaiming the Word in its purity. More important than his writings, of which few (except his *Postille*) reached several editions, was his talent for Church organization. (See *Baring*, *Leben C.*, Hannov., 1749. *Schlegel*, *Kirchen-u. Reformationsgesch. von Norddeutschl.* II., 141, &c.) UHLHORN. — *Santee*.

Cosri (*Liber Cosri* or *Cusri*, rather *Cosari* or *Cusari*) is the title of a remarkable production of mediæval Rabbinism, a religious dialogue, invested with unusual interest, as well for its classic construction, as the import of its title, and a correspondence connected with it. Its author is R. Jehuda Hallevi (Levita) of Spain, the renowned Jewish poet, and stepfather of Aben Ezra, who was trodden to death by a Turkish horseman as he entered the gates of Jerusalem on a pilgrimage, in 1150. He combined in himself the poet, philosopher, and general scholar; and, as a teacher of the Mosaic faith, excited the highest admiration of his brethren. Deut. 12 : 19 was applied to him, and his book *Cosri* was equally prized with the *More hannevochim* of *M. Maimonides*, as the best defence against unbelief. The aim of *Cosri* is to prove the superiority of the written law over heathen philosophy, Christianity, and Mohammedanism, and the validity of the oral law (against the *Caraites*), and thus secure his brethren against temptations to apostasy. He does this with great skill and taste, in a dialogue occasioned by a king, *Cosar*, who, disturbed in a dream by the voice of an angel saying, "Your

intentions are good, but your actions bad," desired instruction in a religion which would teach him how to do well. The result is his conviction of the superiority of the Jewish religion over all others. The book consists of five parts, upon the existence, names, and attributes of God; creation; angels; the written law; tradition; providence, and God's decrees; free will; the resurrection, and eternal life; the worship of God; prayer; idolatry, &c.; the revelation of God, his *Shekinah*: the prerogatives of Jews; their former knowledge of things divine and human; the beauty of Palestine; the nobility of the Hebrew language; music and poetry; the existence, immortality, and powers of the human soul; prophecy, &c. It comprehends everything pertaining to the Jewish religion; is rich in its O. T. exegesis; and is most tersely and accurately written. Of course it betrays rabbinical prejudices, and, as its views of Christianity were mainly derived from Spain, they are very deficient. It was first written in Arabic, then translated into Hebrew, first by R. Jehuda ben Kardaniel; afterwards (better) by R. Jeh. ben Saul. The original MS., says WOLF, *Bibl. hebr.: exstat in B. Bodl., n. 5424, inter Cod. Pocock. n. 97.* Of the Hebrew version, three ed. exist, the Fanentian, of 1504, 4to., and the Venice ed. of 1547, 1594. In the last, which Buxtorf followed, passages injurious to Christians were omitted. Buxtorf issued an ed. in 1660, accompanying the Hebrew text with valuable annotations and a Latin transl. There is also a Spanish transl. (Amstelod. 1663) said to excel Buxtorf's. A continuation of *Cosri*, enlarging upon points briefly treated, was issued by D. Nieto, London, 1712-14.

That the dialogue is a theological fiction is unquestionable; though it evidently rests upon some facts. But it is otherwise with regard to the correspondence contained in the book, consisting of two letters exchanged between R. Chasdai Ebn Sprot, a Jewish minister at the court of Abd-el-Rhaman III. and Joseph, king of the Chazari, in 958. Of the existence of the kingdom of the Chazari, along the shores of the Caspian and Black seas, overthrown in 1016 by the Russians, there is now no doubt (see DE SACY, in the Arab. Chrestom.; FRÄHN, *de Chazaris, Petrop.* 1822; NEUMANN, d. Völker d. südl. Russlands, Lpz. 1847; Gieseler and Neander's Ch. Hist.). But, although the Chasari kings for a time may have embraced Judaism, and the Jews may have enjoyed religious liberty among them, their condition was by no means enviable. For eastern Jews who visited the country found in it so strange a mixture of barbarism and cultivation, that they were far from being edified by the visit. To those, however, living in the distant West, the fact of a king having been converted to Judaism would assume exaggerated importance. Hence it is possible that some Jew in Cordova might be induced at a great sacrifice to open a correspondence with the royal proselyte. Chasdai's letter possesses more proofs of authenticity than Joseph's reply, the genuineness of which has been denied by Düsterdieck (*Götting. gelehrte Anz.*, 1848, p. 1519-26) and Yost.

PRESSL.*

Cotelerius (Cotelier), John Baptist, b. Dec.

1627, was the son of a Reformed preacher, who passed over to the Romish Church. In 1641, he went to Paris, where he studied philosophy and theology. In 1648 he became a doctor of the Sorbonne. Colbert, the minister, 1667, requested him to examine the Greek MSS. in the royal library, and to make a catalogue of the same. At this he spent 5 years. In 1676 he became professor of Greek in the royal college. († Aug. 19, 1686.) He issued an excellent ed. of the apostolic fathers, Paris, 1672, 2 vols. This edition, with other important works, were destroyed by fire in the Collège Montaigne. A second and third edition was edited by the learned *Clericus* (see Art.), 1698 and 1724. Besides these, Cotelier edited other memorials of Church antiquity. (See NICÉRON, *Mémoires*, T. IV., p. 243, &c. *Biogr. univers.*)

HAGENBACH.—*Santee.*

Court, Anthony, b. 1696, at Villeneuve-de-Berg, merits the title, "Restorer of Protestantism in France." After the revocation of the edict of Nantes, the civil, as well as ecclesiastical, existence of the Reformed was practically ignored. The designedly delusive cry, "There are no more Protestants in France!" though constantly refuted by the complaints of priests that their sacraments, &c., were contemned, was still reiterated in the palace and the court. This delusion was, indeed, partly dispelled by the uprising of "prophets and fanatics (see *Brousson; Camisards*). But, when they were silenced, the "great work" of exterminating heresies and retailing official slanders was again put in motion. There were many Reformed, however, who resisted all attempts to induce them to embrace even a modified Romish confession. They were the prop of "new converts," the germ of life still left in the subverted Church. And yet the tares of fanaticism had almost choked this germ. Unprotected by the earlier organization and discipline, and lacking the element of sound religious knowledge, the French Ref. C. seemed doomed to certain death by the fanaticism of its own members. From this sad fate the Lord saved her by the hands of a youth endowed with extraordinary talents, pre-eminently qualifying him for the work of re-organization.

In the synod at Delphinus, 1716, where he met by invitation five pastors, followed by a second at Languedoc, 1717, he laid the foundation for an ecclesiastical constitution, similar to the old form of the French Church, incorporating and based upon the old discipline. In doing this, he encountered and overcame the greatest difficulties and personal perils. These were enhanced by the opposition of fanatical brethren, who said "He is fighting God," and of envious persons, and such as opposed him from jealousy, while others still writhed under the application of discipline. But God favored his work, and Court, though three of his co-laborers had died by violence, could soon replace them. Then arose the great difficulty of entrusting the functions of the sacred office to persons lacking the proper ordination. To obviate this difficulty, he sent one of his associates to Zurich for ordination, who, at a synod held in 1718, imparted said act to his fellow-laborers. The number was small, the work increasing, the demand for services be-

coming greater, while those in safe places would not exchange them for a wandering missionary life, exposing them to the gallows. The indefatigable Court, aided by the government of Berne and the Archb. of Canterbury, in 1729, established a seminary at Lausanne, where ministers were prepared for churches "under the cross," or "of the desert." The "churches of the desert" (a designation which seemed peculiarly suited to the condition of ev. Christians in France), spread more widely, and acquired greater historical importance than the so-called "field meetings" in England, or "conventicles" of Scotland. All ecclesiastical acts were registered "In the desert;" all certificates, &c., of marriage and baptism, and petitions to the court, &c., were dated "from the desert."

The unparalleled success with which this work of Court met in so short a time, could not possibly escape the notice of the government, which, under the regency of the Duke of Orleans, was naturally inclined to lend his power to persecution, but restrained by policy. Closely allied with England against Spain, he feared lest the ambitious Cardinal Alberoni would excite the Protestants to insurrection. The advice of Basnage, then at the Hague, was asked, who said that persecution alone would make the Protestants rebel. The regent even sought to induce Court to leave France. But Court continued his abode at Lausanne. Still he ceased not to travel through the kingdom, to give encouragement and counsel wherever needed, and thus was the soul of the work till his death (1760).

Court's diligence as a writer, and his influence in this capacity on the French C., were considerable. Besides his history of that Church (see *Camisards*), he wrote "*Le Patriote françois et impartial, ou Réponse à la lettre de M. l'évêque d'Agén à M. le contrôleur-général contre la tolérance des Huguenots.*" Villefr. (Genève) 1751, 1753; "*Lettre d'un patriote sur la tolérance civile des Prot. de France*, 1765, &c. His unpublished MSS. are probably more valuable than any of the above. (See COQUEREL'S *Hist. d. Egl. du Désert*; PEYRAT'S *Hist. d. Part. du Désert*; *La France Prot. per MM. Haag., Sept. Part.* Paris, 1854, p. 95, &c.; *Bulletin de la Soc. d. l'Hist. du Prot. Fr.*)

V. POLENZ. — *Santee*.

Cramer, John Andrew, D. D., b. in St. Georgestadt, Saxony, Jan. 29, 1723. He studied theology at Leipsic. In 1748 he became preacher in Crellwitz, and, in 1750, principal chaplain in Quedlinburg. In 1754, Frederick V., of Denmark, invited him, at Klopstock's suggestion, as German court preacher, to Copenhagen. Here he gained renown as an orator, and acquired great influence by his piety. In 1765 he was appointed prof. of theology. After the accession of Christian VII., Cramer lost his place by his fearless assaults upon French scepticism, which had spread into Denmark. He then accepted, 1771, a superintendency in Lübeck. Upon the fall of Struensee, the frivolous prime minister of Christian VII., Cramer was recalled to Denmark as prochancellor, and first prof. of theol. in Kiel. There he labored with great success, especially in raising up worthy men for the ministerial office. He died June 12, 1788. Besides being distinguished as a preacher and

theologian, he gained reputation as a religious Lyric poet. In connection with Klopstock, he issued, 1776-9, an "Algem. Gesangb. zum Gebrauch in d. Gemeinen d. Herzogth. Schleswig-Holst." He also published "Poetische Uebersetzung d. Psalmen," Lpz. 1755, &c.—Although his hymns excel in rhetoric rather than in depth of evangelical sentiment, they are full of pathos, and stirring, passionate outbursts. Indeed, in this respect, he rises above Klopstock. The hymn-books of the latter part of the last and beginning of this century, have many of his productions. KOCH.*

Cranmer, Thomas, Archbishop of Canterbury, descended from a family which came to England in the time of William I., was b. July 2d, 1489, at Aslacton, Nottinghamshire. His first instruction he received from an incompetent teacher, and practised, according to prevailing custom, physical exercises, such as riding, hunting, and archery. After the death of his father, his mother (1503) sent him to Cambridge, where he attended to the customary studies, and became a fellow of Jesus College (1510-1511). As such, he diligently read the writings of Faber, Stapulensis, and Erasmus, besides other good Latin authors, until the appearance of Luther directed his attention to the Holy Scriptures, with which he was engaged for some years. Concerning his inward development, little is known. What he thought of celibacy is apparent from his marriage, about 1519. On this account he had to leave college, but, nevertheless, was selected as teacher in Buckingham College; and, after the death of his wife, which occurred early, and also his child, he was selected again by his former college, where, 1523, he received the honorary D. D. His reputation as a theologian was so well established that, in the following year, he was nominated, among other respectable names, for Wolsey's new college at Oxford. He declined this offer, brilliant as it was, and was elected professor of theology, preacher at the university, and examiner to those to be promoted in theology. At the examinations, he generally made the Holy Scriptures his basis, and refused to pass many monks whose knowledge of the Bible was deficient. This, as the nickname "Scripturist," which was given on account of his sermons, shows that already then he was a representative of the evangelical tendency of the university.

About this time the divorce of the king became the question of the day. For the solution of the difficulty, a theological commission was selected. Cranmer was a member; but, being absent from Cambridge, he did not meet the commission. He removed to Waltham, in Essex, owing to his enfeebled health, with his two nephews, whose instruction he had undertaken. As the commission now unanimously declared the marriage legal, Fox and Gardiner, who were about the king, remembered Cranmer, and visited him at Waltham, to ascertain his views. These suited the king so well that, in August, 1529, he had him called, and requested him to give his views in writing. At the same time, he assigned him the house of Sir Thomas Bolen, Earl of Wiltshire, who was concerned in the matter of divorce, as a place of abode, and ap-

pointed him his chaplain, and afterwards arch-dean of Taunton. After Cranmer had finished his task, he was called upon to defend it at Cambridge, and soon succeeded in winning many to his opinions. Henry now saw that Cranmer was the person to carry his case successfully through at Rome, and sent him thither (1530) with Bolen and others. Cranmer's written opinion was laid before the Pope, and keenly defended by its author. He remained at Rome for a few months, after the others who despaired of the issue had left, and returned only towards the close of the year. Already, in Jan. 24, 1531, the king entrusted him with an embassy to the German court. Here, too, he succeeded in winning many to his side, as the counsellor to the Emperor, Agrippa, and A. Oslander, in Nuremberg, with whom Cranmer formed an intimate friendship, strengthened by marriage with his niece, who came to England in 1534. Oslander supported Cranmer's view in his work *de matrimoniis incestis*. Cranmer was also entrusted with other diplomatic business, in reference to a treaty of commerce with the Netherlands, etc., and with a secret embassy to the Protestant princes, which proves how highly the King prized his prudence and skill. Though these efforts proved fruitless, the confidence of the king in him was not shaken. He rather meditated elevating him to a position in which he might the more successfully carry out the plans of the King. The Archbishopric of Canterbury became vacant by the death of Warham, Aug. 23, 1532. Henry had no doubt previously recalled C., and communicated his views in reference to filling said office. Cranmer for some months delayed his return; but, in the beginning of November, 1532, he was in London, when Henry privately married Anne Bolen. Cranmer, for a long time, refused to accept of an office which then appeared so difficult and dangerous. His decision was embarrassed partly by his natural timidity, and on account of the impossibility of harmonizing the royal supremacy with papal authority. The counsellors of the King found an expedient in the protest which he was allowed to enter at his consecration. This last took place, with papal approbation, March 30, 1533, in Westminster Abbey. Cranmer here solemnly declared that, by the oath he took to the Pope, he in no wise bound himself to do anything contrary to the divine law, the rights of the crown, or the laws of the land—neither should he be hindered in any way to speak and act publicly and freely in matters affecting the Reformation and government of the English Church, the rights of the King, and the welfare of the State. With these reservations, he took the oath, and was consecrated Archbishop.

Cranmer at once was made to realize his critical position. The King, without his knowledge and presence, publicly solemnized his marriage with Anne Bolen, April 12, and Cranmer, from the start, had either to break with the King, or to declare the divorce from Catherine legal, and confirm his marriage with Anne. He accepted the latter, and could do so the more consistently, since he considered the former marriage illegal. On May 23, he declared the first marriage

dissolved, and eight days afterwards confirmed the other, and crowned Anne on June 1. He well knew that this would lead to a rupture with Rome, and accordingly sent to Bonner, the ambassador at Marseilles, an appeal from the Pope to the next general council. The Pope answered with a bull of excommunication (March 23, 1534); the King, on his part, by the decision of the convocation, annulled the papal authority over England by an edict, June 9, and affirmed by the act of supremacy, Nov. 3, 1534, the independence of the English Church over against Rome. The Archbishop exchanged the title of papal legate for that of primate of the whole of England. He now stood at the head of a Church independent of Rome, and thus had a work before him, the extent and compass of which he at first could not comprehend. Thus far, the only point had been concerning the separation from Rome, the justification of the divorce, and the legal heir to the crown. All this could be settled by the secular authority. Now the question was about reforming a whole people, head and members, and bringing the gospel to bear on a cruel and tyrannical King, who stood at the head of the Church, and also on a clergy zealous for papal Catholicism. True, the queen exerted some influence on the heart of the King, as he over his people; and Cromwell, the vicar-general of the King-Pope, favored the Reformation. But opposed to them stood the heads of the Romish party, the Duke of Norfolk, Gardiner, Stokesley, Bonner. Those who would have been the most important for the Reformation had long before fled from the country. He that could, under such circumstances, carry through a thorough Reformation, had to be penetrated by the spirit of the gospel, required intrepid courage and unbending determination, in short, such peculiar attributes as are never found in one single man. Cranmer wanted the most important of these. He was not wholly disentangled from Romanism; though circumspect, he was fearful and complaisant; with all his learning, he was vacillating and unsound in the most important doctrines. But this is certain, that Cranmer saved himself from the executioner's axe, not by such diplomatic dexterity and complaisance, as Cromwell used, but more by the noble traits in his character, which won and preserved for him the unshaken confidence and love of the King. A different character might, perhaps, have attempted greater things; but, under a reign like that of Henry, might have effected much less, or nothing. Cranmer sought to reform step by step, and piece by piece.

Above all, he sought to secure the royal supremacy, which for him was an article of faith, and the acknowledgment of the new act of succession; to abolish gross irregularities, and to give the Bible to the people. He dealt severely with the obstinate, though he did everything to save, for example, Fisher and Morus. To carry forward his reform, and to enlighten the people concerning it, he restored the visitation system, which for 100 years had fallen into disuse. He took the lead in his own diocese, and in this retained only such canons and ceremonies as favored his measures of reform. For the translation of the Bible, he could do but little. He

merely broached the matter in the convocation (Dec. 1534); but the clergy opposed, under the pretence that the foreign versions of the N. T. were unsatisfactory. Cranmer, accordingly, distributed Tyndale's Testament, in 10 parts, and sent them to the Bishops for revision. These, except Stokesley, complied, and thus ended this first effort. He was more fortunate in filling vacancies with evangelical men. In spite of the opposition of the Romish party, the Reformation seemed to be progressing, when an important crisis occurred. Henry, already grown tired of his new wife, eagerly caught at the reports of her unfaithfulness, to get rid of her. Cranmer during his residence in her father's house, had become intimately acquainted with her, and regarded her as a friend of the Reformation, and was satisfied of her innocence. Although designedly excluded from the commission before which she had a hearing, he ventured to address a letter to the King in her defence. But the warmth of his plea was mingled with fear for his rigorous master. He admitted that the King doubtless proceeded on good grounds, commiserated him on account of his troubles, and only begged him not to withdraw his support from the good work. Fourteen days later he obeyed the order from the King to declare the marriage illegal, and the issue of it bastards. True, the Queen acknowledged, with or against her will, the existence of some unmentioned impediment to her marriage. On May 19, 1536, she fell under the axe, and on the following day Henry married Jane Seymour.

Fortunately the new Queen was favorable to the Reformation, and during the next 17 months, until her death, important progress was made. The first Reformed Synod, under the presidency of Cromwell, as vicar-general, was opened June 16, 1536, and discussed the ten articles of faith, which were probably prepared by Cranmer and others, and which form the dogmatic basis of the English Church. The Bible and the three confessions of faith are therein acknowledged as the rule of faith; three sacraments were acknowledged, baptism, the holy communion, and penance; the doctrine of transubstantiation was retained; and concerning justification, it was taught that it was effected by repentance and faith, with love, only through the grace of God and the merits of Christ. Nearly all Romish ceremonies, invocation of saints, prayers for the dead, were preserved; only persons were admonished not to expect through these forgiveness of sin. Cranmer would not acknowledge penance as a sacrament; but in general the above points expressed his views. These articles were, however, a compromise which satisfied neither party, and Cranmer, accordingly, had them revised under his inspection. The result of this labor was "*The institution of a Christian man*," in which an advance in favor of evangelical sentiments is clearly to be seen. In all probability, Cranmer would have gone farther, had he not been compelled to contend against such men as Gardiner and Stokesley. The book appeared in December, 1537. Inasmuch as it had not the sanction of the King, he revised it himself, and sent his corrections to Cranmer, who criticised them with much independence and keenness. The decree

of the King, which introduced these articles, contains some other important directions — the abrogation of holy days, the instruction of the youth in the faith, the Lord's prayer and the ten commandments, and the placing of the Bible in every church. Cranmer's attempt to have the Bible translated by a committee failed. In the mean time, however, this work was accomplished by Protestant refugees abroad. This rejoiced Cranmer so much that he declared it was more to him than £1000. He did everything he could to obtain the King's permission of its sale. On the assurance of Cranmer, that the translation was a good one, the King consented. Thus the fountain of truth was opened to the people. The Bible was eagerly read, and much said and disputed about it. But Cranmer himself was not as yet so thoroughly penetrated by the spirit of the Gospel that he could allow views deduced from thence which rose above his own. He even justified the condemnation of Lambert and two Anabaptists.

It was a great gain that Cranmer succeeded in introducing the Bible before the death of the Queen, Oct. 24, 1537. From this event affairs took an unfortunate turn. The King grew morose and discontented with the movement. The Romish party seized the opportunity of gaining the confidence of the King, and supplanting the evangelical party. Cranmer sought in vain to abolish celibacy. The King prohibited the marriage of priests (Nov. 1538), and Cranmer found it expedient to send his wife back to Germany. The conferences held at London with Saxon theologians had to be suspended. The protest which he, like Cromwell, entered against squandering the property of the Church, only provoked the King. Cranmer well saw that his opponents would not rest until Romanism was fully restored. But he was determined to face the storm. As the notorious six articles were laid before parliament, July, 1539, for adoption, he firmly opposed them for three days. Never was Cranmer so resolute as now. Cromwell yielded; two bishops on his side resigned their offices; but Cranmer was not to be moved, even by the command of the King, to lay the axe at the root of the tree he had with difficulty planted, and thus far sheltered. Cranmer's conduct made such an impression upon the King, that shortly after the close of the session in which the articles were adopted, a deputation was sent to him to satisfy him, and assure him of the kind disposition of the King. Cranmer answered that he hoped that his views might yet prevail, to the glory of God and the best interests of his kingdom. In the mean while, he would not resist the resolutions of parliament.

In order to oppose more successfully the power of the Romish party, Cromwell introduced the King's marriage with Anna of Cleve. Henry immediately thought of a divorce, which Cranmer suffered himself to execute. Cromwell was doomed to the scaffold, and though his former friends attempted his defence, they soon yielded, and voted for his execution. It is difficult to defend Cranmer against the charge of an unmanly succumbing to the will of the King, and a feeble vindication of his friends. But this cannot be attributed to concern for his own

safety; for, in his support of the Reformation, he braved all danger. And when, on Cromwell's overthrow, the Romish party persuaded the King to appoint a commission to remodel the *Articles* to suit the Romish views, neither threats nor entreaties could induce C. to yield. Many declared that his refusal would cost him his head. But Cranmer managed to win the King to his side, and, with his approval, proposed to the commission 17 questions; their answers to which he sent to the King, with his remarks. These are important, in so far as they show the views of Cranmer, as then held. "Only baptism and the holy communion are sacraments, in the strict sense. Princes have charge both of the political and religious interests of their people, and hence appoint chancellors, treasurers, Bishops, and priests. The consecration of those called to spiritual offices is important to preserve good order and due solemnity; but there is no more grace thus imparted than by inductions into secular offices. When there were no Christian princes, the apostles or congregations chose officers. But, according to the Scriptures, a prince can create a priest as well as a Bishop, and, accordingly, consecration is not essential. Compulsory confession and extreme unction are unscriptural." The other bishops dissented materially from these views, and further conference on these points seems to have been broken off. This much, however, was gained, that the attempts of the Romish party were foiled. This was the more important, as they were gaining influence with the King, since his marriage with Catharine Howard (Aug. 1540). But, after a few months, this union again was dissolved. It became Cranmer's duty to inform Henry of her former dissolute life; and this time he could clearly declare the marriage void. Her fall was a severe blow for the Romish party. Cranmer seized the opportunity of having the Bible introduced into every church by the King's command. He also improved the schools, giving special heed to the poor. This provoked his opponents, who moved the King so to limit the use of the Bible that it amounted almost to a prohibition. But they did not stop here. As the Protestants found a new protectress in Catharine Parr, the Romanists became zealously intent on effecting both her and Cranmer's downfall. His clergy were incited to prefer complaints against him; but this resulted only in Gardiner's disgrace, and the imprisonment of the originators of the plot. Equally abortive was Gostwick's accusation of Cranmer before Parliament, and the attempt of some members of the Privy Council to have him imprisoned for heresy. His opponents, however, in some instances thwarted his plans. He complains that, in the "*Necessary doctrine for any Christian man*" (1543), many things were said which he disapproved. He, indeed, secured the institution of a commission for the revision of the canon law, but never saw it accomplished. And whilst he prosecuted the correction of some abuses, the prohibition of the Bible (1546) was more rigidly enforced. There is no doubt that C. proposed a treaty with the King of France, for the abolition of the mass, about the time of Henry's death, Jan. 28, 1547.

Thus far, Cranmer seems to have accomplished but little. Many good rules and regulations were nipped in the bud, while others were only partially carried out. Nor is this surprising. Cranmer had to steer between Scylla and Charybdis, the arbitrariness of the King, and the hatred of the Romish party; so that it seemed to be a great gain merely to have saved the vessel of the Reformation. Even he himself had no settled aim. Another reason why he effected so little, is to be found in the whole process of this Reformation. It commenced with an external rupture with Rome, and spread from the court downwards; whilst the German Reformation commenced with an inward emancipation from Romish errors, and rose from the common people upwards. The relations thus far existing, changed with the accession of Edward. His education had been entrusted to Cranmer. The Lord Protector and Cecil were friends of the Reformation; and though the Romanists were still powerful, the other party had no longer to pass between two fires. They could resist their opponents without having an enemy in their rear. Surrounded by truly evangelical men, Cranmer's views became more settled, and he thus gained courage to apply his best talents to the furtherance of the Reformation; of which, indeed, he was the soul, during Edward's happy reign.

In full harmony with his exalted views of the royal dignity, C. received his office anew from Edward. Holding up Josiah as the ideal of a Christian king, he urged Edward (at his coronation) to imitate that sovereign in his reformation of the Church; but added, that by neglect of such a duty, he would not forfeit his crown. In this onesided view, C. overlooked the independence of the O. T. priesthood, and prophetic office. But he evidently thought he could thus most effectually sap the power and popular influence of the Romish clergy.

He next instituted visitations of all the churches, and a commission was appointed for each diocese. His object was, not only to have the King's supremacy universally acknowledged, and abuses abolished, but also to have the people more thoroughly instructed. He compiled, with the aid of Ridley, Latimer, and others, the *Book of Homilies* (July, 1547), which taught evangelical doctrine more distinctly than before, and he had the paraphrases of Erasmus translated into English. In Parliament (November, 1547), he succeeded in having the Six Articles annulled, and proposed a revision of the liturgy. The celebration of the Eucharist under both forms was at once enjoined—Cranmer's views concerning it having been changed through the influence of Ridley. Then he had the Nuremberg Catechism translated into English (1548). The draft of a new liturgy was completed Nov. 1548, and, in Jan. 1549, accepted by Parliament. This was not effected without desperate opposition from the papal party; and it was found necessary to imprison Gardiner, and afterwards Bonner. The universities being still a bulwark of Romanism, C. sought to bring these into the new measures. He was greatly aided in his efforts by continental scholars, whom he welcomed to his palace. Among these were Peter Alexander v.

Artois, Peter Martyr from Florence, Bernardin Ochino, Tremellius, Bucer, Fagius, Matth. Negelin, Justus Jonas, John Laski, the founder of the first German congregation in London, and the Scot, Alex. Alesius. Peter Martyr was appointed to a professorship in Oxford, where he delivered lectures on the N. T., and triumphantly disputed with the papists on the Lord's Supper. Bucer did the same at Cambridge. Tremellius and Dryander, whom Melanchthon recommended, also received appointments at Oxford, and Fagius in Cambridge.

Cranmer engaged in another important measure. The 10 articles of faith no longer answered their purpose. C. conceived the great idea of uniting all Protestants in a new confession. He proposed the matter to Melanchthon, Calvin, and Bullinger, and proposed London as the most suitable place for deliberations upon the subject. Melanchthon and Calvin greatly desired such a union, but saw insuperable difficulties in the way. C., therefore, had to be content with a confession which he, aided by English theologians, drew up, probably on the basis of the 13 articles found among his papers, the fruit of his conferences with the German theologians, and closely allied to the first 17 articles of the Augsburg Confession. In May, 1552, 42 articles were laid before the Convocation, and subsequently approved by the King, but not by Parliament. In the same year, the liturgy was revised by Cranmer, assisted by Ridley, Cox, Peter Martyr, Bucer, and others, and extreme unction, auricular confession, and prayers for the dead were omitted.

Thus Cranmer completed the external structure of the Reformation. But the *spirit* of the Gospel spread much more tardily. Under Edward, also, extreme measures were adopted. A fanatic, Joana Bocher, was burned, after C. and Ridley had tried in vain to induce her to renounce her errors. It is now certain that C. was not present at her conviction, and did not secure the King's signature to her sentence.

The Romish party continued to assail the Reformation. Gardiner, though in prison, attacked Cranmer's view of the Lord's Supper. C., in his reply, assumed the Calvinistic doctrine. The Romish party, however, effected the downfall of Somerset, and thus deprived Cranmer of an important support. Northumberland, who followed S., sought to draw Edward from Cranmer's influence, and succeeded in persuading the King to secure the succession to his daughter-in-law. Cranmer, who first vindicated the claims of Mary, yielded to the King. The young King soon after died (July 6, 1553), and with him sunk the hope of the Reformation. After an unsuccessful attempt in favor of Lady Jane Grey, Mary ascended the throne.

With this commences the last and shortest period in Cranmer's life. His work was done. Martyrdom threatened him, but he resolved to stand by his banner. Mary could not forget that he pressed her mother's divorce, and sanctioned the elevation of Lady Jane Grey. Moreover she hated him as the champion of the Reformation. He was, accordingly, summoned before the royal council and (Sep. 14) the Star Chamber, and sent to the tower. He was ac-

cused of crimes into which Gardiner had drawn him; and he, who reluctantly assented to Lady Jane's succession, had to atone for it, while others escaped. At first he displayed most admirable courage. While many let go their views, he declared himself prepared to defend the Reformation as scriptural. But no opportunity to do this was granted him. In November he was convicted of high treason. He was ready to die a martyr for the Gospel, but could not endure to be branded a traitor. He wrote to the Queen, and was released from the charge of high treason, but accused of heresy. The tower was so crowded that he was thrown with Ridley and Latimer into one cell. He found great comfort in prayer and the reading of the Scriptures with them. He was soon called before the convocation and heard. He appealed to the Word of God; his opponents pointed to the sword as their weapon. The case was so conducted that many of his opponents were dissatisfied, and it was transferred to Oxford for further action. He was taken to Oxford in May, 1554, and the case was resumed. The session was solemnly opened in St. Mary's church. C., staff in hand, maintained a dignified position before his judges. He was required to subscribe three decidedly Romish articles, but refused, and begged time to answer them in writing. Next day, Sunday, he sent in his reply, and appeared on Monday to defend it. In spite of constant interruptions and gibes, he remained calm and firm, and for six hours defended himself, both in Latin and English, with such learning that his foes were amazed. On Thursday he was recalled, and even the chairman commended his meekness and modesty. On Friday, he, Ridley, and Latimer were again required to sign the three articles. They unanimously refused, and were condemned as heretics. When the decision was announced, C. cried out, "I appeal from your bar and decision to the righteous judgment of the Almighty, in the firm hope that I shall enjoy his presence in heaven, on account of whose corporeal presence in the sacrament you condemn me." In a letter to the Queen, which she probably never received, he complained of the unjust proceedings against him. The three were now kept in close confinement for 18 months, during which time C. prepared a second paper against Gardiner. They stood so high in the regards of the people, that it was probably thought impolitic to execute them without the sanction of the Pope. A new investigation by papal and royal commissaries, was therefore commenced in Sept. 1555. Latimer and Ridley were first heard; then Cranmer. C. protested both against the commission, being bound by his oath to discard the Pope's authority; and against the witnesses, who had violated the oath of supremacy. But the witnesses were examined, the trial was closed, and the result sent to Rome. Again C. wrote to the Queen that he rejected the Pope's authority, as against the law of the land, and because the Pope made himself God, and forbade the sacrament under both forms; that he protested not from personal motives, but to save the independence of his country, and serve the glory of God. Henry had told C. that his intercession for Mary would

prove his ruin. She directed Pole to answer the letter. The mediation of his friends was unavailing. The Pope excommunicated him; Bonner and Thirlby, an earlier friend of C., executed the act (Feb. 14, 1556). Whilst publicly stripping him of his insignia and robes, Thirlby wept. Bonner exulted in his degradation. C. remained composed, and, when they had done, banded Thirlby an appeal to the next general council — a last, but hopeless, attempt to obtain that justice in a foreign land which was denied at home.

But C.'s enemies, not content with his fall as the champion of the Reformation, plotted his deeper abasement, by compelling him to recant. After his excommunication, great attention was paid to him, and he was besieged with entreaties and promises, until he finally signed a recantation, which was forthwith printed and circulated. Immediately an order for his execution was issued, but kept concealed from him. On March 21, he was led into St. Mary's church. The old man knelt on an elevated platform, where all could see him, with bare head and a flowing white beard. He wept bitterly. All present were deeply moved. After the sermon, which argued that, notwithstanding his recantation, such a heretic should be burned, as an example to others, C. was asked to repeat his recantation. "That will I do, right heartily," he replied, and, having offered a touching prayer for the pardon of his sins, he addressed the people; and, to the astonishment of all, declared that his previous recantation was falsely made, from a sinful love of life, and solemnly avowed his adherence to evangelical truth. "This hand that offended shall first burn." He was soon interrupted and hurried to the stake, steadfastly resisting all attempts to shake his faith. Whilst the flames were rising, he thrust his right hand into them, crying out "*This hand hath offended.*" He uttered no lamentation, but calmly looking up said: "Lord Jesus receive my spirit." The fire soon consumed all but his heart; this, it was affirmed, was found entire.

Cranmer's character combined high excellences and great infirmities. He was mild, peaceable, and conciliatory. By nature timid, undecided, and compliant, he often showed inflexible firmness and courage. His gentleness towards foes became proverbial; but he was backward in defending his friends. His generosity and hospitality won many friends, whilst his vacillation and indecision repelled others. He was conscientious, and yet pliant and easily impressed. Above all, he lacked that central living principle, *justification by faith*, which animated Luther, and a clear perception of other Gospel truths. And yet he seemed best suited to influence a man like Henry. Often his conviction of duty may have yielded to what seemed the necessities of the case. — In literature, as in other matters, C. possessed no originality. Though his writings exhibit extensive reading, and skill in the use of material, they present nothing new, display no independent research. He gained by slow steps the theological position he occupied under Edward. Besides contending with outward opponents, he had to wrestle with his natural weakness, which often overcame him.

But his last and deepest fall was only the transition to that final victory which secures to him a place among the great men of the Reformation. (See Foxe's *Martyrologium*, 1576; STRYPE's *Mem. of Archb. C.*, 1693; *Jenkyn's Remains of C.*, 1833; *Todd's Life of C.*, 1831.)

C. SCHÖLL. — *Santee.*

Credence, the, is a small table on the epistle side of the altar, on which the cup, mass-cruet, and other things used at mass, are placed. Such tables are commonly used only at high-mass.

HERZOG.*

Crell (or **Krell**), *Nicholas*, b. at Leipsic circa 1550–53, was distinguished, as a doctor of law and practical jurist, no less for his integrity than his learning. In his lectures at the university of Leipsic, he opposed and ridiculed the pedantry of scholasticism. The elector, Augustus, whose notice he attracted, called him to his court, and Christian I. made him a privy counsellor, then chancellor, and entrusted him with the highest affairs of State.

After the death of Augustus, Crypto-Calvinism, which A. had used every means to eradicate, sprang up with new energy. The Lutheran party hoped to counteract the movement through Crell's influence with Christian I. But Christian was disposed to use his own judgment in such matters; and though not inclined to forsake his father's religion, he did not share his zeal for the Form of Concord; but took the Bible, the ancient symbols, the Augustana, and Luther's two catechisms, as his rule of doctrine. In other respects he was a Phillipist. Crell, whom Christian had appointed chancellor, accepted the office on condition that he would not be required to violate his conscience. This secured, he proceeded, in accordance with the sentiments of Christian, to execute measures for the suppression of vice and heresies, and also of religious strife. By the Elector's command, a German Bible with practical notes was prepared for popular use, under Crell's inspection. But when 2 Chron. was reached, Christian died (Sept. 25, 1591), the work stopped, and most of the printed copies were destroyed. Christian II. was in his minority, and his mother, the Electress Sophia, who hated Crypto-Calvinism, favored the restoration of the extreme Lutheran party. Crell, even before the burial of Christian I., was thrown into prison. Religious proscription swept through the electorate; so that Duke William felt compelled to restrain the violence of persecution by a special edict, Aug. 1592. Meanwhile, Crell was kept in prison, but the Estates were puzzled to take hold of his case. The nobles wished him punished as a malefactor; the universities and cities plead the Elector's high regard for him, and urged that he should be tried by a regular process. Crell's foes triumphed, but three years passed before the syndic brought up the accusation. On Sept. 28, 1597, a hearing was had with him in prison. In 1599 it was decided that he had been unfaithful to the Elector and his country, interfered in religious matters, and otherwise violated his trust. His appeal to the imperial chamber at Spire was denied, and the case was referred to the imperial court, at which Crell's political position was as much abhorred as dissensions among

the Protestants were desired. There the previous decision was confirmed, and he was declared a capital offender. This decision was published, in the name of the administrator, on Sept. 22, 1601. Crell, conscious of his innocence, thought such a result impossible. He earnestly protested against the injustice of the proceedings, but, in reply, was admonished to prepare for death. Three clergy were appointed to attend him, P. Blume and two others. These presented to him an abusive description of a Calvinist (viz., that he was a man who does not trust in God or his Word, gives free license to Mohammedanism and heathenism, encourages treason and bloodshed, &c.), and requested him to sign the paper, and thus frankly confess his sin. Crell acknowledged that he often had erred, but, of course, refused to belie his conscience by subscribing such calumnies. He was executed on Oct. 9, insisting to the last upon his innocence of the crimes for which he was to be unjustly beheaded, but declaring his forgiveness of all his opponents, and commending himself to the triune God for mercy. (See *Dresden Archives*; NIEDNER'S *Ztschr. f. hist. Theol.*, 1848, p. 315; KIESLING, *Hist. mortuum*; HUTTERUS, *Concordia Concors*, c. 49; ARNOLD, *Kirchen- u. Ketzehistorie*, II., 16, 32; ENGELCKEN, *hist. N. Crellii*. Rostock, 1727; MENZEL, *neuere Gesch. d. Deutschen*, V., 176.) VOGT.*

Crescens, the companion and assistant of Paul, on his journey from Rome to Galatia (2 Tim. 4 : 10), where, according to the Apost. Constit., VII., 46, he preached the Gospel. Subsequent tradition reports that he also preached in Gaul. HERZOG.*

Crespin, John, the son of a jurist in Arras, after studying at Löwen, and serving as advocate in the Paris Parliament, became a Protestant, and fled to Geneva. There he established a printing press, and published a number of Protestant works. Like many publishers of that day, he himself became an author, and, besides works on jurisprudence and philology, wrote several which are valuable in the history of French Protestantism; especially, *L'état de l'Eglise, avec les discours des temps*, &c. (Gen. 1562, 8vo.), and *Histoire des Martyrs*. In 1555 the Geneva Council conferred on him the right of citizenship. He died in 1572.

A. SCHMIDT.*

Crete, the modern *Candia*, attracted commerce both by its location and fertility (ARISTOT. *polit.* 2, 8; STRABO, p. 838). Although traversed by a rocky mountain, which reaches its summit in the snow-capped Ida, it is well watered, and anciently had beautiful forests. It also richly produced barley and tropical fruits. It was the seat of the most ancient culture, the earliest tribes having sought to secure its possession. The original inhabitants, *Eteoeretes*, of Carian descent, were gradually driven, by the inroads of *Hellenist* colonies, especially Dorians (circa 1000 B. C.), to the eastern portion of the island, and confined to the mountainous parts. The western portion was peopled by *Syro-Phœnicians*, the antiquity of whose settlement there is attested by Homer (Il. 2, 649; Od. 19, 172, &c. Cf. *Horat.* odes, 3, 27, 33; *Virgil*, *Æn.* 3, 106). the worship of the Minotaur and Talos (Baul

and Moloch), and of Europe and Ariadne (Ash-toreth). Minos personifies the Phœnician period in the history of the island which preceded Hellenist colonization; and it may be that the Greeks derived much of their civilization, letters, measures, weights, &c., from the Phœnicians of Crete (MOYERS, *Phœn.* I., 27, &c.; DUNCKER, *Gesch. d. Alterth.* III., 254, &c., 383, &c.). The Cretans bore a bad reputation for falsehood, deceit, avarice, and licentiousness. The prophet whom Paul quotes (Tit. 1 : 12) was Epimenides of Gnosus, in whose work, *περί χρησμῶν*, Jerome found the passage (cf. POLYB. 6, 46, 3; 6, 47, 5; PLUT. *Philop.* 13, and the various commentaries). They were skilled in archery (PAUSAN. 1, 29, 5; XEN. *Anab.* 3, 3, 7; VIRG. *Georg.* 3, 345).

In the O. T., C. is called Caphtor (see Art., and *Pelethites*). In 67 B. C., the island became a Roman province, and was ruled by a proconsul (FLOR. 3, 7; JUSTIN. 39, 5; TACIT. *Ann.* 3, 38; 15, 20). Many Jews were then living there (Jos. *Ant.* 17, 12, 1; PHILO, *leg. ad Caj. l.* II., 587, ed. Mang.). Paul seems to have founded Churches there (Tit. 1 : 5). The silence of Acts upon this point is no contradiction (See *Paul*). The following places in Crete are mentioned in the Bible: *Salmon* (Acts 27 : 7), *Gortyna* (1 Macc. 15 : 23), *Lasea* (Acts 27 : 8), nowhere else named; *Phenice* (Acts 27 : 12). During the middle ages the Arabs invaded the island (823). But it was taken from them (962) by the E. Roman emperors. In 1204 the Venitians seized it. In 1669 the Turks took it from them. By the clearing of its forests and the poor management of its lands, Crete has lost its reputation for fertility. It contains about 300,000 inhabitants, mostly Greeks. The chief cities are *Candia* (15,000 in.) and *Khania* (10,000 in.), near the ancient Cydonia. (See STRABO, 472, &c., 572; PAULY'S *Real-Enc.* II. 745, &c.; WINER; R. PASHLEY, *Travels in C.*, Cambridge, 1837, 2 vol.) RUETSCHL.*

Crispus, the leader of a synagogue in Corinth, was converted by the preaching of Paul. He and his house then embraced Christianity. His example led many to be baptized. The Apost. Constit., VII., 46, cite him as Bishop of Ægina.

Criticism, biblical. [In the following article, immediate reference is had to the N. T. But what is said of the possibility of biblical criticism, and in justification of it, will equally apply to the O. T. The first two of the problems proposed below, as demanding solution, have been met, so far as they concern the O. T., in the Arts. *Bible-text*, O. T., and *Canon*, O. T. The third problem, as it affects the O. T., will be treated in the respective articles upon its several books. A separate article upon N. T. criticism was required on account of the peculiar importance of the subject for Christian theology, and of the present state of the questions involved. — HERZOG.]

The *Bible*, as the Word of God and a means of grace, is above human judgment. As Christians it is not subject to our criticism, but the reverse (*κριτικός ἐνδυσμῶν καὶ ἐνοίων καρδίας*. Hebr. 4 : 12); and whoever has learned the fullness of grace and truth in Christ, subjects himself, both as a Christian and Christian theologian, to the Word, which testifies of Christ as

the only and highest *norma credendorum*. But whilst the *Bible* is above our criticism, its single books form a subject of critical inquiry, so far as they are a part of *human literature*, and consist of writings, composed by particular authors, at certain places, for certain ends, and at certain times, circulated by copies, and were purely or impurely preserved. It is not the *object* of such inquiry to sit in judgment over the style and contents of those books (for when biblical criticism makes this its chief object and motive, it has lost its path), but, though the contents must be studied and used as a *means* of criticism, to ascertain the age, authorship, and historical facts touching the origin and preservation of the biblical books, with as much certainty as can be attained by the (frequently imperfect) helps at command.

Biblical criticism has *three chief problems* to solve: 1. *What books claim investigation?* This is answered by the *history of the canon*, which informs us what books were acknowledged as *ἐκδοχαὶ* by the Church of the 2d–4th cent. 2. *Are the books bearing the names of those then received really the same?* This is answered by the *history and criticism of the Bible-text*. 3. *When, where, and by whom were the single books written, and what is their credibility?* This is answered by what, in a narrower sense, is called *criticism of the biblical books and biblical history*. As questions 1 and 2 have been met in the articles *Bible-text* and *Canon*, we shall here confine ourselves to the solution of the third inquiry.

I. But, first of all, is bibl. crit. *justifiable* and *possible*? If the Bible stands above human criticism, are not all critical investigations into the age, genuineness, and credibility of its several books impertinent and superfluous? For if these books have proven, in their organic whole, the power of God to the mind and heart, not only of individual believers (the Christian theologian also), but of the entire Church, why should not the very inquiry touching the credibility and genuineness of the books separately be superfluous, yea sacriligious? And yet the scientific tourist is allowed to examine, botanically and chemically, the tree of the oasis, whose fruit has saved him from perishing, and to inquire even how it got there. So in the sphere of our spiritual life. There are two ways of attaining to faith in the *Word* of Christ, as in Christ himself (John 14: 11); the one by immediate believing apprehension, the other by mediate dialectic examination. Those whose faith has been attained by the first method need not the second; *at least not for the purpose of acquiring faith*. Criticism cannot give them what they do not already possess; neither can it rob them of what they have. A hundred proofs of negative criticism, tending to invalidate the genuineness of John's Gospel, the reality of Christ's miracles, &c., will no more affect the man who has experimental faith, and is alive in Christ, than the dialectic proof of the owl, that "there is no sun in the heavens," will shake the convictions of the seeing man who walks by its meridian light. But whilst the believer does not need *for himself* the help of criticism, it is none the less requisite for the *whole Church*, which includes not only firmly established mem-

bers, but many who need assistance in answering the *objections* raised against the credibility and genuineness of the sacred books.

In proportion, however, as such a *justification* of criticism is established, its *possibility* seems to vanish. "If," it is said, "the Bible is above human criticism, how can there be any actual criticism of its several books? What confidence can be placed in a criticism which *assumes* as an axiom the divine power and character of those books?" Were this objection valid, it would exclude the possibility of biblical criticism, at least for theologians who would not lay aside their Christianity; and this labor would have to devolve upon men who stood outside of, not under, the prepossessing influence of Christian faith. For even should the Christian theologian promise, for the time, to abstract himself from his convictions, the non-Christian would not believe him, but insist that he was, though unconsciously, so much influenced by his faith as to disqualify him for impartial investigation. "But true criticism *must be free from prepossessions*." This principle, often reiterated, has really induced many theologians to strive to affect the state of mind it demands. And yet this affectation is imaginary. For the freedom from prepossession feigned by the negative critics is a delusion. Every inquirer brings some philosophical or theological views into his critical operations. If, therefore, to hold that God is above nature, and that miracles are possible, is a "*presumption*," why is it not equally so to hold that "the divine causality lies in the course of nature?" And will not this latter "*presumption*" influence critical processes as much as the other? One might suppose that the pantheist, who believes in an everywhere operative, but not an almighty, God, a God whose power is limited by what he actually does, whose being is inclosed by his own works, and is wholly coincident therewith—the pantheist who, accordingly, is horrified by the idea of a miracle, as well as by that of an independent life in God, who considers *evil* as an unavoidable, essential factor of progressive *good*, and redemption as the sure ripe fruit of a poisonous blossom—must of course find the doctrines of the N. T. unpalatable and repulsive. For if it were critically proven that the Gospel reports of miracles were true, and especially the testimony of Christ's resurrection, his entire system would tumble into ruins. The impulse of philosophical self-preservation, therefore, would most probably lead him, consciously or unconsciously, to use all means, to leave no stone unturned, to prevent so undesirable a result.

But this does not prove the possibility of true biblical criticism. On the contrary, it would seem as impracticable in the one case as in the other. Still, it is *possible* for the critic, be his dogmatic standpoint what it may, without affecting indifference, freely to express his views, and yet *fairly to inquire and report the facts ascertained by purely historical and scientific investigations, and show how far these agree with his religious convictions*. Critical questions cannot be wholly separated from dogmatic and religious questions. But it suffices if, as the result of critical investigation, a Gospel fact, or a biblical book, in view of purely historical

facts, and quite independently of dogmatic presumptions, is regarded as credible and genuine, or the reverse. Such an investigation demands, above all, inward peace, such as only the confirmed believer enjoys, who has experienced the life-giving power of the Holy Scripture. He knows that no seeming lack of external evidence can shake his confidence in the divine origin of the Bible, and he can therefore fearlessly prosecute his inquiries. Neither must the Church wait until critics have reached satisfactory results, or agreed in all points; as little as the blind man (John 9) needed to wait until the scribes had finished their investigations concerning the Messiahship of Christ. The believing Christian (theologian also) can calmly watch the process of criticism, furthermore, because he knows how defective its apparatus is, and that its results, both positive and negative, must be at best but problematical and incomplete. It does not disturb him to see that the positive results are so; it comforts him to find that negative are so.

II. The relation of Christian faith to Bibl. Crit. will be better understood if we consider the duplex nature and the twofold method of criticism. A discursive-analytical investigation, which deals with objectively certain proofs, such as constrain even the opponents' assent, forms but half, and really the smaller half, of the critic's work. Valuable as this careful process of inquiry may be, especially as a restraint upon wild fancies, the higher office of criticism is reproductive-synthesis. The true critic must sustain an inward affinity for the sacred history, spiritually digest it, and thus reproduce its facts synthetically in his own mind; and the inductive proof (or proof of evidence) resulting from such synthetical contemplation, will serve more effectually to solve any points in question than all discursive-analytical demonstrations. It is with the N. T. history, as with secular history and historical investigations. The sources, i. e., the writings, as to their age, authorship, &c., must first be carefully and honestly examined. But this work of the understanding must be animated by the co-operation of the spirit, before which the historical facts must spring up in bold relief, like flat pictures in a stereoscope. The spirit must feel the living breath of the history; its most lively contradictions must solve before his eyes; as a real unity, it must explain itself; the light of the whole must elucidate its several parts. In short, the discursive-analytical method must be combined with the synthetical-reproductive; we must endeavor to understand the sacred narrative, with its assumption of the possibility of miracles, in its own spirit, in its unity and harmony. Both methods demand and condition each other. Mere analytical investigation, unsustained by synthetical conspection, would soon be lost in the sands of single facts, and fall into anxious, joyless skepticism. On the contrary, mere reproductive synthesis, unchecked by the discipline of severe analysis, would be in danger of substituting arbitrary fancies for historical facts.

III. The real presumptions of true criticism, therefore, are of a twofold kind. The synthetic criticism of the history assumes, 1, the reality of redemption, to the spirit of which the critic is

no stranger, whose saving power has, indeed, taken hold of his inmost being, and thus qualifies him to understand the history of salvation in its own nature; 2, the results of a careful analytic-critical examination of the sources. But this analytic criticism of the sources presupposes a general, minute, and yet comprehensive, knowledge of the Jewish and Christian literature of the apostolic and next succeeding period — a knowledge animated by the true historical spirit. Of the literature, we say, for mere acquaintance with the N. T. citations¹ found in Church fathers is not enough. This must be insisted upon in opposition to the perverse plan of determining the value of a N. T. book algebraically, by the number of citations in its favor, or of rejecting the book, if the citations can be cunningly set aside. It is obviously a main proof of the age of a book, if it is used or quoted by authors of a certain period. But one such citation, if indubitable, is decisive; if there are several, they merely corroborate each other (thus CLEM. ROM., ep. 1., 35, freely quotes Rom. 1 : 29, and literally, v. 32; POLYC. ep. ad Philip. c. 6, cites Rom. 14 : 10, 12; and in the ep. to the Churches in Vienne and Lyons, Rom. 8 : 18 is quoted, to say nothing of citations found in the ep. of Ignatius, and the works of Justin M., and Irenaeus). But the citations are not always literal, but mere allusions, and these more or less obvious (see an allusion to Rom. 13 : 9, 10, in POLYC. l. c. 3). The critical value of such allusions depends upon their real extent. (For allusions to John's writings in Ignatius, &c., see John.) Of equal importance is the use made by ancient heretics of N. T. scriptures. Marcion's entire Antinomian system is an obvious perversion of Paulinism, and the Church fathers mention special passages which Marcion thus distorted. The opposition of Gnostics to John's Gospel serves the same purpose. Marcion never disputed the genuineness of the Gospels of John and Matthew, though he denied their apostolic authority (TERT. adv. M. 3, 6); neither did the Valentinians dispute that of John (IREN. 3, 11, 7). Nay, Heraclion wrote a diffuse commentary on John's Gospel, and sought to derive Valentinianism from it, and Origen quotes largely from this comm. All this shows how little depends upon a dry enumeration of single citations, and how important to consider them in a literary-historical aspect. The least doubt of the genuineness of John's Gospel would have been seized and circulated by the Gnostics, instead of their taking refuge to a distorted exegesis. Marcion would have done the same. The Gospel of John must therefore have been above all suspicion of spuriousness as early as 150, only a few years after John's death. How rapidly must that Gospel have spread over the entire Christian Church!

But the paucity of explicit citations, and their entire absence in some fathers, as well as certain phenomena in ancient canons, has been thought of great negative weight. This argumentum a silentio, however, vanishes before a scientific,

¹ The collection of these in the "Quellensammlung zur Gesch. d. N. T. Kanons," Kirchhofer, Zurich, 1842, is valuable.

comprehensive view of post-apostolic literature. 1. Inferences against the genuineness of some N. T. books have been drawn from the circumstance that, whilst passages are *literally* quoted, *the fact is not stated, the author's name not given* (thus Rom. 8 : 18, in the ep. to the C. of Vienne and Lyons; Rom. 3 : 11-17, in JUSTIN. *dial.* c. Tryph. c. 27; 1 Tim. 6 : 7, 10, in POLYC. *ad Philip.* 1, though in 3 and 11 he cites Paul by name, as does CLEM. R., 1 Cor. 47). It has hence been concluded by many that, whilst the citations might prove the age, they did not prove the genuineness of the books, but that the omission of the author's name was rather prejudicial to their genuineness. But all who have read the apostolic fathers through, know that it is their *rule* to quote the Scriptures without naming author or book, excepting for special *personal* purposes, as when Clem. R., reproving the Corinthians, refers to Paul. In other cases, the citation is made as being a *well-known* Scripture passage. Such citations imply that the *γραφὴ* quoted was a *γραφὴ ἐνδιαδικτός*, publicly read, and canonical. And as long as there are no traces of the ep. to the Romans having been regarded by any Church where it was read as the work of any other than Paul, or the fourth Gospel as the work of any other than John, so long must those citations be considered proofs of the age and canonical authority of those books, and, mediately, also of their genuineness.

2. As a second *negative* argument, it has been urged, some of the fathers *never quote* certain Scriptures. "Had they existed in their day, or been acknowledged as apostolical and canonical, they would certainly have cited passages bearing upon the subject they were treating." These arguments *e silentio* are, in advance, wretched shifts. They assume that every author must always say all he might say. But what preacher of our day does this? Moreover, *we possess but small scraps of ancient patristic literature*. We have but a few fragments of Papias and Melito; the writings of Quadratus, Aristides, and Miltiades, and all of Justin *adv. hæc.* are lost. Had we the library which existed in Cæsarea, in Jerome's time, what a wealth of citations, &c., might be collected!—In close affinity with these arguments *e silentio*, are the inferences drawn from certain phenomena of the ancient canons. Because the Muratorian canon mentions only 2 ep. of John, and none of Peter or James, it is concluded that these and 1 ep. of John were not then (at least not before the Nicene Council) universally considered genuine. Because Eusebius (3, 25) cites the ep. of James, of Jude, 2 Pet., and 2 and 3 John, as ἀντιλεγόμενα, it implies that their genuineness was then disputed. The Churches of the 2d and 3d. cent. are supposed to have been engaged in incessant *scientific investigations*, in modern style; the theologians and scholars of that day must have grown ever more credulous and ignorant; so that books previously thought *spurious* were gradually admitted into the canon. The Apocalypse is wanting in the Peschito, and even in *Cyrrill. Hieros.*; the Muratorian canon mentions it; Eusebius says some thought it a *δυσκολογούμενον*, others a *νόσον*; Athanasius quotes it as canonical. In the Peschito, 2 Pet. and 2 and 3 John

are wanting; the Muratorian canon mentions 2 ep. of John, and Jude; Eusebius names them all, but as ἀντιλεγόμενα; Athanasius enumerates all as canonical.

But all this may be satisfactorily explained. Whilst the primitive Church considered the question of the genuineness of certain Scriptures important, the fundamental inquiry in the formation of the first canons was a different one (see *Canon N. T.*). And only by rightly apprehending that inquiry, can we properly understand the significance of those canons. This inquiry was an ecclesiastico-practical one: What books may and should be read in public assemblies, and privately by Christians, for their edification? In answering this, the chief concern was to exclude everything heretical. This is obvious in the Muratorian canon. The great object of the author is, evidently, to define what books might be read by Christians, publicly or privately, with edification.

IV. It would next be proper to describe the process of criticism; but we must confine ourselves to the following hints, referring for the rest to special articles. Analytical criticism, to be durable, must begin by establishing the authenticity of those Scriptures for which the remains of ancient Christian literature furnish the most and strongest proofs. These are *Paul's ep. and John's writings*. Of Paul's ep., especially 1 and 2 Cor., cited by Clem. Rom. and Polyc. as Pauline; *Romans*, acknowledged as Pauline by the Valentinians (*Iren.*, I., 3, 4; 8, 3); *Galat.*, often alluded to and cited by the fathers and heretics of the 2d cent.; *Thess.* and *Philip.*, attested by Polyc. (see *Paul*). The authenticity of these being settled, we have solid ground for showing the credibility of *Acts* (see *Luke*); and thus we secure a basis for ascertaining the age and genuineness of the Gospels (cf. especially such passages as Gal. 4 : 4; 2 Cor. 5 : 19; Col. 1 : 16; 2 : 9; 1 Cor. 1 : 2; 8 : 6; 2 Cor. 8 : 9; Phil. 2; 1 Cor. 15; Eph. 1 : 19; Rom. 6 : 4; Acts 20 : 9, &c.; 28 : 3, &c. Upon the complementary relation of the Gospels to each other, see *Harmony of the G.* On their origin, see respective Art.). To these analytical investigations must be added the results of *synthetical criticism*, for which we refer to the Art. *Apost. age, Jesus Christ, Jewish Christians*, and to *Neander's Life of Christ*, and *Neander's and Lechler's Apostolic age*.

V. In conclusion, we shall notice the history and course of the *negative* criticism of modern times. As the canonicity and genuineness of the SS. had never been questioned during the middle ages, the Reformers had no controversy with the Romish C. upon this subject. During the Reformation and succeeding period, other matters absorbed attention. *Deism*, by its frivolous assaults, was the first to challenge positive apologetic criticism. Collins and Tindal called Christianity mere priestcraft; Peter Annet ridiculed the Bible; Whiston declared that the miracles were Jewish impositions; Woolston pronounced them allegories. These attacks called forth LARDNER's great works, which left but little for others to do (see *Lardner*). J. C. Edelmann ("Moses mit aufgedecktem Angesicht," 1740) and Reimarus transplanted Deism

from England to Germany. No Lardner opposed. It was thought that sceptics and scoffers might be more easily won over by "rational" concessions, and "natural" solutions of miracles (*Paulus, Venturini, Thicss*. But see *Teller's Lexicon* for specimens. Cf., also, *Harmony of the G.*). The first period of modern criticism quickly passed. *Schleiermacher* introduced a reformation in dogmatics, *De Wette* in exegesis. Men learned, even by the progress of profane philology in Hermann's school, that it was really the exegete's work not to intrude *his own* notions upon an author, but honestly to inquire what the *author* meant to say. It was, accordingly, admitted that the N. T. writers actually intended to report miraculous and supernatural facts concerning Christ. This point conceded, rationalism found itself compelled to seek by means of criticism what its exegesis could not yield, viz., proof that the *miracles reported were not really performed*, or the credibility of the evangelical records. This could be maintained only by showing that the authors were not *eye-witnesses*, which *Bretschneider* attempted, especially in regard to *John*. Less pains were taken with *Mark* and *Luke*; for though *Luke* was a cotemporary, it was said he gathered his materials indiscriminately from all sides. *Matthew's Greek Gospel*, despite *Papias' testimony* (or rather the *Presb. John's, Eus. 3, 39*), was said to date from post-apostolic times. But these were only shy beginnings. *Gabler, Krug, Horst, Schleiermacher, Ilase, and De Wette* commenced to explain *some* things (especially touching the infancy of Christ), as "mythical." Then came (1835) *Strauss* (see Art.) with his "Life of Christ," making the whole record a myth. The scheme of *Strauss* not only called forth numberless refutations, but overreached itself. The discovery of the inadequacy of his theory is betrayed by *Gfrörer's* (*Gesch. d. Urchristenthums*) attempt to trace the "myths" to talmudic traditions. Others (as *Weisse, Ev. Gesch.*) retreated halfway, by rejecting *John* in part, and in part the other Gospels. The unbridled frivolities of this school culminated in *Bruno Bauer's Krit. der ev. Gesch., &c.* But the works of *Gfrörer, Weisse, and Bauer* only exposed the inward bankruptcy of the *Strauss* hypothesis. To save it from utter reproach another course had to be adopted. The negative criticism of the N. T. books and their genuineness was then combined with a similar treatment of the N. T. history. This led to the 4th period of negative criticism. And the broader the foundations laid, the more imposing was the superstructure of seemingly scientific results. In reaching these, however, seven-ninths of the N. T. writings had to be referred from the 1st to the 2d cent. This required a remodelling of the entire history of the post-apostolic age. *Lützelberger* ("d. kirchl. Tradit. über d. Ap. Joh.," 1840) and *Wilke* ("d. Urevangelist" 1837) took the lead. But *Schwegler* really began the work ("über d. Montanismus," &c., 1841; "nachapost. Zeitalt.," 1846). He regards the contention in *Corinth* (which arose, 1 Cor. 3 : 4, &c., mainly between two parties of Gentile Christians) as a strife between Gentile and Jewish Christians, and ascribes the predilection for speaking with tongues

(1 Cor. 12) to the latter, or, in his confused way, to the Ebionite party, which he thinks designated in the phrase: *ἐν δὲ Χριστῷ* (1 Cor. 1 : 12). Thus he obtains what he wants, a resemblance between the Corinthian Ebionites and the Montanists of the 2d cent., who also laid great stress upon "gifts," and therefore must be a continuation of Ebionitism! For *Schwegler* is either really or affectedly ignorant of a distinction between the healthy Judaism of the Apostles, and the morbid Judaism of the *παρακαταφύβου ἀδελφοί* (Gal. 2; Acts 15), Galatian errorists, and later Nazarites and Ebionites. As the Montanists are said to have taught that the Holy Ghost was not given at Pentecost, but first to Montanus (?), *Schwegler* concludes that M. originated the doctrines of the Trinity and Logos (!), and that out of the theory of a successive Trinity the subsequent eccl. dogma of an essential Trinity was developed. The conclusion drawn is: there was no united Church in the 1st cent.; what is said of the Ebionites as an insignificant sect is untrue; Ebionism was rather the primitive Christianity of the twelve Apostles, originating in the doctrine, Jesus of Nazareth was the Messiah, sent for the Jews only; hence circumcision, &c., were indispensable conditions of participation in his kingdom. In opposition to the twelve Ap., Paul conceived the bold idea of making the religion of Jesus a world religion. Paul never agreed with the twelve. Hence two hostile religions sprang up, and contended with each other until in the 2d cent., when the strife waxed hotter, *Praxeas* and *Marcion* having (140) advocated Paulinism, and won the Romish see to its side. Then the Ebionites were called "Montanists," and declared a sect. Montanism then attempted by means of the pseudo-clementines, to assume a more liberal (Gnostic) form. For *Schwegler* identifies (Marcionite) Gnosticism with Paulinism, just as he had Ebionism with the doctrines of the twelve apostles. This point reached, S. assumes that all the N. T. writings, transposed by him to the 2d cent., were surreptitiously written, in order to smother the old dissension, and make it appear that the Apostles agreed in doctrine, and thus effect a reconciliation of the adverse parties. Of course no trace of the dissension is found in the N. T. books; hence they must be pronounced the work of pious fraud, in order to convert adverse passages into proofs of this romantic hypothesis!

But it seems reasonable to ask, if the N. T. says nothing of such parties, how do the critics of Tübingen know of their existence? To meet this difficulty, Prof. v. *Bauer* pronounces Rom., 1 and 2 Cor., and Galat., genuine; and he volunteers this concession, although he has as good reasons for doubting them as for contesting *John's Gospel*. "They bear," he says, "unquestionable marks of Pauline originality, &c." But how does he know the features of such originality? Not surely from the other ep., which he declares spurious. Still he has good grounds for knowing these to be genuine; for he extracts the same hypothesis from Galat. which *Schwegler* drew from 1 and 2 Cor.! But the other N. T. books, which yield him no support, belong to the 2d cent.! (*Bauer's Paulus*, 66, 68, 73, &c.). In its first period, negative criticism supposed

it might hold, not only to the moral character of Christianity, but to the genuineness of the bibl. books, since it let go the supernatural character of Christianity. In its second and third periods, it felt compelled to yield the genuineness of the books, but hoped to adhere to the moral character of their authors. In the fourth period, it was necessitated to admit that most of the N. T. books were the work of pious fraud. To a sincere Christian consciousness, which draws from these scriptures the power of holy living and thought, and finds in them a stern *κρίσις ἐνθυμήσεων καὶ ἐνοίων καρδίας*, this acme of negative criticism appears as the acme of absurdity; and to a truly Christian and judicious scientific spirit as a tissue of sophistries. Such criticism must ever serve to instigate Christian scholars to new and more thorough demonstrations of the genuineness and sacredness of the N. T. scriptures. DR. EBRARD.*

Croatia. The original abode of the Croats, was E. Gallicia and White Russia; their language, also, was related to the Russian. Whilst dwelling near the Bosnians, near White Chrobatia, they assumed the name Chrobatians (Croats). In 634, the Emp. Heraclius gave them Dalmatia, which the Avari had conquered in 630, that they might expel the Avari, and hold the country under Greek rule. The Croats, led on by five brothers, effected this, 634-8. They then were baptised by priests, sent from Rome at the Emperor's request; and the propriety of setting Archb., Bishops, &c., over them was discussed. John of Ravenna, Archb. of Split, took special interest in them. Dubno and Sisek are mentioned as the oldest sees. But their conversion was more politic than real. They soon proved faithless, and, 641-829, renounced allegiance to the Byzantian court. But, about 790, they became subject to the Franks. By a treaty with Nicephorus, 810, this subjection was checked. After Charlemagne's death, the Franks cruelly treated the Croats, who threw off the dominion of the Franks. After the murder of their leader, Lindivit (823), the Croats gained their independence under Porin, 825-30. To secure a protector, they concluded a treaty with the Pope, and promised to re-assume Christianity. From 868-79, they again subjected themselves to the Greek emperors, and to the Patriarchs of Constant., especially because they preferred the Sclavic liturgy of the Bulgarians. But in 879, already, John VIII. commended their prince, Branimir, for his return to the Romish C. It was long, however, before the Greek faith was expelled from Croatia. The Sclavic liturgy obtained long after the invention of the Glagolitic letters in the 13th cent., or rather after the Cyrillian were changed so as to resemble the Coptic alphabet, although the Synod of Split (925) strictly prohibited it, and pronounced Methodius (its author) a heretic, 1035, and Cyril's alphabet an invention of Arian Goths. In 928 three new sees were founded, Screvlin, Sisek, and Duwno; under Kriesimir two more, Belgrad and Knin. After 990, the Princes called themselves Kings. In 1091, Ladislaus the Great subjected Croatia to the crown of Hungary, to which it remained united. Ladislaus founded the see of Agram (Zagreb). The Reformation extended into Croa-

tia, supported by the renowned Zriny. From 1580-1600, many Croatian religious works were printed, Bibles, N. Test., Catechisms, &c.; some in the Sclavic press of Teuber, in Wittenberg. One of the most zealous Croatian reformers was Michael Butschitsch, a preacher on the island Murakoz, who openly embraced the Calvinist Confession. Bishops persecuted and synods condemned him; but Maxim. II. protected him. In 1607-10, the Reformation was exterminated from Croatia. It again became Roman Catholic. Its present pop. is 483,868, viz., 479,701 Rom. Cath.; 246 united Greeks; 58 Lutherans; 31 Reformed; 2900 orthodox Greeks. The Rom. Cath. are under the B. of Agram, a suffragan of the Archb. of Colocsa. This see has 343 parishes, but extends beyond Croatia. Including Croatian parishes in Hungary, there are 450, and 250 public schools. The united Greeks are under the B. of Kreuz, whose diocese has 20 parishes, but stretches into Hungary, Dalmatia, and Illyria. The union is said to be growing. The orthodox Greeks belong to the see of Carlstadt, which numbers 152 parishes. They can hold office and property. Formerly their religious books were publ. in Russia; latterly, through fear of Russia, none can be printed out of Austria. The Latins and Greeks sustain friendly relations in Croatia. Protestants enjoy fewer rights in Croatia and Slavonia than in any other Austrian province. (See P. J. SCHARIKS, slav. Alterth., *Wuttke's Uebers.*, Lpz. 1844; *Gesch. slav. Sprache, &c.*, von E. v. O., Lpz. 1837; *REUTER's Repert.*, Bd. 74, 75.)

KLOSE.*

Crocus, John, D. D., a Reformed (or, as he preferred being called, evangelical) theologian of Cassel and Marburg, b. July 28, 1590, was the son of Paul Crocius, D. D., of Basel, the author of the oft-published "Martyrbuch." He excelled in his studies, and, after completing his course at Marburg, became (1612) court-preacher of Landgrave Moritz. In 1614, he was called to Berlin, where Moritz consented to let him spend two years. On his return to Marburg, 1617, he was appointed first prof. of theology, preacher, and a member of the consistory. From this time to his death, July 1, 1659, he was the chief advocate and leader of the State-Church of Hesse-Cassel, which had become Reformed, whose evangelical (but not Calvinistic) character and claims he set forth in a number of writings. In consequence of this, when (1624) Landgr. Lewis of Hesse-Darmst. reinstated Lutheranism in Marburg, Crocius and nine colleagues had to seek refuge in Cassel. Whilst there, Crocius wrote most of his works: "Summarische Nachricht, &c.;" "*Comm. de Aug. Conf. societate, &c.*;" "*De eccl. unitate et schismate, &c.*" His chief work against Romanism is "*Anti-Becanus, &c.*" He survived the re-opening of the Marburg university (1653), and became its first rector. He also assisted in preparing the united Church-Directory of Hesse-Cassel, which is still used by both parties.

HENKE.*

Cromwell, Oliver, Protector of England; b. April 24, 1599, in the county of Huntingdon; died Sept. 3, 1658. Few men have had such diverse judgments passed upon them. The pre-

vailing opinion of his character was formed under the Restoration, during the Anglican reaction under Charles II., and Romish reaction under James II. That estimate of him became current in France through Bossuet's influence. For a long time he was regarded, on the continent and in England, as an arrant but genial hypocrite, and a skilful warrior (cf. ST. BEUVE, *Causeries du lundi* 17. dec. 1849). Thomas Carlyle was the first to attempt a thorough vindication of his character, by publishing his private correspondence, and the authentic text of his Parliamentary speeches. Carlyle showed that his letters bore the impress of sincerity, and that his speeches were lucid and vigorous. He appealed to historical impartiality, and asked for a new investigation of Cromwell's character and life. Carlyle regards Cromwell as a type of the vigorous spirit of northern nations, as contrasted with the less individual, less independent spirit of southern nations. He affirms that only Christians can rightly judge Cromwell, who was the first to proclaim liberty of conscience, and sincerely desired what England desired, religion and liberty. To these views many responded; though some modified them. Two celebrated historians have since published their opinions of Cromwell. Macaulay thinks England owes all its present glory to Cromwell; he sowed what the three united kingdoms are now reaping. Guizot's judgment proceeds from a higher and more comprehensive point of view, and shows less sympathy for the Puritan hero, whose hypocritical modesty and proud humility elevated him. In our day, continental popular opinion is disposed to hold that a great man must be a mixture of courage and charlatany; that the rejection of all religiousness is indispensable to a strong character; and that it lowers Cromwell to describe him as a sincere Puritan. It is otherwise in England. To excite admiration in the English masses, they had to be convinced of Cromwell's religious sincerity. But what were his religious convictions? What had selfishness and ambition to do with them? There are two main periods in a man's life in which native character shows itself: youth and death. Now we have authentic documents to prove that in these two periods Cromwell really had religious convictions. He was trained by a pious mother; and, though he spent some earlier years in dissipation, he seems to have been truly converted. He refunded large sums won in play. After his marriage, in his 21st year, he spent ten years in retirement, and acquired in his neighborhood a reputation for uprightness. He is charged with youthful licentiousness. But the proofs of this rest upon his own penitent confessions of his folly. In his family, and letters to his children, he always displays sincere piety, though, of course, colored with Puritanism. He was, indeed, dissatisfied with his position, but felt happy "in not being his own." Powerful impulses wrought in him, which early awakened in him his need of subjecting himself to the law of God, as he found it in the Bible. Filled with the feeling of Protestant independence, he acknowledged no supremacy but God's. He was a Puritan, so far as such a man could be one. Like other Puritans,

he sought the Lord; but the answers he received to his prayers differed from those granted to others. They inspired him with intrepidity and wisdom. The combination of enthusiasm with worldly prudence, of mysticism with clearness of perception in other matters, is more common than many have supposed. Instance the characters of Socrates and the Maid of Orleans. Thus it was with Cromwell. He, too, had his inward voice, which he ever desired to follow. He ever sought for "providences" in his heart, in his understanding, in the Bible, in prayer. And when he arose from humble prostration in prayer, he was filled with a confidence in God which he believed a divine influence. Not that he pretended to be a prophet, or, to speak and act by the Holy Ghost. His enemies have failed to prove this charge. He did not seek to subject others by arrogating superhuman qualities; he rather seemed pervaded by a sense of human weakness, which he shared with others. Some Independents held to the letter of the Scriptures, others to the spirit within them; Cromwell laughed at both. He also ridiculed Fox, the Quaker, for his self-confidence. He likewise saw through the pride and self-delusions of the dogmatism of the Chiliasts, and adherents of the fifth monarchy, and repelled those of them (yet kindly) who thought him the man of their expectations. In reality he desired — therein lay his strength — what England wanted, the victory of religion, *religious and political liberty*. During the first period of his public career, he displayed his zeal for these by opposing illegal measures against the rights of the people. "The world," said he, "is beginning to laugh at the idea that the people belong to the King, and the Church to the Pope." Having once taken this path, he could not recede. When he attained to power, he would gladly have secured the victory to political liberty; but he could not. He effected many reforms; but the man of war and revolution was not the man to establish the cause of freedom in Britain. The contradictions combined in his character were in the way. His faith was mixed with politics and egotism. By turns he played the Christian, the patriot, and the aspirant. Humor and seriousness, laughter and tears, jests and exhortations, were alternately indulged. Thus he combined in himself elevation of spirit and low thoughts, weakness and magnanimity, prayer and pretence, frankness and a deceit which could utter the boldest lies. And yet he had the profoundest convictions. Religion was the centre of all these divergencies; not, indeed, the pure religion of Christ, but, still, religion as Cromwell apprehended it; a religion with sword in hand, which should realize his fond dreams. Hence, when the hour came which tries man's heart, in which he shows his true character, Cromwell proved the correctness of our delineation. "Tell me," said he to Sterry, one of his chaplains, "is it possible to fall from grace?" What does this question signify? Does it come from the abyss about to engulf his soul, or from the depths of that conflict through which many a sincere Christian passes on the approach of death? God knows. Yet we rather think it sprang from the latter. "It is not possible," said the chap-

lain. "Then," exclaimed the dying man, "I am safe, for I know that I was once in grace" (see *Lingard*, Hist. of England, XI., 125-6). Then he continued: "I am a miserable creature. Yet, Lord, thou hast made me an instrument in thy hands. This people desires that I may live, believing it would be for thy glory. Others wish I might die." — "God is good," he added, "he will not" "I desired to live for the service of God and his people; but my mission is accomplished. God will be with his people."

These were his last words. They are, indeed, not the utterances of filial resignation. They rather betray grief at being called from a work which he thought needed his presence, than a true longing after rest with God. He seems to have shared the desire of many Puritans, that a fairer sun might dawn upon England, and a new kingdom of David arise, a kingdom of righteousness and glory, which he believed himself called to inaugurate. He longed for the triumph of God's law and of liberty, but could not effect it. In his death he saw his dream vanishing. In its place the unrighteous means which he had employed rise up to view. He sees the true, eternal religion in contrast with that political one he had sought to establish. The broad road he had trodden diminishes before his vision into the narrow path of the Gospel. Hence his fears. He would gladly console himself with the consciousness of good intentions. But this comfort also fails. Then he cries out: "Can a man fall from grace? I know that I was once in grace;" and enters the eternal world.

L. VUILLIEMIN.*

Cross, Signs of the Cross. The form and significance which the cross has acquired among Christians is peculiar to Christianity; indeed, it owes the form of it which is now prevalent wholly to its Christian significance. *Cruz* is any figure formed by the intersection, or contact at one point, of two lines. The earliest and simplest form of it is the *Thau* (T) of the old Phœnician alphabet, which is also found in Egyptian MS. and on Jewish coins, instead of Π . With this sign, animals in the East were branded; hence it is called (Ezek. 9 : 4, 6) the sign (cf. *Vulg.*). The same sign was transferred to the Greek and Roman alphabets. It was usual among the Phœnicians and Carthaginians to execute criminals by nailing or chaining them to a wooden cross of the above form. From them the Romans and Greeks borrowed their *σταυρός*, *cruz*; and many fathers believed that Jesus was crucified on one of that form, referring to Ezek. 9 : 4. This figure is often found carved in catacombs. But the Church has unanimously believed that the cross of Christ had the cross-beam intersecting the upright below the top (†), was a *cruz immissa*. Various comparisons and indications were urged in favor of the Christian form of the cross. It was observed to be a prominent form in nature, which thus furnished a tacit prophecy of Christ — a favorite idea of the ancient fathers and apologists, of mystics and symbolists. The four cardinal points (Hier. in Jer. 31); living birds; man praying with extended arms (TERTUL. *adv. Jud.* II.; JUSTIN. *dial.* 3); a roasted paschal lamb; a ship with oars; a man plowing, or even walking; the

Roman *vexillum* and *tropæum*; Isis with her Nile key (†); and *Thor* with his hammer, all seemed types. But our cross, as a geometrical figure, might often occur as a mere ornament or sign, without further signification. And as the O. T. with its brazen serpent, typical of Christ, seems not to contain the slightest allusion to the sign of the cross, it must, like the atonement completed on it, be regarded as the most peculiar property of Christianity. Nevertheless, it may be acknowledged as providential that the Redeemer of the world was put to death by the Roman people upon an instrument better suited than any other to become a sign to all nations, of a sacrifice in atonement for the sin of the world. It is easy to see how the cross became the appropriate memento of Christ himself, the symbol of his Gospel, and the abbreviation of "the name of Christ." Gradually the sign of the cross, made on the person with a finger or the hand, was used instead of an artificial one, at the commencement of religious services or secular work; especially at baptisms and exorcisms. Hence, in later missions, as under Ansgar, &c., it was used as the *prima signatio*, *primsigne*, in the antecedent consecration of persons as Christians (cf. TERTULL., *de Coron. mil.* c. 3). The sign was usually made on the forehead (Ex. 9 : 4). Prudentius (*hymn* 6¹) admonishes, before going to sleep, to sign thus the *breast* and *brow*, to dispel temptations; the brow as the head of the body; the *breast* and *mouth* with allusion to Matt. 15 : 18, 19 (CHRY. *hom.* 87 in *Math.*). Thus it became the prevalent custom to cross these parts, or, instead of the mouth, both shoulders. The Western Romish Churches used either "the German" or "Latin Cross." The Latin formula used is: *In nomine patris et filii et spiritus sancti. Amen*; or *Adjutorium nostrum in nomine Domini*; or *Deus in adjutorium meum intende*; or simply, *in nomine Domini nostri Jesu Christi*, whilst repeating which the palm of the right hand touches the brow, the breast, the left, and then the right side. The German cross is made by placing the left hand on the breast, then laying the thumb upon the first finger of the right hand, and thus touching the brow, mouth, and breast, and saying: *Im Namen Gottes des Vaters, des Sohnes, und des Heiligen Geistes. Amen.* The Greek cross, is used by Eastern Churches and orthodox Russians, and made with the first three fingers of the right hand, with the formula, "Holy God, holy Strengtheners, holy Eternal One, have mercy on us" (see *Alt. Chr. Cultus*, 1851, p. 183). All this was to effect the same as calling on the name of Christ, "if done in faith," as the Russian Catechism says. But it could be readily perverted by superstition. Luther, however, retained it (see his small Cat.). In the Lutheran (European) and Anglican C. it is still used at Baptism, the Lord's Supper, and in the Aaronitic benediction. The Reformed C. abolished it.

The artificial cross, *cruz exemplata*, must have been in use in Tertullian's time (*Apolog.* 16),

¹ *Fac, cum vocante somno
Castum petis cubile
Frontem locumque cordis
Crucis figura signet.
Cruz pellit omne noxium.*

but without ornaments. Chrysostom speaks of it as a common and favorite device. A small golden cross with a ring, intended probably to be worn on the neck, was found in the Vatican cemetery. Graves also had crosses placed over them; though they occur more rarely in catacombs (see Art. and *Alpha*) than the monogram of Christ (see *Roma sub. ed. Arnheimiae*, 1671; *Evang. Kalender*, 1857). After 380–400, it was used to ornament churches, especially altars. Nilus of Sinai recommended that it be placed in the *sanctuary*, towards the East; Paulinus, B. of Nola, directed it to be put over the *entrance* of his Church (Augusti, *Beiträge*, I. 166). In the Mosaics of the 5th cent., the cross usually occupies the foremost place, amid stars, emblems of the evangelists, and other ornaments; this formed the transition to images and pictures of the crucifixion, one of the oldest of these known being that named by *Beda venerabilis* (cf. Dr. Piper, *chr. Bilderkreis*, 1852, p. 27).

The cross was also used as an *ecclesiastical sign*, primarily at the laying of corner-stones of churches. This was enjoined under Julian; also by the Justinian code (Nov. 5, 1; 67, 1; 14, 7), and the *capit.* of Charlem. (5, 229). Churches were consecrated by its use. ORDO ROM.: *et faciat episcopus crucem per parietes cum pollice suo de ipso chrismate in 12 locis*. It was carried in processions, &c. (cf. Du CANGE, I. 1273–6). The universal adoration of the cross was fixed for Good Friday; only such could participate who lay under no mortal sin (*Synod Nemausens*, 1245). The cross, even on a highway, was an asylum for criminals; hence the phrase, *ad crucem confugere*. The cross also became the emblem of apostolic dignity. The Pope enjoys the right of always having one borne before him; so may the greater Patriarchs, excepting in Rome, or in the presence of the Pope or his legate, and each dignitary endowed with the pallium, in his own diocese. But Greg. XI. forbid this to Patriarchs, Primates, and Bishops, in the presence of cardinals. The cross is also used, in the Romish C., in the consecration of burial-grounds, and on graves. Many Protestants are returning to this custom. — As early as the 5th cent. it was often placed at the *head of diplomas*, &c., instead of "in the name of God, &c." Christian physicians long put it on their prescriptions. In the 6th cent. letters, &c., were often signed with one (or three crosses), instead of the person's name. Clergy put it *after*, Bishops *before* their names. Greek emperors often signed with *red*, Byzant. princes with *green*, old English kings with *gold* crosses. The bearer of a dispatch thus signed was called *σταυρονάτης*. Thus from Constantine onward the cross became the ensign of Christianity, as opposed to heathenism and the crescent. It was carved or painted on banners, crowns, &c., &c. *Crucem assumere* or *crucizari* became the motto of Christians after the *Conc. Claramont.* under Urban II. In countries and cities taken from the Mahomedans or heathen, a cross was erected. Persons accused by kings and emperors were made to carry one; by it oaths were administered; ordeals enacted; boundaries fixed, &c. After the crusades, the form of the cross was applied to eccl. architecture (see Art.), and it was put on every book, vessel, &c.,

used in the Church. Thus its use fostered superstitions. Even Protestants have not always risen above such influences. Crosses must be put on houses, stables, &c., to keep off bad spirits, witches, &c. (LUTHER's works, Erl. Ausg. X. 397; XV. 333, &c.).¹ The crusades led to the adoption of the cross as a badge of eccl. and secular orders, and in so many forms that a *staurologia* became necessary. The ancient Roman C. had three: 1, *Cruz decussata* X, or St. Andrew's; 2, *C. commissa* T, also called Egyptian or Antonius; and 3, *C. immissa* or *ordinaria* †. Distinct from these are the *Greek C.* †; *Peter's C.* †; *Bernward's C.*, shaped like a dagger; the *robber's C.* Y; the *double C.* †; and the *triple C.* † of the Russian separatists, the lower cross-piece being for the feet (*lignum suppedaneum*).

H. MERZ.*

Crowns, wreaths, of flowers and twigs, sometimes of silver and gold, were used among the ancient Israelites, but not as extensively as among the Greeks and Romans. They are oftenest mentioned in the O. T. Apocrypha. They were worn as *ornaments*, symbolical of joy (3 Macc. 7 : 16, &c.), by princes and generals, on festival and triumphal occasions (Judith 3 : 18; 15 : 13; comp. Rev. 6 : 2); at feasts and marriages (Ezek. 23 : 42; Is. 28 : 1; Cantic. 3 : 11, &c.). Houses, gates, temples, idols, the animals sacrificed, altars, and priests were then also crowned (1 Macc. 4 : 57; *Joseph. B. J.* 4, 4, 4; *Athen.* 15, p. 674; *Herod.* I. 132). Hence the term is often used figuratively (Job. 19 : 9; Prov. 12 : 4, &c., &c.). In the N. T. it is frequently named in allusions to Grecian games (1 Cor. 9 : 25, &c.). For ancient monographs upon this subject see UGOLINI, thesaur. XXX. (See WINER's Lex.) RÜTSCHE.*

Crucifix. Figures of Christ crucified are found in paintings and MSS. of the 6th cent.; sometimes also on the shrines of relics and ivory lids. But crucifixes are thought to have originated about the end of the 7th cent., and to have become common during the Carolingian period. The oldest plastic crucifixes in the West are a bronze in the gallery *degli Uffizi*, in Florence, and the two which Leo III. presented to the Vatican and Ostia basilica. That the East had crucifixes in early times is proven by D'Agincourt's copy of a Syrian MS. of the Gospels, hints of the Church fathers, and the 82d c. of the Trullan Synod of 692 (see GIESLER, eccl. hist. § 127, n. 7). Subsequently the orthodox C. of the East forbid the use of all images, including crucifixes. In the Greek C., even the cross is not placed above the altar, but on its tablet. But in the West crucifixes of wood, stone, silver, gold; ivory, &c., are everywhere found, especially in churches, Rom. and Lutheran. The Reformed Churches, however, do not tolerate them. — The crucifix has undergone several modifications. Its first form was a lamb under the cross, as in the church of

¹ In general, the more these outward uses of the form of the cross prevailed, the more did living faith in the crucified One vanish; the more did the inner "cross of Christ" become a stumbling-block and foolishness. In this respect the Romish C. resembles Christians who are ever talking of their religious experiences, and making a display of them, until, having exhausted themselves, they utter glaring nonsense. — HANCOCK.

Paul of Nola. Then the bust of Christ was added, under or above the cross, with a lamb on its centre. The next form was a human image of Christ, clothed, and with extended arms, in the suppliant posture of the ancients. Such representations were used until the 12th cent. Meanwhile, the cross with Christ living nailed to it, was introduced, first with four nails, one in each hand, and one in each of the feet, which were placed beside each other; then with Christ dying, or dead, having only a girdle around his loins, fastened (after the 13th cent.) with three nails, one in each hand, and one through the feet crossed, the right above the left. Early in the middle ages the crucifix was surrounded with a group, usually Mary the mother of Jesus, and John, sometimes a soldier with a sponge and another with a lance; most frequently Mary Magdalene on her knees, embracing the cross. Anciently, and now yet in some Romish churches, the body of the dying Saviour is represented as emaciated, and his features as distorted; but more cultivated Christian art gave to his form and face the noblest expressions of agony and dignified suffering. (See MÜNTER, d. Sinnbilder, &c., d. Mittelalt. I. 77; OTTE, Handb. d. kirchl. Kunstarchæol. d. Mittelalt.) GRÜNEISEN.*

Crucifixion. This mode of punishment was common among the ancient Persians, Assyrians, Egyptians, Indians, Scythians, Grecians, and Macedonians (see WINER's Lex.). Alexander M., after taking Tyre, had 2000 Tyrians crucified. C. seems to have been practised even by the Phœnicians and Carthaginians. The latter are said to have put Regulus to death upon a high cross. Hanno, after being scourged, had his eyes put out, was tortured to death, and then exposed on a cross (see similar cases in Herod., Xen., and Plut.). Cæsar's letting the pirates be strangled before crucifixion, is named by Sueton. as a proof of his clemency (J. Cæs. c. 74); for it was at once the most painful and shameful death (*crudelissimum terribilissimumque suppl.*, CIC. VERR. V. 64; *damnatissimum quoddam fatum* (Nonus) *extremum suppl.*, ARNOB. *adv. gentes*, I. 36). The cross was called *infelix lignum* or *arbor, infamis stipes* (LIVY, I. 26; MINUC. *fol. Oct.* c. 9). The Romans considered C. a *servile suppl.* (HOR. *Sat.* I. 3, 80-83; CIC. *l. c.* 66), to be inflicted on common criminals, especially on slaves, robbers, assassins, forgers, thieves, and seditious persons. It was never executed on a *civem romanum*. The Romans practised it until Constantine's time, sometimes even upon freemen, captives, Christians, and women (LACTANT. *div. instit.* IV. 26. Cf. JOS. *Arch.* 18; 3, 4; B. J. V. 11, 1). It was inflicted by the Jews only under Roman rule; instead of the Greek and Latin phrases describing it, they used "hanging," and of the culprit, "the one hung." Impalement was practised by the Jews only to expose stoned criminals to greater indignity. The crucifixion of Christ was in the *Roman mode* (concerning the Rom. forms of the cross, &c., see Art.). Representations of Christ's crucifixion usually make the cross too high. High crosses were used only for great criminals (JUST. *hist.* 18, 7; SUET. in *Galb.* 9). Usually the convicts' feet were only a few spans above the ground. The use of the hyssop-reed, commonly only a foot long, proves

that this was the case with the Saviour. The Rom. cross had a pin projecting from the middle (ὥς κρίκας, JUST. *dial.* 91; πηγμα, *sedile*), to support the body (IREN. *adv. hæc.* 2, 42), and keep the hands from tearing out. LIPSIVS, *de cruce*, *Antw.* 1595, supposes Christ's cross was made of oak; but it was most probably made of the sycamore, palm, or olive, the most common trees in Palestine (a gloss in CLEMENTIN. I. *de summa trin.* says, *cedrum in stipite, palmam in palo per longam, cupressum in ligno ex traverso*).

Scourging preceded crucifixion (JOS. B. J. 5, 11; LIVY, 33, 36; CURT. 7, 11, 28), either in the Prætorium or on the way to the execution, which took place on some public road outside of the city, as a warning to all who passed. Convicts had to drag their cross, or at least the larger beam, to the place of execution (PLUTARCH, *ser. vind.* c. 9); it was never carried for them; the soldiers compelled Simon the Cyrenean to bear the Saviour's from arbitrary rudeness, not from pity to Christ. A white tablet (*titulus, cavis, λένωμα, αίρία*), with the crime inscribed, was carried before the convict, or hung round his neck (SUET. *Calig.* 32; EUSEB. H. E., V. 1, 19). A herald went before the procession and proclaimed the cause of the execution. In Rome and cities where the governors had lictors, they were the executioners. As Pilate had no lictors, soldiers performed this office. The soldiers were usually commanded by a centurion or tribune (*exactor mortis*, or *cent. suppl. præpositus*), on horseback (TAC. *Ann.* 3, 14; SEN. *de ira*, 1, 16). The custom of giving the convict about to suffer a narcotic drink, was *Jewish*, but allowed by the Romans in the case of Jesus. It was vinegar, or sour wine and bitter ingredients (gall, &c.) mixed with myrrh, which Christ refused. Convicts were usually fastened to the *uplifted* cross (hence *tollere, ascendere*, &c., in c., and c. *statuere*); to fasten them to a cross lying on the ground was an exception; and the prevailing opinion of the Ch. fathers is that Christ was executed in the usual way. Before crucifixion, convicts were stripped naked; the exceptions were rare. The cloth around the loins of Christ in most paintings, is probably an addition of Christian art; though Hug thinks Roman custom warrants it. The phrase, γυμνοί γὰρ σταυροῦνται (ARTEMIDOR. *Oneirocr.* II. 55) does not forbid it. It is more uncertain that Jesus was crucified with the crown of thorns, as represented since the 13th cent. — The crucifixion, ἡ σταυρώσις, was as follows: four soldiers drew up the convict with ropes, and set him on the *sedile*; the arms and feet were then bound to their places, and nails driven through the hands and feet (see WINER's Lex.); whether a nail through each foot, or one through both, cannot be decided; the latter method was most common. The convicts' garments belonged to the executioners as *spolia* (John 19 : 23). The tablet, with its inscription in the official Roman language, the Greek world-language, and the national Hebrew, which was fastened above the head of the crucified, was probably the same which was carried before him, or on his neck. — The sufferings caused by crucifixion were, 1, the unnatural fixed position of the body, with the arms violently stretched, so that the least movement

caused the severest pains in the whole body, especially in the back lacerated by the scourging, and in the pierced hands. 2. As the nails were driven through the limbs at points having many nerves and sinews, some of which were thus torn, others violently compressed, they caused great pain. 3. Inflammation of the wounds and other parts, in which circulation was checked, ensued. The pain and thirst thus occasioned were momentarily increased. 4. The blood was driven from the wounded and stretched extremities to the head, swelled the arteries, and caused terrible pains in the head. The circulation of the blood being checked, its passage through the lungs was impeded, the action of the heart became oppressed, all the veins distended, and unutterable dread ensued. Loss of blood through the wounds would have relieved these pains; but coagulation soon checked this flow. Thus death spread by slow degrees from the extremities through the muscles, veins, and nerves. Sometimes these sufferings lasted for twelve hours, or even to the second and third day (PETRON. *Sat.* III.), when the wretched beings died of hunger and pain combined (EUSEB. *H. E.*, 8, 3; cf. HERODOT. 7, 194; JOSEPH. *vit.* 75). According to Roman custom, the bodies were left hanging until the flesh fell off, or was devoured by birds or beasts. Soldiers guarded them against attempts to take them away for burial. Occasionally, death was hastened by kindling a fire beneath the convicts, or bears and lions were allowed to devour them. Sometimes they were speared under the shoulders (ORIG. on Matt. 27: 54). The Romans never took the bodies down for burial, excepting on the eve of the Emperor's birthday. According to Deut. 21: 22, the Jews could not permit a person to hang exposed over night; it was thought a special desecration to allow one to hang thus on a high-sabbath. Hence, they begged the *crucifragium* of Pilate, which was a separate punishment; it was a substitute for the sufferings curtailed by a more speedy death. The broad lance inflicted the death-wound. Then they might bury the body. (See JAHN, *Archæol.*; FRIEDLIEB, *Archäol. d. Leidensgesch.*, 155.) II. MERZ.*

Cruciger (*Creuziger, Creutzinger*), Caspar, a faithful and judicious friend of the Reformation, was b. Jan. 1, 1504, in Leipsic, of a respectable family. At first his talents seemed only moderate, but he soon displayed higher abilities. He quietly embraced evangelical doctrines about 1519. In 1521, having fled from the plague to Wittenberg, he heard *Melanchthon*, then *Luther*. In 1524 he was called to Magdeburg as rector of the St. John's school. He also preached there with success. In 1528 he returned to Wittenberg, preached, lectured on the O. and N. T., and assisted *Luther* in his translation of the Bible, in which his knowledge of medicine and the natural sciences was of advantage. He took part in the Marburg discussion, 1529; the Wittenberg conc., 1536; the Smalcald conference, 1537, and the convention of Worms, 1540. In 1539, he was called to aid *Myconius* in introducing the Reformation into Leipsic; but, by *Luther's* advice he was not allowed to go, which is the more remarkable, since L. had begun to mistrust him and *Melanchthon* upon the doctrines of the

Lord's Supper and justification (cf. *Corp. Ref.* III. 159; IV. 1037). He died, after great bodily sufferings, patiently borne, Nov. 16, 1548, leaving two daughters (one married to *Luther's* son *John*) and a son, *Caspar*, *Melanchthon's* successor. *Caspar*, being expelled for implication in crypto-Calvinism, became pastor in Cassel, where he died in 1597, characterized by extreme Lutheranism as "*optimi patris pessimus filius*," because he advocated the Reformed doctrine. *Cruciger*, Sr., as *ταχυπαφάτος*, took down, with *Rörer*, many of *Luther's* lectures and sermons, and prepared them for print. He left behind many speeches, treatises, and exegetical writings, which still possess value. (See REINHOLD'S *Gedächtnissrede*, *Corp. Ref.* XI. 833; ADAMI, *Vit. Theol.*; BOSSECK, *diss. de Cr.* Lpz. 1739; *Piper's* ev. Kalender, 1854.)

E. SCHWARZ.*

Crusades.—After Constantine the Great built the church of the Holy Sepulchre, pilgrimages to places distinguished by Christ's bodily presence were considered meritorious, and became more frequent until they reached their height in the 11th cent. Whilst the Arabs held those places, the pilgrims were kindly treated; but when the Seljuk Turks seized Syria (1073), they so grossly maltreated, not only pilgrims, but Christians dwelling in Palestine, that a spirit of vengeance was aroused in multitudes of pious and brave hearts. The appeals of Peter the Hermit, therefore, and of Urban II. at the Councils of Piacenza and Clermont (1095) called forth zealous responses. With the cry, "God wills it," thousands of every station and age, following the devout fanaticism of the age, resolved to join the expedition, and, as their badge, wore a red cross upon their right shoulder; hence the name *crusaders*. Soon hundreds of thousands, from France, Lorraine, and Normandy, impelled by the hope of temporal and eternal gain, and fired by the wide-spread enthusiasm, seized the cross, and rushed into an enterprise, of whose extent and perils they had no conception. The first of these bands, collected in March, 1095, and led by *Peter of Amiens* and *Walter the Penniless*, after cruelly persecuting the Jews, and robbing their native country, met with almost annihilating vengeance, by hunger and sword, on their passage through Hungary, Bulgaria, and Asiatic Turkey. In August, 1096, however, a well-organized army of knights, mostly from France, the Netherlands, and Normandy, started by different routes for Constantinople, the appointed place of rendezvous. Its several divisions were commanded by brave and warlike men: *Godfrey of Bouillon*, whose ability in the council and on the field soon secured for him the highest influence; *Raymond of St. Gilles*, Count of Toulouse, who rivalled *Godfrey's* influence; *Robert of Normandy*, the first son of William the Conqueror; *Count Robert of Flanders*; *Hugh the Great*, brother of Philip of France; the eloquent *Count Stephen of Chartres*; the crafty and ambitious *Boemond, Prince of Tarentum*, Robert Guiscard's son; the chivalric and noble *Tancred*, *Boemond's* nephew; and *B. Adhemar of Puy*, the papal legate. After indescribable hardships, the host crossed the Bosphorus, and pressed on to the conquest of Nice,

the Syrian Seljuks constantly opposing them. On June 2, 1098, Antioch fell into their hands through treachery. The Persian nobleman, *Carboran*, who had come to the relief of Antioch with 300,000 men, was also vanquished. Then first could the victorious crusaders summon courage to pursue the great object of their invasion, along the Syrian coast, towards Ramlah and Emmaus. But repeated conflicts with the Turks, and dissensions among their leaders, hindered their progress. It was not until June 7, 1099, that they reached Jerusalem. Only 20,000 warriors survived, and 39 days were spent in impatience before the enemy was compelled to surrender the city. At length, by means of batteries and scaling-ladders, they effected an entrance, July 15, and triumphantly ascended the heights of the temple. Seventy thousand infidels perished by the sword; the Jews of the city were all burned without mercy in their synagogue. Having thus sated their vengeance, the victors went with uncovered heads and bare feet, through gore and flames, into the church of the Passion and Resurrection, singing hymns as they proceeded, and there confessed their sins and vowed amendment.

Thus the zeal and sufferings of the crusaders seemed to have won their prize. But to secure permanence to this dearly-bought conquest, it was necessary to establish an organized government of the country, and provide proper management of the surviving but broken forces. For many pilgrims already thought of returning home, whereas Jerusalem was still surrounded by prowling foes. At the same time, selfish dissensions arose among the temporal and spiritual leaders of the crusades. *Arnulf*, the episcopal successor of *Adhemar*, at the head of arrogant priests, contended that a spiritual kingdom should be founded, under a temporal protectorate. The assembled princes decided upon the choice of a temporal king. *Godfrey*, of *Bouillon*, was unanimously chosen, but would assume no other title than "Defender of the Holy Sepulchre;" being unwilling to wear a royal crown where Christ had worn a crown of thorns. — Whilst these things were transpiring in Jerusalem, the Egyptian Caliph *Mostali* had urged an immense army, for the recovery of Palestine, as far as *Ascalon*. *Godfrey* led forth his enthusiastic hosts against him, and, Aug. 12, 1099, routed his army with terrible slaughter. Provisions and arms in abundance fell to the share of the victors, and the new kingdom acquired increased influence and security. Soon after this victory, *Daimbert*, Archb. of *Pisa*, arrived in Jerusalem; by the help of the princes, he expelled the hated *Arnulf*, and having, as Patriarch, demanded, in the Pope's name, that the kingdom should become a fief of the Church, constrained *Godfrey* to promise to defend the Holy Sepulchre and the Church as the vassal of the Patriarch and Pope. *Godfrey* (see Art.) died July 18, 1100. The Crusaders were, meanwhile, reduced to 2000 footmen and 300 horsemen. The kingdom was confined to the possession of Jerusalem, Joppa, Nazareth, Ramlah, Cæsarea, and some adjacent villages, and the feudal tenure of four chief baronies, of which *Laodicea*, was under *Raymond*, and *Tiberias*

under *Tancred*, whilst *Antioch* and *Edessa*, the bulwark of the kingdom, sustained a less intimate relation to Jerusalem, on account of their distance, and intervening Turkish possessions. It was fifty years before the Christians subdued the entire coast to *Askelon*. And, as the parts taken were apportioned to those most active in their conquest, there arose in Jerusalem a feudal nobility, pledged, as in the West, to render the King forty days' service every year, and general obedience. The cities in part fell to the barons, partly remained under the immediate rule of the King. The chief barons, among whom the King was *primus inter pares*, presided at the diets; but they often so quarrelled among themselves that they called in the Turks to their aid. The knights of the kingdom, in its most flourishing period, numbered only a few hundred, and, with the cities, could not rally more than 5000 warriors. As the King's power was embarrassed by his relations to the feudal lords, it became still more so by the repeated strifes which arose between these nobles and numerous arrogant priests. Besides the Patriarch, who aimed at supremacy over the entire Eastern Church, and a large number of Bishops, there were five Archbishops in the small kingdom; those of Tyre, Cæsarea, Bessaret, Nazareth, and Krak (*Philadelphia*). To these were added crowds of poor subordinate clergy, whom the hope of gain had drawn to Palestine. Numerous monks, also, favoured by Rome, infringed upon the rights of the other ecclesiastics, and provoked open contentions. As the clergy received, besides having their own hands, tithes of all the revenues, and the offerings of the pilgrims, whilst the income of the Kings was so small that they could scarcely maintain the government, frequent feuds arose between the spiritual and temporal powers. In addition to the nobles and clergy, the new state acquired a mixed population of the most diverse character and manners. The chief and most favoured of these were the European crusaders, or pilgrims, generally called Franks, whose rapacity and cruelty made the Mohammedans hate and despise them. The offspring of those born in Palestine were called *Pullani*, who became worse than their parents. Besides these were the orthodox Greek Christians, *Surians*, the working class, whom the Latin ecclesiastics sorely oppressed. In language, manner of life, and customs, they most resembled the Saracens, who, as also the *Grifons* (as the Franks called the Greeks) were few in number. — The kingdom of Jerusalem maintained itself, amid constant hostilities and growing corruptions, until Oct. 21, 1187. Eight kings¹ succeeded *Godfrey*, who, though brave amid the perils of warfare, lacked ability and wisdom to confirm their rule. Indeed, the government would not have lasted so long, but for the aid which annually arrived in the per-

¹ These were, 1, *Baldwin I.*, *Godfrey's* brother, to 1118; 2, *Baldwin II.*, his cousin, to 1131; 3, *Foulk of Anjou*, the husband of *Melissinda*, daughter of *B. II.*, to 1142; 4, *Baldwin III.*, *Melissinda's* son, under the regency of *M.*, to 1162; 5, *Almeric*, brother of *B. III.*, to July 11, 1173; 6, *Baldwin IV.*, *Almeric's* son, to 1183; 7, *Baldwin V.*, son of *B. IV.*, to 1186; and 8, *Veit of Lusignan*.

sons of new pilgrims, and the support of the religious-knightly orders of the *Hospitallers* and *Templars*. The great influence of these orders in the kingdom calls for some special notice of their origin. About the middle of the 11th cent., some benevolent merchants of Amalfi and other Italian cities founded a hospital, with a monastery and church, in Jerusalem, for the accommodation of poor sick pilgrims. The members of this institution, called *Hospitallers*, took the name of their patron, *St. John* of Alexandria. At the time of the first crusade, *Gerhard of Provence*, a pious philanthropist, was at its head, and obtained from Paschal II. a distinct constitution. Gerhard's successor, *Raymond of Puy*, added (1118) military to the other duties of the members, and thus induced large numbers to join the order; they wore a black cloak, with an eight-cornered cross of white linen on the left breast. Their leader was called *Master*, and, since *Hugo of Reval*, *Grand-Master* (see *Hospitallers*). About the same time, *Hugh of Payens* and *Geoffrey de St. Aldamar* joined with seven other knights in a vow of chastity, obedience, and poverty, in honor of the sweet Mother of God, and for the defence of the Holy Land and pious pilgrims, according to the rule of *St. Augustine*. Martial and monastic objects were thus combined at their outset. This basis of a new order was laid in 1119. It soon rendered important service to the feeble kingdom. *Baldwin II.*, therefore, cheerfully offered for their use a part of his palace, near the supposed locality of Solomon's temple; hence their name, *Templars*. The Patriarch of Jerusalem, also, at once recognized the order as a religious society, and *St. Bernard* of Clairvaux proclaimed their praise in Europe so zealously, that *Honorius II.* confirmed the organization, 1128, and their numbers and wealth rapidly increased. The knights lived in their houses like monks; valour against infidels was their chief virtue. Their dress was a white cloak with a red cross. Admissions took place secretly, in the assembled chapter, with simple ceremonies; their various rules, also, were kept secret, being shown only to the higher and older members (cf. *Gieseler*, *Eccl. H. II.* § 72). These two religious-military orders impressed their character upon the age, and long efficiently aided the kingdom of Jerusalem. Securing to the members a double merit, they attracted the choicest warriors of Europe; those who could not join them made the one or other order the heir of their estate. Both orders were divided into different classes, the first class being composed of knights proper, who could prove their nobility; but any one might enter the order as a fellow in arms, or a serving brother. The Grand-Masters, who had their seat in Jerusalem, had command of a strong force, and, by means of their immense revenues, could sustain many hired soldiers.

Thus supported, *Baldwin I.* and *II.* successfully defended themselves against the infidels. But when, under the feeble *Fouk*, the terrible *Zenghi*, emir of Aleppo, and his son, *Noraddin*, took Edessa, the news of its fall spread such alarm that nothing short of another and general crusade was thought adequate to the deliverance of the kingdom. *Eugene III.* headed the move-

ment at once, offered the immunities of the feudal lords and the faithful to the crusaders, and summoned the princes of the Western Church to the rescue, through *Bernard* of Clairvaux (*Eugen. Ep. ad Ludov.* in *Mansi*, XXI. p. 626, &c.). Bernard (see Art.) inflamed all France. *Louis VII.* and most of his knights took the cross, to atone for the burning down of a church filled with human beings. In 1146, Bernard preached the crusade in Germany. At the diet of Spire, his burning eloquence fired all present; even *Conrad III.* was borne down by it against his will, and was the first to march forth, with 70,000 warriors, on the old course, through Hungary towards Constantinople. But, as bitter dissensions existed between the members of the Eastern and Western Churches, and as the Germans were already engaged in hostilities in Thrace, *Manuel I.* did not hesitate quietly to conclude a peace with the Seljuks advantageous to himself. This involved the Germans in so many difficulties and losses, that *Conrad* hastened to Constantinople, and advised his followers to join the French. But *Louis VII.* had suffered equal losses in the devastated country, from all whose heights and ravines the light-armed foe assailed him. Only after the severest toils did he, with a small part of his army, reach Syria, where *Conrad* met him. There they were soon joined by the North German and English crusaders, who had meanwhile taken Lisbon from the Moors. Unwilling that the enterprise should prove utterly fruitless, the united host, with *Baldwin III.* and the troops of his baronies, besieged Damascus. But here, again, ambition, strife, and especially the treachery of the Pullani, defeated the attempt. Well nigh consumed by hunger, pestilence, and vice, the Princes, disheartened, returned with their few remaining followers to their homes (1149).

After this failure, the Christians in Palestine met with one misfortune after another; and, although they were constantly assisted by new pilgrims, the debilitated, distracted kingdom would soon have gone down, only for the hostilities of rival houses. But after *Saladin* had subjected Egypt and frontier Asia, he assailed and took Jerusalem, Oct. 3, 1187. Although he treated the conquered Christians with surprising clemency, the tidings of the fall of the Holy City spread consternation and grief throughout the entire West. *Gregory VIII.* issued a call for titles in support of a third crusade. The Italians, with the Archb. of Pisa and Ravenna, in conjunction with the Normans, Frieslanders, Danes, and the Flemish, hastened forward with a fleet of more than a hundred ships. It was the most splendid of the crusades. The veteran *Frederick I.*, fired with the spirit of vengeance, seized the cross, and, early in 1188, was in the field with 30,000 warriors, the flower of his nation, and marched for Constantinople, which, by his strict discipline, and the bravery of his troops, he reached without loss. Suspensions, however, prevailed, that the emperor, *Isaac Angelus*, had formed treaties with *Saladin* which were dangerous to the crusade. *Frederick*, therefore, treated the empire as a conquered country, and, forcing his passage into Asia, took Iconium, and reached Tarsus with but trifling losses. There

he perished whilst bathing in the Cydnus (or Selef), July 10, 1190. His army fell into disorder, and became so reduced that but a remnant was left, which, under Duke Frederick of Suabia, the Emperor's second son, besieged Ptolemais (Acre). Thither had the Kings of France and England also led their hosts. Philip embarked on the coast of Palestine on April 13, 1191. Richard, after encountering a storm, delayed, to avenge himself upon Isaac Comnenus, for his maltreatment of the English, by taking Cyprus, and arrived later. Both kings now stormed Acre; but nine bloody battles, hunger, pestilence, and other misfortunes, had carried off nearly 300,000 Christians. Many nobles, and Duke Frederick himself, fell by the plague. But, before his death, he founded the *Teutonic order of knights*, prompted by a desire to provide for the comfort of needy and sick German pilgrims to Palestine, who were mostly neglected by the Hospitallers and Templars. After the taking of Ptolemais, disunion stopped further progress. The haughtiness of Richard drove his confederates from him, so that he soon found himself alone in the field against Saladin. After various fierce encounters, this noble foe consented to a truce of three years. With the hope of completing the conquest of Palestine at some future time, Richard, after giving Cyprus to Guido, and dividing half the land of the island among his knights, started (1192) homeward, but was seized by Leopold of Austria, sold to Henry VI., and released only on the payment of an immense ransom (BARONIUS, *ad. ann.* 1193; MATTH. PARIS, *ad. ann.* 1195).

Subsequent crusades assumed an essentially different character. Youthful enthusiasm had subsided; the zeal of the people grew cold; the princes gave more heed to their private interests; the voyages to the East assumed a more commercial character, and did the Christians in Syria and Palestine more harm than good. Innocent III., however, had a new crusade preached by Foulk of Neuilly. A number of Italian dukes and counts obeyed the call. Foremost among them were Thibaut of Champagne, Simon de Montfort, Baldwin of Flanders, and Boniface of Montferrat. The assembled host amounted to 20,000 warriors. As this force was not thought sufficient for a land-march, a contract was made with Venice to convey the army by sea for 80,000 marks. The crafty Doge, Dandolo, sought to turn the embarrassment caused by the raising of this sum to his own advantage, by inducing the crusaders to further his designs upon Dalmatia. This accomplished, they also let themselves become involved in the revolution of the Greek empire. They took Constantinople, April 12, 1204, plundered the city, destroyed rich treasures of ancient literature and art, and founded a Latin feudal empire, of which Baldwin of Flanders was crowned the first emperor. Although Innocent deprecated the conquest, he availed himself of its results, claiming for Rome the appointment of the Patriarch of Constantinople (GEOFFROI DE VILLE-HARDOUIN, *Hist. de la conq. de Constant.*, 1198-1207). The new empire lasted only until 1261. Its establishment, however, afforded security to pilgrims on their land-route to Palestine. But it did not relieve

those already there. Innocent, therefore, proclaimed another crusade—the *crusade of children*. It was composed of crowds of youth of both sexes, whom no authority could fully control. Some of them went by land, and fell by hunger, disease, or the sword before they reached Constantinople. Others forced an embarkation from Italy, and either perished in the waves, or were seized by pirates, and sold as slaves to the infidels. Such catastrophies were calculated to disgust men with crusades. But the Popes still hoped to wrest Christian countries held by the infidels from the power of Islam, and re-establish the supremacy of Rome over the Greek Church. They really succeeded, in the fall of 1217, to get a new crusade into the Orient. Those who took part were mostly Hungarians, under Andrew II., and Germans, under Duke Leopold VII. of Austria, Duke Otto of Meran, the Archb. of Salzburg, and other spiritual and temporal lords. Many came also from Norway, Denmark, and Northern Germany, under Duke William of Holland, by way of the North Sea, taking Alcazor on their way; these did not reach Syria until the following year. Meanwhile, Andrew II., discovering the difficulties of the enterprise, returned home with some of his best soldiers. The other crusaders, however, under the avaricious Cardinal-legate Pelagius, joined by the three orders of knights and King John of Jerusalem, invaded Egypt, and, after severe struggles, took Damietta, Nov. 5, 1219. They then moved on to Cairo, but, being ignorant of the country, the overflowings of the Nile and the resistance of the Egyptians so harassed them, that they capitulated with the Sultan, and not only surrendered Damietta, but had to leave Egypt. In Europe, Frederick II. was blamed with these misfortunes. At his coronation, 1215, he had taken the cross, and had often subsequently renewed the vow. His marriage with Isolanthe, heiress to the kingdom of Jerusalem, increased his obligations. Still he continued to evade the call. At length Gregory IX. compelled him to move. Frederick embarked at Brundisium, Aug. 15, 1227, with a large army of princes and knights; but returned in three days, on account of real or feigned sickness. Gregory excommunicated him; but he, without waiting for absolution, started again in August for Palestine. There, instead of meeting confederates, he found that even Christians secretly and openly opposed him; tidings of his excommunication had been sent before him. He therefore concluded a ten years' truce with the Sultan of Egypt, and thus secured the restoration of the kingdom of Jerusalem. He entered the city in triumph, and put the crown upon his head with his own hands, ecclesiastics having refused to do it. Then he hastened back to Italy, to check the aggressions of the Pope upon his possessions there. Frederick could now assert that he had redeemed his vow, and served believers in the East even against their will. But Jerusalem was held by them only a short time beyond the truce. In 1240, Thibaut I. of Navarre and Richard Duke of Cornwall, with many French nobles, started upon another crusade, which also proved a failure. After Sultan Khamel's death, his younger son, *el Saleh*, succeeded him. About

the same time, the Moguls swept like a whirlwind over all Asia, laid waste the Islam states, and brought on the final overthrow of Christian rule in Palestine. This was effected by the Carizmians, who, flying before the Moguls, sent an army to Syria which joined that of the Sultan, routed the Christians at Gaza, and, in 1247, took Jerusalem, Gaza, Askelon, and Tiberias. This gave occasion to the last crusades. Louis IX. of France (*St. Louis*) led them, in compliance with a vow made during a dangerous sickness. His nobles hesitated; but at length, in Aug. 1248, arrangements were completed, and the King left France with a fleet, and reached Cyprus in safety. There he wintered. After due deliberation, he resolved to attack the Mohammedan power in Egypt. Damietta and Mansurah were rapidly taken. But, having imprudently pressed into the interior, the invaders suffered great losses. Louis himself had to surrender, with the flower of his knights, and then to pay 400,000 livres for liberation. He led his other troops to Syria, but, without accomplishing anything, returned home in 1254. But he still felt himself bound by his vow, and in old age made another appeal to the nobility of France. This time he first assailed *Tunis*, hoping to conquer and convert its king, Abu Abdallah. Instead of a willing proselyte, he found a wary foe. During a toilsome siege, many of his followers died of fever. Louis himself fell a prey to the ravager, Aug. 24, 1270. His son, Philip III., succeeded him, and forthwith raised the siege, Abdallah having made some important concessions, and returned to Europe. *St. Louis* was the last of the crusade heroes. The bloody conflicts for the Holy Land were ended. Religious enthusiasm yielded to more sensible or selfish considerations. After the fall of Antioch (1268) and Tripolis (1288), that of Ptolemais soon followed, May 18, 1291, with terrible slaughter. — But, although the proper original object of the crusades was not attained, they exerted a mighty influence upon European civilization. They once more brought the East and West into the closest contact, and started important movements in both continents. It is true, more than five millions of lives were lost, and for several ages papal despotism, superstition, and warlike and plundering propensities, were abetted; but there were many counterbalancing advantages. They effected a closer union between the nations of south-western Europe; prepared the way for independent national development; effected an increased unity in the state, inasmuch as the power of the king rose with the fall of the minor princes; promoted the influence of ordinary citizens, by opening the way for commerce, and the consequent accumulation and distribution of wealth; enlarged the horizon of human knowledge; inspired taste for the arts and the enjoyments of life; and, above all, released the people of that bondage of the mind and spirit by which they had been so long enthralled, and shed upon them the dawn of a higher and brighter destiny. The internal impediments to an advancing perfection of the life of the state were surmounted (*WACHLER, Lehrb. d. Gesch.* 255). But without dwelling upon these more general results, we shall briefly no-

tice those which specially concern *theology* and the *Church*. The first may be found in the *elevation of spiritual over temporal power*, in which they both originated and resulted. They were a practical acknowledgment of ecclesiastical supremacy, having, from the first, been under the control of the Popes, if not in person, through their *Legates*. The crusades also secured the *Pope's unlimited power over the clergy* (see *Legates*, and *Episcopi* in *p. inf.*), and became a *main source of the wealth of the Roman court, and its clergy in general*. They also kindled the spirit of religious intolerance, which so zealously resisted the sects of the *Cathari* and *Waldensians*, which sprang up during the same period. The crusades furthermore strengthened the power of the papacy by multiplying orders of monks and mendicant friars. Another result was that, mainly through the crusades, the Popes succeeded in completing the hierarchical edifice, of which Gregory VII. had laid the foundation, and in organizing the entire West into a political union, subject to the Church. But then, as a counterpart to this again, it must be noticed that the spread of popular knowledge, and the consolidation of the states respectively also led to the Reformation. The influence of the crusades upon scientific theology was mediate, and of less importance; still they led to the discovery and translation into Latin of several works of Aristotle, which incited the scholasticism and theology of the middle ages to more acute investigations.¹ KLIPPEL.*

Crusius, Chr. Augustus (b. at Leuna, Jan. 10, 1715), was, next to Buddeus (see Art.), the principal opponent of Wolfianism. After completing his academical course at Leipsic, he became prof. of philosophy (1744), of theology (1750), and primarius of theol. (1757), in that university. He acquired the reputation of an acute, independent thinker, and was a man of an upright, mild character. He wrote many theological works, practical and theoretical; the principal ones are, *Hypomnemata ad theol. prophetica*, 3 Thle. Lpz. 1764, &c. (the views of which have been partly revived by *Hengstenberg* and *Delitzsch*); the third part also separately; *Comm. in Jes. cur.* PEZOLD, 1779; *Moral Theol.*, 2 Thle. Lpz. 1772, &c. He died Oct. 18, 1775. (See *Delitzsch* and *Caspari's* bibl.-theol. u. apolog.-krit. Studien, I., Berlin, 1845. E. SCHWARZ.*

Crypto-Calvinism, the secret leaning to Calvin's view of the Lord's Supper, ascribed to the adherents of Melancthon—to those in particular who lived in the electorate of Saxony. The age in which we live may be said to have both

¹ Sources: ALBERTUS S. ALBERICUS AQUENSIS, *de passagio Godofr. de Bull.*, &c., libri XII., ed. Reiner Reinerus, Helmst. 1584, 4to; FULCHERIUS, *gesta peregrin. Francorum* (to 1124); WILHELMUS SYRII, *hist. rerum in part. transmarinis gest.*, libri XXIII.; JACOBI DE VITRIACO, *hist. Hierosol.* in JACOB BONGARS; *Gesta Dei per Francos*, &c., II. Tome, Hannov. 1611. — FR. WILKEN, *Gesch. d. Kreuzz.*, &c., 7 Bde.; J. MICHAUD, *Hist. of the Cr.*, transl. by Robson, 3 vol., New York, 1855; V. RAUMER'S *Gesch. d. Hohenstauffen*; LUDW. HAKEN, *Gemälde d. Kr.* &c., 3 Thle.; H. V. SYBEL, *Gesch. d. ersten Kr.*, 1841; MEEREN, *Versuch einer Entwicklung d. Folgen d. Kr.*, &c.; REGENBOGEN, *comment. de fructibus*, &c., &c., *perceperint e sacro be. lo*, Amst., 1809.

a practical and theoretical interest in the rise and progress of the controversy between Phillipism and Flaccianism. Practical, because the principles originally involved are still represented and defended in our day, and theoretical, because the latest investigations by *Heppe* present problems which can only be solved by a complete history of the age of the Reformation.

First of all, it must be confessed that, for a long time after the outbreak of the quarrel, and even after its termination, the Melanchthonian tendency in the Church had been acknowledged, and that the name, "Lutheran Church," was adopted at a later period. Prior to this, the distinction between the *invariata* and *variata* (1540 and 1542) *editio* of the *Confessio Augustana* had not been received, and in part not even known. Luther himself (*Gieseler*, 204) wrote, May 10, 1541, an apology for "Philip and ours" to the Electors, that they might not "worry themselves to death on account of the dear Confession, to which they still held fast, though all things else failed." And yet Art. 10, on the sacrament—and this was the point in dispute—*corpus et sanguis Christi vere adsunt, et distribuuntur vescentibus*, had been altered into *cum pane et vino vere exhibentur*—a change necessitated by the further development of Melanchthon's views, according to which the entire institution of the sacrament, and not simply bread and wine, constituted the channel of grace, and the *os fidei* alone, the organ for its reception. Notwithstanding this alteration, *Selnecker*, 1571, one of the opposite party, assures us that *recognita est aug. conf. posterior, relegente et approbante Luthero, ut vivi adhuc testes affirmant*. The *variata* was regarded as the *locus pletior, emendata, uberior, explicita, repetita* Augsburg Confession, as the "*confessio imperatori Carolo V., 1530, exhibita*," under the protection of which the Protestants were placed at the Passau conference, and at Augsburg, 1555. Its contents were sanctioned, March 1558, at the Frankford Recess, and, at the Naumburg Assembly of Princes (Jan. 20 to Feb. 8, 1561), the Elector Frederick of the Palatinate, having broached the relation of the two editions, it was declared that the emended confession had been presented to the Emperor at Worms (1541), as the common creed of the evangelical countries, and that it was not designed that the confession of 1530 should be construed into any abandonment of that of 1540. Luther, however, had expressed a very favorable opinion of Melanchthon's *loci theologici* (*Gieseler*, 208). The Art. of the Marburg Conf., 1529, the union acts between the German and Swiss Reformers, the Augsburg Conf.—Philipist in character—and Melanchthon's *tractatus de primatu et potestate papæ*, were officially subscribed at the Smalcaldic Assembly (*Studien und Krit.* III. 643), whilst, as late as 1570, Luther's Smalcaldic Art. were not generally and publicly acknowledged. No wonder that (*Planck*, V. 2, 536) the collection of MS. writings privately made and published by Ernst Vögelin in Leipzig, should, under the title *corpus doctrinæ misnicum*, have obtained an official distinction, which was confirmed by the patronage of the Elector.

Though M. was regarded as "the learned

authority," the people and princes still held fast to Luther, and to M. only as long as no quarrel existed between them. Up to this time, though there had been some differences between them, they were true friends. Calvin, too, bore in his hands the olive branch of peace. Of Melanchthon he wrote, 1539, *de ipso nihil dubito, quin penitus nobiscum sentiat*; and, in 1557, *Ego, si temere comperior Philippi nomine abusus, nullas ignominiae rotas recuso. Solum quod dixi et quidem centies, si opus sit, confirmo, non magis a me Philippum quam a propriis visceribus in hac causa posse divelli*; and of Luther that, though he might call him a devil, he still would honor him as a servant of Christ, whilst L. could write, *spero quidem ipsum olim de nobis melius sensurum, sed æquum est a bono ingenio nos aliquid ferre*; and Calvin, again: *id et vidit Lutherus et probavit vehementer 1545, quo tempore testimoniis fide dignissimorum hominum constat eum in hæc verba erupisse; non inepte judicat iste scriptor. Atque ego quidem quæ mea sunt (vitia) agnosco; Helvetii si idem, facerent et sua quoque serio agnoscerent, et retractarent, jam pax esset in hac controversia* (see *Ebrard*, *Doct. of Holy Comm.*).

Ecclesiastical war soon broke out. In Calvin's letter of 1539, we read Melanchthon's acknowledgement, that in the opposite party were some *qui crassius aliquid requirant*, and in 1537, *Scio me quædam minus horride dicere de prædestinatione, de assensu voluntatis, de necessitate obedientiæ nostræ, de peccato mortali. De his omnibus scio re ipsa Lutherum sentire eadem, sed ineruditi quædam ejus πορτικώτερα dicta, cum non videant quo pertineant, nimium amant. Fruantur suo judicio. Mihi tamen concedunt homini peripatetico amanti mediocritatem, minus stoice alicubi loqui. He, whom "nunquam placuit hæc violenta et hostilis digladiatio inter Lutherum et Zwinglium," who, as early as 1525, was afraid that the controversies on the Supper in *intricatas, obscuras, et profundas quæstiones ac rixas conjectos animos a conspectu doctrinæ necessariæ tunquam turbine quodam auferri*, who could say, "*non aliam ab causam me unquam τειδεολογησάνας nisi ut vitam emendarem*," and "*ego non delector inanibus disputationibus, nec quæro subtilitates in ullo genere doctrinarum, sed quæro realia et quæ utilia sunt in omni vita*"—this man, after having made the acquaintance of the Swiss Reformers, who modified his views, felt bound thus to proclaim his doctrine: *ego posui in usu sacramentalem præsentiam et dixi datis his rebus Christum vere adesse et efficacem esse. Id profecto satis est. Nec addidi inclusionem aut conjunctionem. Sacramenta pacta sunt, ut rebus sumtis adsit aliud*. He now laid chief stress on the substantial presence of Christ in the administration of the Lord's Supper (*cum pane et vino not in, sub et cum*), the indwelling of the whole Christ (*integrum et vivum Christum adesse, 'caveamus, ne ita astruamus divinitatem hominis Christi,' ut veritatem corporis auferamus*), and must have regarded the Lutheran view of the visible symbols as a *ἀπολαρπεία*, and the question *de physica conjunctione panis et corporis* as unnecessary. As his object was not to gain a triumph over the strictly Lutheran view, but to obtain toleration for his own theory, he for a*

long time remained silent. The adherents of the former suspected him of "secret Calvinism;" most conspicuous among whom were the theologians in Jena, Flaccius at their head; later John Wigand, Joh. Fred. Cölestin, Timothy Kirchner, 1568, and particularly the fanatical Tilemann Hesshus, 1569. Princes like the noble Duke Christopher of Würtemberg († Dec. 28, 1568), Landgrave Philip of Hesse († March 3, 1567), and his successor, William, in vain sought to reconcile the contending parties. At the Conference in Worms, Sept. 1557, where the Jesuits and the Flaccians prevented a union, the ecclesiastical fight began in good earnest. In the Palatinate, under the patronage of Frederick III., the Melanchthonian view gained the ascendent. Brentius, who, in his church at Würtemberg, had hitherto advocated it, went over to the Lutheran party, and, before the synod at Stuttgart, Dec. 19, 1559, vindicated the strictly Lutheran doctrine. He made the presence of Christ depend upon his being seated at the right hand of God, in virtue of which, as man, he effected everything in a heavenly manner; and, though good Lutheran theologians, as Chemnitz and Selnekker, based it upon the fact that Christ could be where he willed to be, or upon consubstantiation, the mode of his presence now became the apple of discord. Melanchthon († April 19, 1560) lived long enough to protest against the new doctrine of ubiquity; his followers fanned the flame by a direct attempt to abolish the Lutheran dogma. An absolute rupture, however, between the two parties had not yet taken place. The peace which Duke Christopher effected at the Naumberg Assemb., Jan. 1561, by the adoption of the Augsburg Conf., without reference to its separate editions, was soon broken. The pious Elector Frederick III. of the Palatinate, worn out by the obstinacy of Frederick of Saxony and John of Brandenburg,—who, dissatisfied with the *variata*, demanded an alteration in the preface of the Conf.,—and intent on preserving religious peace in his own dominions, organized the church on the Melanchthonian basis, and adopted the Heidelberg Catechism, 1562,¹ as embodying Melanch. and not Calvinism. For this, at the Diet of Augsburg, March to May, 1566, he was to be expelled from the society of the Evangelicals. So honorably did he bear himself, that Augustus of Saxony exclaimed, "Fritz, you have more piety than we all." In fact, Augustus himself now faithfully followed the teachings of his theologians, who opposed not the Lutheran creed, as such, but only the ubiquity-theory of Würtemberg, and the pugnacity of Flaccius. Indeed, so conciliatory was the course of the Wittenbergers at Dresden Conf., 1562, and at the one held later, from Oct. 7–10, 1571, that Selnekker affirmed there was nothing more to be feared, as the sacramental quarrel had now been adjusted. Re-opened by the Elector's physician, Peucer, who openly opposed his position, Augustus cut off the Lutheran zealots, on the ground of the *corpus misnicum*, and, after the style of the *Allenburg* Conf., 1568, declared that he would hold fast to the *corpus*

doctrinæ, and regard everything but that as Flaccian, dangerous error, which was to be avoided and condemned. He purified the University of Jena, expelled Hesshus and Wigand, removed the superintendent, Rosinus, from Weimar, and all the adherents of Flaccius. Thus originated, with the beginning of 1571, the *Wittenberg Catechism*, Philipistic in character (*de cæna; credentibus, not vescentibus*), in which was urged against the theory of ubiquity, Acts 3: 21, *oportet Christum cælo capi*; and against the zealots of Lower Saxony, the fact that Luther, in his Latin translation of the New Test., made use of "*cælo suscipi*." Thus everything seemed to conspire in favor of the Philipists.

Their hopes, however, were unexpectedly frustrated. In 1574 appeared an anonymous treatise, on French paper, and with a Genevese inscription, "*Exegesis perspicua et ferme integra controversiæ de sacra cæna, scripta ut privatim conscientias piorum erudiat et subicitur iudicio sociorum confessionis augustanæ, quicunque candide et sine privatis affectibus iudicaturi sunt*" (for a closer analysis see *Heppe*, II. 468). It was composed of three parts, the first of which advocated the Melanchth. view of the unity of Christ's person; the second, the altered edition of Art. 10 of the Augsburg Conf., whilst it condemned the Lutheran doctrine of consubstantiation; the third discussed the way in which a concord pleasing to God could be established. Whilst Luther's name was honorably mentioned, his authority was subordinated to that of M.; nothing was said touching Calvin and his predestination theory. This book soon gained circulation in Leipzig and Wittenberg, and Vögelin, who printed the *corpus misnicum*, announced himself the publisher. On the authority of Planck and Löscher's *historia motuum*, it was generally believed that two Wittenberg theologians, Christopher Petzel and Esrom Rüdiger, were the authors; but the investigations of *Heppe* have clearly shown that these had nothing to do, either with the composition or the publication of the book; but that it was written by the Silesian physician, Joachim Cureus (died Jan. 21, 1573), and was never designed to be made public. The printer of it, having obtained a copy, and unwilling to bring upon himself and the Wittenbergers any suspicion, published it as anonymous. The book stirred up the old controversy. Its opponents succeeded in discovering a conspiracy between the theologians and courtiers on the one hand, and the Palatiners on the other, for the establishment of the German Reformed Church in the country, and certain disparaging remarks touching the person of the Elector, and his blind reverence for the name of Luther. The Elector, exasperated beyond measure, imprisoned Cracov, Peucer, Stössel, and Schütz, the leaders of this movement, examined their papers, and instituted a criminal process. At the Synod of Torgau, May, 1574, he had a confession of faith drawn up, and presented to the Wittenberg theologians for subscription. The aged Major put his name to it; Wiedebram, Cruciger, Petzel, and Möller refused their assent. These four were imprisoned in a small room, and, at the end of five days, conducted by a guard of soldiers to the Pleisenburg, in Leipzig. At the

¹ A different view of the Heidelberg Cat., by Sudhoff (see Art.).

end of 14 days, they subscribed, but with reservations: On their return to Wittenberg, they were deprived of office and banished. Stössel died in prison, and Cracov from the effects of torture, 1575; Peucer and Shütz, at the end of twelve years, obtained their freedom.

Thus fell Philipism in Lower Saxony, and with it the Melanchthonian tendency in the German evangelical Church. For an account of its temporary triumph in 1586, and its bloody downfall, 1592, see Art. *Crell*. (NIEDNER, *Gesch. d. chr. Kirche*, 669; LINDNER, *K.-gesch.* III. 1, 183-6; GIESELER, *Eccl. Hist.*; WALCH, *bibl. theolog.* II. 375, &c.; PLANCK, *prot. Lehrbegriff*, &c., V. 2, 411-633; HEPPE, *Gesch. d. deutsch. Prot. in d. Jahren 1555-81*, I. 1852; II. 1853; *Stud. u. Krit.* 1855; EBRARD, *Dogma v. heil. Abendm.*, &c., II.; GASZ, *Gesch. d. prot. Dogmatik*, 1854.) C. BECK. — *Ermentrout*.

Crypts, Cryptæ, *κρυπταί*, among the Greeks and Romans, were subterranean corridors and grottos; also covered passages at the house; and, in Christian authors, designates the *subterranean vaulted graves*, which, from the end of the 5th cent., were styled *catacumbæ* or *catatumbæ*. In the ages of persecution, natural caves, abandoned stone quarries, tophus and sand mines were used by the early Christians as *latibula martyrum*, *κοιμητήρια*, or *dormitoria*, for the dead (comp. Art. *Catacombs*). The general belief that the Apostles Peter and Paul had been buried in the crypt of St. Sebastian, in Rome, invested it with special glory, whilst that in Nola, where was honored the tomb of the Presbyter Felix (died in the 3d cent.) obtained great distinction in the 4th and 5th centuries. In order to accommodate the vast multitude of pilgrims who, on festival days, visited the crypts to satisfy their devotion, they were enlarged by means of passages and halls; above them churches were built, and underneath, over the graves of martyrs, the Lord's Supper was celebrated. These churches were frequently called *Cæmeterium*, and the crypts where confession of sin preceded the communion, the Confession. In the period ranging between the 4th and 8th cent., the C. were adorned with pictures, mosaics, and precious stones, and remained the central point of the tombs that encircled the grave of the martyr. Thus originated many ancient basilicas, the oldest parts of which are their subterranean stories.

It soon became customary for each church to have the grave of a martyr, whose bones were deposited in a small subterranean chapel, which was also called *crypta* (whence the German *Gruft*), *confessio* or *testimonium memoria* — *testimonium*, because these bones testified to the consecration and name of the church, and *memoria*, because of the remembrance of the martyr.

In the course of time, German genius applied to the basilica the "Romanic" style of architecture, introduced the nave, enlarged and elevated the choir, so that a number of steps led up to it (in the cathedral of Brandenburg, 22). This induced the construction of larger crypts, the roofs of which, composed of vaulted crosses, were supported by rows of pillars. Sometimes a second crypt was built, an addition very sel-

dom made to the Italian basilicas. The crusades over, which must have powerfully excited in the minds of the Germans the necessity for such martyr-churches, and the German genius having passed through its first youth, the elevated choirs and crypts disappeared, and were superseded by another order of architecture, which built the cathedrals of Cologne, Freiburg, and Vienna. (Comp. *Bellermann* on the oldest Christ. tombs, p. 7, 12; *Kugler's Manual of Hist. of Art*, p. 330, 431, 540; *Otto*, *Archæol. of Church-Art*. 2 edit. p. 5.) H. MERZ. — *Ermentrout*.

Cudbert, or *Cuthbert* (Bishop of Lindisfarne; not to be confounded with Bede's pupil of the same name, abbot of Yarrow); distinguished, in the 7th century, for all Christian virtues, and for the gift of miracles and prophecy. His life was written first by a lay brother in Lindisfarne; afterwards at large (by the aid of this biography and of oral tradition) by Bede, in poetry and prose, who gives an abstract of this work in his *Church History*, IV. 27-32.

Cudbert was of humble family; in his boyhood remarkably indifferent to the sports of youth; and impelled towards monastic life by appearances of angels to him while a shepherd, aided, no doubt, by the influence of a pious widow, who was a mother to him from his eighth year. In 651, he entered the monastery of Mailros, then under the care of the excellent Abbot Eata, but particularly attractive to Cudbert for its eminently holy *præpositus*, Boisil, who became his instructor in the Scriptures, and his model. Here the pupil so emulated his master that, in a few years, when Eata, at King Alfred's order, founded the monastery of Inrhyppum (now Ripon), he made Cudbert its *PRÆPOSITUS HOSPITUM*. When the plague, in 661, carried Boisil away from Mailros, Cudbert, who was himself brought to the brink of the grave, became his successor, and not only trod in his steps as *præpositus*, but made it his special object to traverse the whole region around, and dispel by his preaching the darkness of superstition. Some years later, Eata, become abbot of Lindisfarne, transferred Cudbert thither as *præpositus*, to reform that cloister in the Roman spirit; and here, by his mildness and decision, he won the monks to his views. He had long shown a great predilection for hermit life. He often withdrew for days together, for prayer and religious exercises, and, at last, chose the small island of Farne, near Lindisfarne, for his residence. The fame of his holiness attracted multitudes from far and near; and, on Eata's death, in 684, he was unanimously elected Bishop of Lindisfarne, by king and council. Prevailed on to accept this office only by the most urgent entreaties, he resigned it after two years, spent as formerly in unwearied labors, particularly in preaching within his diocese, and went back to Farne, where he soon sickened, and, on March 20, 687, died. His remains were deposited in Lindisfarne, and are said to have been found eleven years after undecayed. His distinguished piety afterwards placed him among the saints.

C. SCHÜLL. — *E. D. Yeomans*.

Cudworth, one of the most eminent English philosophers and theologians of the 17th century. He lived when Romish and Puritan

principles were in most violent conflict, when Presbyterianism, Independency, and Episcopacy were successively ascendent, but when Christian theology was greatly disturbed by Deism. Without entering into the external controversies, he became the champion of revealed truth, and the leading advocate of the Platonizing philosophy then flourishing in Cambridge, in opposition to Deism; and took a conciliatory position between the Church parties.

Ralph Cudworth was born in 1617, in Aller, Somersetshire, where his father was rector; came, in 1630, to Cambridge, which became his second home; and pursued his studies in Emanuel College, where, soon after graduating, he became fellow and tutor. In his tutorship he met with unexampled success. In 1641 he was presented to the parish of North Cadbury, Somersetshire; and, in the following year, published his discourse on "The true Notion of the Lord's Supper;" advocating the idea of an *epulum ex oblatis*, against the Romish idea of an *oblatio sacrificii*. Soon after appeared his treatise, "The union of Christ and the Church in a Shadow." In 1644 he took the degree of B. D., and was appointed master of Clare Hall, and the year after Regius professor of Hebrew. In 1647 he preached before the House of Commons on a public fast day, a discourse for which he received the special thanks of the House. In 1651, he received the degree of D. D., and was, three years after, elected master of Christ's College. At this time he married. In 1657 he was one of those who were consulted by Parliament about the English translation of the Bible. At the restoration of Charles II., he addressed a congratulatory Latin poem to the king. In 1672, he was presented by the Bishop of London to the vicarage of Ashwell; and, in 1678, became prebendary of Gloucester; and then published his celebrated work, "The Intellectual System of the Universe" — an imperishable monument of his learning and intellectual power. This work provoked attacks from various and even opposite quarters. Even those whose cause he aimed to defend, considered him so fair and moderate in stating and explaining the errors he combated, that he almost betrayed his own cause. The work was translated into Latin by Mosheim, in 1733, and a second edition in 1773. He also added valuable notes and discussions. Cudworth died June 26, 1688, and was buried in the chapel of Christ's College. It was not till after his death that the importance of this, his chief work, was duly understood. He considered Deism as destructive, not only of Christianity, but of all religion; and, therefore, brought forward against deistical fatalism, the principle of freedom and personality. The foundation of his "True System of the Universe" consists in these three ideas: the personality of God; morality imminent in God; and human freedom. His other works were a "Treatise concerning eternal and immutable Morality;" "Discourse on moral Good and Evil;" "On Liberty and Necessity;" "On Free Will;" "On Daniel's prophecy of the 70 weeks;" "On the verity of the Christian religion;" "On the creation of the World, and immortality of the Soul;" "Hebrew

Learning;" and "An explanation of Hobbes' notion of God, and of the extension of Spirits."

Cudworth was not a pure Platonist. In metaphysics, indeed, he followed Plato and the Neoplatonists, but in the philosophy of nature, the Atomists, and in that of religion, Herbert. His theological position was partly determined by his philosophy, partly by the state of religion in his time. He took only the Sabellian view of the Trinity, and rejected absolute predestination as decidedly destructive of morality. He asserted the necessity of revealed religion, but perceived, also, a divine illumination in philosophy. With decided preference for the Anglican Church, he rendered to other religious communions their due. He took the middle ground between High Church and Independency; holding, with the one, the authority of a Church constitution, and established forms of worship; with the other, the necessity of inward illumination, and an orderly life. His moderate views procured for him and his adherents the name of *Latitudinarians*. He was a man of extraordinary learning, keen discrimination, and profound penetration; at home in literature, in antiquities, in philosophy, and in mathematics. His style is often obscure and tedious; in his sermons rhetorical, with frequent quotations in Latin and Greek. With his vast erudition, he was deservedly esteemed for his piety, and his mild and retiring disposition.

C. SCHÖLL. — E. D. Yeomans.

Culdees. A word of Celtic origin, meaning, probably, "servants of God" (*celle-de, keledai*, Latinized *colidei*, English, *Culdees*). The name may have been early used of the Celtic monks, but does not occur with certainty till the 12th century, in the form of *colidei*, in Gerald of Cambria, who puts the word with *cœlibes* and *cœlicolæ*. The same name is written *kelledai* in the Scottish cartularies. It afterwards came to be applied to secular priests, and continued in use in some quarters till the 17th century.

About the Culdees there are many conjectures. Some have supposed them to have been a Christian fraternity, adulterated with elements of Celtic paganism; or a primitive monastic order, derived from Egypt. Some influence of Druidism on the formation of Celtic Christianity cannot be denied; but we have no authority for it; and we can look no further for the Culdees than to the Celtic clergy, who, after the suppression of the ancient British and Scottish Church by the Roman in the middle ages, continued to distinguish themselves by that name. Yet we may properly glance here at the history of the Celtic Church in general; since this name has become current for the early Britons and Scots, and since their history best explains the later phenomena.

The Celtic Church consisted of three branches: the British, the Irish-Scottish, and the Albanian-Scottish. The *British* branch embraced the Romanized Britons, and flourished in the 6th century in Wales. Gildas and Bede afford materials for a correct picture of this age. The central institution was the monastery of Bangor, in Caernarvon, which, at the time of the conference on religion between Augustine and the

Britons, numbered over 2000 monks, living by their own labor, and devoted to pious exercises and scientific pursuits. The abbot, Dinooth, seems to have held a position in that conference (603) which puts Bangor on a level with Hii. Yet, besides him, seven bishops are mentioned as taking part in the council. Whether these had definite dioceses at that early period cannot be certainly determined; but there are indications that they had; and it is known, in general, that the organization of the Church in Wales was at that time tolerably well developed. The monasteries and nunneries drew not only from the lower classes, but even from the princely ranks; and secularization and corruption already appeared among the priests. The difference between the Roman and the British Church came out in the above conference of 603; but really amounted to nothing; the most important points being a reckoning of Easter, which had formerly been usual in Rome itself, and a variation in the mode of baptism. Yet Augustine's arrogance repelled the Britons, and the hatred between Britons and Saxons allowed no ecclesiastical fellowship. The British Church received a fatal blow in the massacre of monks in Caerligion (Chester) in 613; and in the twelfth century only its ruins were to be seen.

The first success of Roman influences in Britain was the introduction of the Roman Easter by Elbodugus, Bishop of Guenedotia, in 768. A century later Wales submitted to King Alfred, who drew Asser, Abbot or Bishop of St. David's, to his court, and took that prelate's church under his protection, against the frequent depredations of neighboring chiefs. Of course this brought the British Church more or less under the influence of the Anglo-Saxon. Yet the suppression of the former was very gradual. Though Wales had, by the 12th century, become almost wholly Catholic, monks of the old school were still existing at the end of that century on the island of Enbli or Burdsey. Even in the city of York, which had been longest under the Anglo-Saxon power, King Athelstan, on his return from Scotland in 936, found in St. Peter's church "*viros sanctæ vitæ et conversationis honestæ, dictos ad tunc Colideos*," devoting themselves to the support of the poor. The king granted them certain tithes, called "*Peter-corne*," to aid their labor of love; and, in 1036, they founded a hospital on some crown land, given for the purpose, and transferred their revenues to it. Whether they continued as a body after this, cannot be told.

Far more important is the *Irish-Scottish* branch of the Celtic Church. But the primitive history of the Scottish Church is very obscure. Its flourishing period begins with the second half of the 6th century, with the missions of Columba, Columban, Gallus, &c. Ireland had then many dioceses and monasteries, which cherished learning and culture. What Bangor was for Wales, that was Benchuir, or Bangor, for the north of Ireland, Dearmach for the south. Rome sought to exert her influence on the Irish Church, and, in the matter of the date of Easter, succeeded. But, for the most part, the Irish steadfastly clung to their traditional institutions and faith, and their Church

flourished until the 9th century, when the Danish invasions and incessant civil wars induced a decline, from which she never recovered. After an interval of entire obscurity, she re-appeared in history in the middle of the 11th century; and appears then, at least to some extent, under the authority of the Archbishop of Canterbury, through the Norman settlers in the south-east, who had probably come converts from England. But the decisive step towards the subjection of the Irish Church was taken by Gregory VII., who asserted his supremacy as successor of Peter, in a letter to the Irish, in 1085, and appointed Gilbert of Limerick the first legate for Ireland. Gilbert, aided by his friend Anselm, had considerable, but only partial, success in instructing the Irish clergy in the *ecclesiastica officia*, and procuring reform of abuses from the king. Finally, Malachias, Archbishop of Armagh, a friend of Bernard of Clairvaux, yielded himself a willing instrument of Rome. In 1152, Ireland was divided into four Archbishoprics and twenty-eight episcopal sees. Adrian IV. confirmed the papal authority there by allowing King Henry II. to conquer the island; and when the Irish princes did homage, in 1172, ecclesiastical affairs were settled on the Roman basis. Yet the new system did not come very rapidly into play; "*Caelcolæ vel Culidei*" were found by Girald on the two islands of a sea in North Munster; and even in Usher's time, *Colidei*, with a prior, were the choristers in the cathedral of Armagh; showing, indeed, the continued existence of the Culdees, yet their subordinate place.

The *Albanian Scottish* branch proceeded directly from the Irish Church. It was planted by Columba (see *Art.*) in 563, in the country of the Albanian Scots and Picts; and extended, through King Oswald, to Northumbria, where the virtues of the Celtic Church for the first thirty years shine more brightly than anywhere else. The Scottish monks labored in apostolic simplicity and self-denial for the spread of the Gospel and of learning, and for the relief of suffering, even beyond the limits of Northumbria, till the lamentable Easter controversy, in 664, destroyed their beneficent influence in the Anglo-Saxon countries, and limited it to the Celts in the North. After this time, the Romans succeeded gradually in inducing among the Scots some conformity to their own institutions; and, after the middle of the eighth century, the history of the Scottish Church becomes very obscure.

The Celtic Church, however, seems to have preserved its identity tolerably well down to the middle of the 11th century. The strife between Canterbury and York respecting the ordination of Turgot, who was chosen Bishop by a national council of Scotland in 1107, under Alexander I., is the first certain trace of the aggression of the Roman Church on the Scottish. Turgot was consecrated by York; but on his death, in 1115, Alexander applied to Ralph of Canterbury, who proposed and consecrated his monk Eadmer Bishop of St. Andrew's. This was a heavy blow on the Celtic Church. The introduction of the Norman-Roman forms and of Roman monastic orders rapidly followed, under Alexander, and espe-

cially under his successor, David I. (1124-53). The Culdees were gradually, in various ways, suppressed. Although they were still tolerated by the side of the Roman clergy, in the vain hope of Romanizing them, in 1308 their last retreat at Brechin was subjected to the see of St. Andrews. Thenceforth they were persecuted as heretics.

The Celts had a simple Bible Christianity. Their great work was the study of the Scriptures; in which they employed the more important commentaries of the fathers, and especially the older Latin translations, though with constant reference to the Greek text, and with the practical object of bringing their life into harmony with the sacred precepts; and Bede, the zealous opponent of the Celtic Church, can present to his contemporaries no higher example of Christian temperance, humility, self-denial, and unwearied missionary zeal than that of the Scottish monks. This deeply Christian spirit explains their predilection for monastic life, missionary labors, and pilgrimages. Their monastic discipline was of the most self-denying kind in all respects. The abbots set their monks a good example, both in suffering and in acting; and the respect they enjoyed with the great may be seen in the lives of Columba, Aidan, Columban, and Adamnan.

Of course, certain cloisters held a pre-eminent rank; Bangor in Wales, Bangor in Ulster, Hii in Scotland. The latter institution certainly stood at the head of the whole Albanian Scottish Church. An abbot-presbyter, with a college of elders, presided over the whole Church, and consecrated its priests and Bishops. But this furnishes no precedent, as some have supposed, either for Episcopacy or Presbyterianism. The Celtic Church certainly had its different orders of clergy, but laid not so much stress as the Roman Church on the distinctions among them. Each church seems to have had a Bishop; and the Bishops, who were at the same time monks, were dependent on their cloister, most of them being secular clergy, and hence under no vow of celibacy. The marriage of priests continued in the Celtic Church to her end.

In worship, the British branch followed the Gallic Church in her liturgy, as in her Episcopal system; but neither the Irish Scottish nor the Albanian Scottish seems to have had a fixed liturgy. In baptism they used no consecrated oil, and hardly exorcism; and did not confine the administration of the ordinance to churches. It was administered only by priests, and to children as well as adults. Whether the holy Supper was given always under both kinds can hardly be determined; it was celebrated every Sunday at Hii. Marriage was not considered a sacrament. A bishop could be ordained by one. Of festivals, Christmas, Quadragesima, Easter, and Pentecost, and the anniversaries of the founding of cloisters were certainly observed. They reckoned Easter according to the eighty-four years' cycle, and fixed Easter Sunday between the 14th and 20th day of the moon.

In doctrine, the Celts cannot have deviated from the primitive Church; for Bede himself never reproaches them with heresy, but testifies to their agreement with his own Church in hold-

ing the redemption of man by the passion, resurrection, and ascension of Christ, the Mediator between God and man. In other points they differed from Rome. They are variously accused of Pelagianism, Universalism, peculiar views of predestination, &c. But from such scattered statements as we have, mostly by enemies, we can hardly form a true judgment. Certainly nothing appears among the Celtic Christians which does not somehow show itself in other portions of the ancient Church. They are distinguished from other branches of the early Church by having preserved the simplicity, moral earnestness, love for the Scriptures, and missionary zeal of the apostolic Church longer than the rest.

Sources: Bede; Usher's Works; Dalrymple's Collections; Columban's and Adamnan's Works; J. W. Braun: *De Culdeis* comm. 1840, the author regrets to say was not at his hand.

C. SCHÖLL. — E. D. Yeomans.

Cumani (*Comani*), a nation of the Asiatic steppes, whose hordes, as early as the 11th cent., laid waste Hungary and the adjacent countries. By their bold and skilful archery, and rapid movements upon their small horses, they filled Europe with terror. After being repulsed with heavy loss by King Salomon (1070), St. Ladislaus (1089) gained a decided victory over them, and gave them the choice between servitude and Christianity. Those who chose the latter had Jazigia assigned as their home. The rest resumed hostilities, which were decided by a single combat between Ladislaus and the Cumani chief, Akos, in which Akos fell. Under Andrew II., Robert, Archb. of Gran, labored for the conversion of the C., and a bishopric was founded for them. In 1238, they sent an embassy to Bela IV., reporting that they had been defeated by the Moguls, and asking for a home in Hungary. Bela consented, and dispatched a mission to convert them; 40,000 Cumani families moved to Hungary. The C. were still a half-barbarous people, and committed many acts of violence in their new abode. Bela sought to subdue them by mildness. This failing, it was determined to scatter them over several districts. As the C. opposed this plan, it was but partially carried out. They found a special friend in Ladislaus IV., the son of a Cumani woman, who appointed some of them to the first offices of his kingdom. Meanwhile, further efforts were made to convert them; Nicholas III. induced many Minorites to enter the thorny field. Philip, B. of Fermo, sent as papal Legate to Hungary, was wholly occupied with them. He finally persuaded Ladislaus IV. to enact laws (June, 1279), requiring all the C. to be baptized, receive the sacraments, cast away their idols, and all idolatrous customs, receive religious instruction, substitute fixed houses for tents, form into congregations, restore what they had stolen from churches and cloisters, liberate all Christian slaves, &c., &c. Two chiefs, Uzuc and Tolon, pledged compliance, only reserving some unimportant customs. An abode was assigned to them between the Danube and the Theiss, with the reservation of Church property. Ladislaus made oath that, if mild measures now failed, he would subject them to Christian laws by force. But the beauty

of the Cumani women prevailed against his oath. Nicholas IV. then incited a crusade in Hungary against the C., but this also failed. Ladislaus himself was assassinated (July 9–10, 1290). The C. long continued to oppose Christian efforts to convert them. Even in the 14th cent., the Popes requested Hungarian Minorites to make new attempts. These did not succeed until their nationality was absorbed by the people among whom they dwelt. Their descendants still live in Cumania. (Cf. MAILATH, *Gesch. d. Magyaren* I.; DAMBERGER, *synchron. Gesch. d. K. u. d. Welt in Mittelalter*, XI.) TH. PRESSEL.*

Cummean, Cumean, Comean. According to ancient manuscripts, a native Irishman, author of a penitential work, which has of late been critically edited and printed in Wasserschleben's *Sammlung der Bussordn. d. abendl. Kirche*, p. 460–493. Some suppose him to have lived before, others to have been contemporary with, Theodore of Canterbury (68–690). Fragments of his work, largely scattered through later collections, under the title of *judicia Cumeani*, show that he lived before Bede and Egbert, at latest in the beginning of the 8th cent. Wasserschleben refers to a Bishop of this name, who went from Ireland to Italy, and ruled the monastery of Lobbio, in the name of King Liutprand. Here, at all events not in Ireland, the penitential book was composed. The work begins with a preface: *Incipit de diversis criminibus. Diversitas culparum diversitatem facit penitenti-
arum, etc.*, and contains fourteen chapters, the several propositions of which could be almost all traced by Wasserschleben to known sources. It circulated widely in the Frank empire and in Italy, and has been frequently employed since, both in the compilation of penitential books, and in the pre-Gratian collections of canons.

MERKEL. — E. D. Yeomans.

Cunibert, Bishop of Cologne in the 7th century; born in the province of Mosel, of noble parentage (Krallo and Regina); educated in Treves; consecrated Bishop of Cologne (as is supposed) Sept. 25, 623; died about 663. One of the earliest instances of the sons of the German nobility devoting themselves to the service of the Church, that, adding the higher spiritual dignity to the secular, they might secure the greater scope of political efficiency. The desired opportunity for this offered itself to Cunibert in 630, at the court of the Merovingian Dagobert I., and in 633, at the court of his minor son, the Austrasian King, Sigebert III., where, with Pepin, he conducted an energetic administration, though one which impaired the kingly power itself. In 656, he retired into his bishopric, but, in 658, assumed the direction of Childeric II. He was subsequently canonized, and the 12th of November celebrated as his day. (See *Binterim*, *Erzdio. Cöln*, I. p. 60. *Retberg*, *K.-G. Deutschl.*, I. p. 296, 302, 535, 543.)

WAGENMANN. — E. D. Yeomans.

Canigunda, St., daughter of Sigfried, first Count of Luxemburg, and wife of Duke Henry of Bavaria, with whom she was crowned (1014) as Queen of the Germans, by Benedict VIII. She had, before marriage, made a vow of perpetual virginity, with Henry's consent, who formed a corresponding resolution. Having

been subsequently suspected of infidelity by her husband, she proved her innocence by walking unharmed over glowing ploughshares. She certainly never had children. Henry died in 1024. C. retired to a convent, took the veil, and spent the rest of her life in acts of devotion. She died March 3, 1040. Innocent canonized her in 1200. Her anniversary is March 3. (See *Butler's Lives of the Fathers*, III. 344–48.) — Another C., canonized 1690 (anniv. July 24) was the daughter of Bela IV., of Hungary. She died 1292.

TH. PRESSEL.*

Curatus, the incumbent of a *beneficium curatum*; i. e., an office involving the pastoral care of a given district (see *Benefice*). The term would apply, therefore, in its general sense, to all pastors; but it was originally appropriated, in the Roman Church, to the assistants and vicars of pastors, who were appointed to a perpetual curacy by the Bishops. In collegiate churches they were called curate-chaplains. The name does not occur in this strict sense till the 15th century; but the term *beneficium curatum* was in use a century before (c. 11, *extrav. comm. de prae. 3, 2*). From the earliest times, there was an officer representing the Bishop in the cathedrals (*vicarius curatus*; see *Vicar*); but when the old parishes were transferred to the cloisters and other foundations, or united with prebends, the curates soon became numerous and respectable. After the peace of Westphalia, the institutions with which the cures were connected were mostly abolished, though the cures, as independent benefices, remained as before.

MERKEL. — E. D. Yeomans.

Cureus, Joachim, (born in Freistadt, Silesia, 1532), was the author of the work on the Eucharist, which appeared in 1574; on account of which, the Elector Augustus, of Saxony, charging the authorship upon his counsellors and theologians, who held Melancthonian sentiments, caused them to be deposed and banished. This work was republished, at Marburg, in 1853–54.

HENKE. — E. D. Yeomans.

Cusanus, Nicholas Chryppfs (Krebs), best known as *N. de Cusa* or *Cusanus*, was born in Cues, in 1401. At the University of Padua the LL.D. was conferred upon him in 1424. But finding theology more congenial, he abandoned the practice of law, and became an ecclesiastic. In 1430 he was dean of St. Florin, Coblenz, then became provost at Minster-Maynfeld, and then Archdean, and protonator at Liege. As such he attended the Basel Assembly, and distinguished himself by vindicating the Eccl. Supremacy of General Councils. In his *de Cathol. Concordantia* (*Opp. Bas. ed.*, II., 683, &c.), he contends that the Papal dignity is not bound to the Romish chair, but that only he is Peter's successor whom the regularly assembled representatives of the Church elect; that Constantine's grant is apocryphal; and that temporal princes are independent of the Popes in all matters not concerning faith. Subsequently he changed his views, and at the German diets of 1440–42, as the legate of Eugene IV., defended the claims of the Pope as zealously as he had before opposed them. (See *Summa dictorum N. de Cusa*, &c., in WÜRDTEIN, *Subsid. diplom.*, IX., 1). Whatever caused this change, whilst

it was long an apple of discord between Antiochus and Ptolemy. These strifes effected the downfall of the smaller princes, and Ptolemy became the sole ruler (Dion. XIX., 59, 79; XX., 21, 47). The island continued under the Egyptians until the Romans united it to their empire (STRABO XIV., 684, &c.). At the division of the Roman empire, C. fell to the Greek Emperor, and was placed under governors. At the time of the crusade of Richard, the Lion-hearted, Cyprus was under an Emperor Isaac, related to the house of Comnenus, who had usurped independent sovereignty, and whom Richard drove off, putting two governors in his place (WILKEN, Hist. of the Crusades, IV., 197-216). It subsequently became a separate kingdom, held by Guy Lusignan in fief for the English crown. In 1473 the Venetians got possession of it. From them it was taken by the Turks, 1571, who have since then held it. — The Kittim of Gen. 10:4, and Chittim of Is. 23:1, &c., are primarily the inhabitants of Citium, then of the whole island (see also 2 Macc. 4:29; 10:13; 12:2). Cyprians are named in Acts 4:36; 21:16. The first preachers of the gospel to the Greeks were Cyprians and Cyrenians (Acts 11:20). Paul and Barnabas visited Cyprus (13:4), then Barnabas and Mark (15:39). In the N. T. Salamis (Acts 13:5) and Paphos (13:6, 7, 13) are named as cities of Cyprus. — Upon ancient C., see MEURSI, op. posth. de antiq. rebusque insul. Rhodi, &c.: Amstel., 1675, 4to. CELLAR., Notit. orb. ant. II., 266, &c. MANNERT, Geogr. d. Griechen u. Römer VI., 1. p. 546, &c. Upon modern C.: POCOCKE; HASSEL, Erdbeschr. XIII., 170, &c.; BLANC, Manual, &c., 1849, III., 167, &c.). ARNOLD.*

Cyrene, the capital of upper Lybia, hence called *L. Cyrenica* (POMP., *Mel.* I., 4, 8; PLIN., V., 5; AMMIAN., XXII., 16). The city is mentioned 1 Macc. 15:23; Acts 11:20. Cyrenian Jews are named, Acts 2:10; 6:9. Lucius, a Cyrenian, is spoken of in Acts 13:1, and another, Simon, in Matt. 27:32, &c. ARNOLD.*

Cyril, of Alexandria, born in A. at the close of the 4th cent. After spending some time as monk in the Nitrian desert, he succeeded his uncle and instructor, Theophilus, to the patriarchate of Alexandria, 412, as the 24th (traditional) successor of the Evangelist Mark. He followed in the footsteps of his predecessors in ruthlessly persecuting all errorists, especially the Nestorians, (see Art.) He was also implicated in the murder of the philosophic-heatheeness Hypatia. For his arbitrary arrogance at the Council of Ephesus (431), he, and Memnon, B. of Ephesus, were deposed by an imperial decree: but he subsequently became reconciled with John. His most meritorious work is a vindication of Christianity against Julian, in 10 books. As a homilist he indulged freely in allegory and typology. His homilies were mostly written as festival programmes. Mariolatry is very prominent in them. His thoughts are often brilliant, but the style loose and otherwise defective. He died, 444. Among his doctrinal writings were those upon the Trinity, Incarnation, and the worship of God in Spirit and Truth (19 books), against the anthropomorphites. — (Sources: RENAUDOT, *hist. Patriarch.*

Alexandr. Jacobitar.: Par., 1713, 4to.; CAYE, *Script. eccl. hist.*, I., 391-2; OUDIN, *Comm. de Script. eccl.*, I., 1007; SCHRÖCKH, *K.-Gesch.*, XVIII., 313, &c.; AUBERT's ed. of C.'s works: Par., 1638, 7 vols. fol.). HAGENBACH.*

Cyril, of Jerusalem. — It is not certain whether he was born (215) in Jerusalem. In 350 he became B. of Jer., after having been presbyter and catechete there. His *κατηχησεις* are not properly catechetical exercises, but 23 sermons, delivered in the Church of the Resurrection, probably during Lent, 348, partly to the unbaptized catechumens, partly to the neophytes. The last five sermons (*υποταγῶναι κατηχησεις*) treat of the mysteries of baptism, unction, and Holy Supper. Their genuineness has been doubted. But they possess archæological and liturgical, as well as homiletic value. Although inflated, diffuse, and illogical, they contain many practical thoughts, and are remarkably free from controversy, considering C.'s participation in the Arian (he was semi-Arian) strife. At the Synod of Seleucia, 359, he withstood Acacius, and aided in his deposeure. Thereupon the Acacians deposed C. at the Synod of Constantinople, 360. But after the death of Constantius, he regained his See. Under the Arian Valens he was once more expelled, 367. It is not known where he abode until Valens' death, 378. It is certain that he finally adopted the Nicene orthodoxy. In 381 he represented the orthodox party at Constantinople. † 386. — (Sources: SOCR. H. E.; SOZOM. H. E.; THEODORET, H. E.; TOUTTÉE, *Diss. Cyrill. s.*, &c.; DU PIN, II., 134, &c.; TILLEMONT, *Memoires* VIII., 1358; SCHRÖCKH, *K.-G.* XII., 369, &c.; AUGUSTI, *Donkw.* IV.; ERSCH u. GRUBER, *Encycl.*, XXII., 148. The best ed. of C.'s works: A. TOUTTÉE, Par., 1720, fol.; and Ven., 1763). HAGENBACH.*

Cyril and Methodius, Apostles of the Slavonians. The history of these men is still involved in darkness. The most current account of them is based upon the probably genuine letters of Pope John VIII., and the contemporaneous *Translatio S. Clementis*; although this account has been modified by Bohemian and Moravian influences. The complaints of the Salzburg and Passau clergy against the infringements upon their diocese, are the most reliable documents. But, according to these, and Pannonian, Bulgarian, and Russian legends, the chief labors of C. and M. were not in Moravia, but among the Southern Slavonians, along the Drave and Save, as far as Dalmatia on the S., and beyond the Raab and Danube, to the Carpathian mt. on the N. — The sources of their history, among which the Byzantine are missed, are collected in *Scharfrik's Slav. Antiq.*, II., 471, &c., completed by *Wattenbach's Beitr. z. Gesch. d. chr. K. in Mähren u. Böhmen*. Wien, 1849; the *Bollandists, acta Sanct. Mart.*, II., 14, &c.; *Assemani, Kalend. eccl. universæ* III.; *Dobrowsky, C. u. M. d. Sl. Apost.*: Prag., 1823; *Mährische Legende v. C. u. M.*: Prag., 1826; *Blumberger, Wiener Jahrb.*, 1824, 1827; *Palacky, böhm. Gesch.*, &c.; *Philaret, C. u. M., &c.* (deutsch), Mitau, 1847.

In the 6th, and especially the 8th cent., the Slavonians crossed the Danube and Mt. Balkan into Macedonia, Epirus, Thessalia, Hellas, and

Peloponnessus, and took almost exclusive possession of those countries. They were subdued and Christianized about the close of the 8th cent. The work spread from Thessalonica, where Greek culture received a new impulse by the introduction of Slavonian elements. C. and M. were born in Thessalonica, in the 2d or 3d decade of the 9th cent. C. early displayed extraordinary talents, and was taken to Constantinople, where his literary attainments attracted notice, won the favor of Photius, and secured success as a teacher of philosophy. Thenceforth he was surnamed the Philosopher. But his pious zeal soon became ascendant. He joined the clergy, and, with his brother M., renounced the highest political honors and withdrew into a secluded monastery. He also took part in doctrinal disputes. He contended with Photius about the unity or dualism of the soul, defended the use of images, and wrote apologies for Christianity, against the Mohammedans. The inroads of the latter led him to undertake his mission. The Jews and Mohammedans attempted to convert the Chazars, a Tartar tribe, inhabiting the country on the N. E. of the Black Sea to the lower Volga. The Chazars had some intercourse with the Byzantians, and from them had probably learned something of Christianity. Some private Christians may have sought to convert them; but they failed to win the confidence of the Chazars, and that very party which desired union with Greece, wished to obtain such advocates of the Greek Church as would be qualified to contend with Jews and Moslem. Hence they applied (960) to Michael III., who sent Constantine (Cyrill) to them. C. first went to Chersonesus, and prepared himself for the mission by learning the necessary languages. Whilst there he secured possession of the reputed relics of Clement of Rome, which he then, or at least on his return, took with him. He proceeded to the country of the Chazars, and under the protection of the prince, the Chagan, preached and disputed in favor of Christianity. Many were converted, but there is no trace of a Greek or native Church organization among the Chazars; and it is certain that most of the tribe became Moslem or Jews, many of the latter having, long afterwards, filled the office of Chagan. Constantine obtained the liberation of many captive Greeks, and returned with them and Clement's relics to Constantinople, and lived in retirement with his brother M., until another tribe applied for a missionary to the Emperor. Among the Slavonian Bulgarians and S. Slavonians, missionaries had long been laboring. They had gone from different places, and pursued their work in various ways. The Romish C. was also represented by emissaries of German Bishops, whose sees extended towards Corinthia, Carniola, and Pannonia. But those tribes felt disinclined towards the Byzantine and German national Churches, because they associated them with the idea of political subjection. They desired a native form of Christianity, and a native hierarchy, which should be subject to Constantinople or Rome only in cases of ultimate appeal. The Slavonians were most naturally directed to the Greek C., which was especially entrusted with the conversion of the Slavonian population

of the empire, was, indeed, zealously engaged in this work, and seemed best suited for it. The Byzantine empire also excited less fear than the western Frankish states. The Greeks could often prosecute the mission as it was done among the Chazars, by free instruction of the people, and then leaving converts to organize in their own way. Constantine's (Cyrill's) method seems to have best pleased those tribes who were jealous of their independence. And on his return home, he again prepared himself to resume his work, and became the head of such as took interest in the true conversion of the Slavonians. There were many opportunities for learning the Slavonian language in the Greek empire. C. and M. may, in their youth, have met with a Græcised Slavonian family. C. studied the language, and sought to operate upon the Slavi by writings. For this purpose he used an alphabet, which was either a modified old one, or newly invented by him. He thus laid the basis of a Slavonian literature, by translating the Bible and the principal liturgical books. He was induced to commence his mission among the Slavi beyond the Greek empire, by an invitation of Radislav (the same, probably, whom the Germans called Rastices, the founder of a large Moravian empire). Radislav maintained his independence of the German rulers. He desired also to keep his Christianized tribes independent of the German national Church, especially those living within the sees of Passau and Salzburg. Hence he applied to Constantinople for such missionaries as had preached to the Chazars. Accordingly, C. and M. went forth. They hardly passed around the Bulgarians; but if they went through Bulgaria, they doubtless participated in their conversion, and laid the groundwork of their future influence upon that people. They reached Radislav's court about 863, which was probably S. W. of the present Moravia. They were honorably received, and began their labors by gathering a male circle of pupils around them, whom they hoped to train as native priests. They also preached, circulated their Slavonian version of the Scriptures, and commenced religious services in the native tongue. There soon sprang up a zealous Slavonian Church. The German priests, content with receiving tithes and reading the Latin liturgy, which they scarcely understood themselves, were soon deserted, and returned to their Bishops. Meanwhile, Rome and Constantinople strove with each other for ascendancy in Bulgaria, and we can easily conceive why Nicholas I., hearing of the success of C. and M. in Pannonia, should endeavor to prevent a departure there from the doctrine, liturgy, and order of the hierarchy. Hence he invited the brothers to Rome. They respected his claims, and adopted his and Radislav's idea, of re-establishing the old Pannonian see, to be independent of Constantinople and the German Bishops. They may also have cherished special reverence for Nicholas, who had displayed much love and wisdom in Bulgarian affairs. C., moreover, seems to have felt an enthusiastic regard for Rome. He and M. were about four years with Radislav and other Pannonian princes. In 868 they went, accompanied by many pupils, to Italy. They

attracted great attention. In Rome, Hadrian II. had succeeded Nicholas († Nov. 13, 867). He received the apostles of the Slavi with marks of honor, and took measures to organize the new Church province. C. and M. were to be the Bishops, and their pupils the priests. But C.'s strength was failing, and he desired to spend his last days in Rome. It was here that, as monk, he adopted the name *Cyrill*, by which he is commonly known. He died Feb. 14, 869.

Methodius now gave verbal and written pledges of fidelity to the doctrines and regulations of Rome, was made Archb. of the Pannonian diocese, and returned to his field. The restoration of this diocese necessarily affected the metropolitans of Passau and Salzburg. Hence, in 871, a memorial appeared, setting forth the claims of Salzburg, and asking for their protection. But King Ludwig and Duke Swatopluk (Radislav's successor) paid no heed to the appeal, and at Rome the pretensions of Salzburg were disowned. But the complaints against M. as Archb. made an impression on Pope John VIII., who was averse to all the Greek and Slavonian peculiarities of the new province, and resolved to abrogate them. Accordingly, he directed Paul of Ancona to require M. to drop the Slavonian mass. M. refused, and thus gave his enemies advantage over him at Rome. Swatopluk, who was favorable to the Germans, became his accuser. John summoned M. to Rome. M. forthwith complied, fully acquitted himself, and convinced John that, if the Slavonian Church should be kept from falling over to the Patriarch of Constantinople, it must be left untouched. Moreover, Rome's simultaneous attempts to regain Bulgaria would have been frustrated by offending the Pannonian Slavi. John likewise saw that, in this case, his own interests differed from those of the German Church. Thus M. prevailed. Swatopluk was informed by a papal letter that M. was found in harmony with the doctrines, &c., of the Rom. C. and general councils. It was only required that the Gospel should first be read in Latin, then in Slavonian, and that, if the Duke and his court desired it, the mass should be said in Latin. M.'s archiepiscopal powers were confirmed, and even extended. With this letter, M. left Rome in 880, accompanied by *Wichin*, a German, who had been consecrated as his suffragan. Wichin, soon after their return, joined the enemies of M. and of the Slavonian Church. He misled Swatopluk by forged papal letters. S. applied to John VIII. for counsel, who replied that he had not written to Wichin, and promised to have the matter duly attended to. John VIII. died in Dec. 882, and thus M.'s main prop was broken. Wichin openly opposed M., and Swatopluk let himself be drawn into the same course. M. was compelled to excommunicate and banish them and their adherents. A letter, ascribed to Stephen VI., of about 890, upon these distractions, was evidently a forgery of Wichin, or the German party. The documents which report M.'s doings in Olmütz and Brünn are also doubtful. Probably M.'s diocese did not extend to the present Moravia, and he may never have visited it. So of some other traditions. The date of his death is differently given. We follow the

Pannonian legend, which fixes it on April 16, 885. He was buried in the cathedral of his episcopal residence—the place unknown. He appointed Gorasd, a Slavonian, his successor. But the Germans were resolved to exterminate the hated Slavonian Church. Gorasd had to yield to Wichin. All the Slavonian priests were persecuted and driven off. They found a refuge among the Bulgarians, taking their Bible and liturgy with them. The Russians obtained these treasures from the Bulgarians. The two brothers are held in grateful veneration for their labors, especially by the Russians. And, after many Popes had pronounced them heretics, and the Slavonian Churches in Hungary had been laid waste by the Magyars, to the joy of the Romans and Germans, even the Romish C. acknowledges them as saints. A. VOGEL.*

Cyrus, *שִׁירָא*, *Kūros*, on coins *Qurus* (= the sun, according to Ctes., 49; PLUT., *Artax. c. 1*. Compare the modern Persian *Khur*, *Khurshid*. LASSEN questions the preceding derivation. That from *κύριος* [Ælian, Hesychius, &c.] is certainly wrong), is the name of the man who has generally been considered¹ the founder of the Persian monarchy, and the deliverer of the Jews from the Babylonian captivity.—For our knowledge of Cyrus we are indebted mainly to Herod., Ctesias, Xenophon, to some notices in Strabo, Diod. Sic., Plut., Alex. Polyhist., Cl. Ptolem., Thallus, Castor, Polybius, Joseph., the Iranian book of Heroes, Shah-Nameh of Firdusia, and the references to him in the O. T. canon, and apocr. books. The accounts of Herod., Xen., and Ctesias materially vary. Which shall we credit? The story of Astyages' dream, reported by Herod., is well known. Ctesias says nothing of Cyrus being related to Astyages, but forthwith tells of his attack upon Media, his dethronement of Astyages, his marriage with Amytis, A.'s daughter, and his appointment of A. as governor of the Barcanians. Xenophon, finally, says nothing of contentions between Cyrus and Astyages, but describes A. as the maternal grandfather of Cyrus, relates that C. resided from his twelfth year at the Median court, in his sixteenth led out an army against the Assyrians, &c., and having conquered Croesus and the Babylonians, received the daughter of *Cyaxares* in marriage, and thus acquired the right of succession to the Median throne, which he ascended after Cyaxares' death, 536, B. C.

Of far greater value than these conflicting accounts, and the brief hints found in other authors above named are the following chronological dates. According to Diod. Sic., Thallus, Castor, and Polybius (*cf. EUSEB. præp. evang. X., 10, p. 488*), began to reign in the 1st year

¹ Since 1845 this has been disputed by three men: 1) *Duke George*, of Manchester, in his learned work, *The Times of Daniel*; 2) Prof. *Ebrard*, in the *Heidelb. Stud. u. Krit.*, 1847; and 3) *Wetake*, in his less weighty book, "Cyrus d. Gründer d. pers. Reichs war nicht d. Befreier d. Juden," &c. 1849. Their aim and hope has been to effect a reconciliation of the discrepancies between the chronology of the Bible and that of profane history. But whilst failing in this, they involve both systems in greater confusion. Their arguments have been answered in the *Theol. Stud. u. Krit.*, 1853, 3d Heft.

of the 55th Olymp., i. e., 4154 or 4155 *per. Jul.*, or 559 B. C. This is corroborated by an eclipse of the moon, which, according to Ptol., occurred in the 7th year of Cambyses, and is fixed by all astronomers and chronologists, in 4191 *per. Jul.*, or 523, B. C.; so that Cambyses began to reign 529, B. C., 30 years after his father ascended the throne. The time of Nabopolassar (= Labynetus I., of Herod., and father of Nebuchadn. or Labyn. II.) is also fixed by an eclipse of the moon, about 66 years earlier, the eclipse having occurred in N.'s 5th year, and being assigned by most astronomers to 4093, *per. Jul.*, or 621, B. C. The calculation of the *Canon Ptolem.*, according to the improved ed. which *Calvisius* and *Bengel* used, gives the following dates:

	B. C.
Nabopolassar reigned.....	625 — 604
Nabocolasser (= Nebuchadn.)....	604 — 561
Ilvarodame (= Evilmerodach)....	561 — 559
Niricassolasser.....	559 — 555
Noboned (= Belshassar).....	555 — 538
Cyrus.....	538 — 529
Cambyses.....	529 — 521
Darius I.....	521 — 486
Xerxes.....	486 — 465
Artaxerxes.....	465 — 424
Darius II.....	424 — 405

But what does the O. T. tell us of Cyrus? There seem to be both chronological and personal discrepancies between its statements and profane accounts. As to the former, it is probable they can never be reconciled. But what of this? That the O. T. Cyrus was the great *Persian King*, and that this king *was no Chaldean*, is too plain from the O. T. to allow of our being disturbed by those trivial difficulties. The O. T. books describe Cyrus: 1) as a *Persian*, Dan. 6 : 28, and God's rod against the Chaldeans and Babylonians, Is. 48 : 14;—2) as *the King of Persia*, 2 Chron. 36 : 22; Ezra 1 : 1, &c.; Dan. 10 : 1, 3;—3) as a general of *Darius*, Dan. 5 : 31, whom he succeeds to the throne;—4) as king of *Media* and *Babylon* (not Bab. and Media)

Ezra 5 : 13, 17; 6 : 2, 3;—5) as a *conqueror*, and the founder of a *universal monarchy*, Is. 45 : 1–3, 14;—6) as the *fourth monarch* before Xerxes, Dan. 11 : 2;—7) as *overthrowing* the Bab. dynasty and Chald. idolatry, Is. 46 : 1; 48 : 14; Dan. 2 : 39; 8 : 3, 4, 20;—8) as having become a *worshipper of the true God*, 2 Chron. 36 : 23; Ezra 1 : 2;—9) as the *liberator of the Jews*, &c., Is. 44 : 28; 45 : 13; 2 Chron. 36 : 23; Ezra 5 : 13; 6 : 3, &c.;—10) as God's *shepherd* and *anointed*, Is. 44 : 28; 45 : 1, whose spirit the *Lord stirred up*, 2 Chron. 36 : 22, 23, &c.—From the Scriptures we also learn that Cyrus received his favorable religious impressions: 1) from Daniel's part in the fall of the Babylonian kingdom (Dan. 5 : 28, 30). It was no wonder that the man who fulfilled such prophecies should cherish regard for the prophet; 2) from Daniel's position and heroic piety at the court of Darius (Dan. 6); 3) from the contrast presented to him between the vanity of idolatry and the excellence of Daniel's faith (Bel and the Dragon. v. 17). See also *Jos. Ant.*, 11, 1, 2.

That the profane accounts of Cyrus fall short of the delineation of Isaiah and Daniel, cannot surprise us if we remember: 1) that those moments in the life of a great man in which his noblest qualities are exhibited, are most rarely known to his cotemporaries and posterity; 2) that the most exalted men are often prevented from communicating their best gifts to their fellowmen, by the popular incapacity for them, or unwillingness to receive them; 3) that Greek historians would not appreciate the new religious impressions made on C.'s mind; 4) that a universal conqueror like C., who sought (cf. *Xen. VIII.*, 1, 23) to unite his monarchy by a religious bond, and combine all the religious influences of his kingdom in the order of the Magi, and thus reconcile the contradictions of the frontier Asiatic cultus in the native worship of fire as the material embodiment of light, would also find the religion of Jehovah, as he learned it from Daniel, *essential to his plans*.

PRESSER.*

D.

Daeh, Simon, an exceedingly fertile poet of the 17th cent., was born at Memel, July 29, 1605, a year earlier than Paul Gerhardt. He belonged to the renowned Königsberg school of poets, and constituted its brightest ornament. His contributions to religious poetry, and hymnology are full of pathos, and excited general admiration, and entitle him to rank with his cotemporary, the devout and genial Gerhart. No complete ed. of his poems has ever appeared. A chief source for his hymns (and those of his associated friends) may be found in *HEINR. ALBERT'S "Arien,"* &c.: Königsb., 1638–50, fol. 8 Thle. (See *Pischon*, *Denkm.* III., 161. *HENNEBERGER'S Jahrb. für deutsche Literaturgesch.* Meiningen., 1854).

Cosack.*

D'Achery, Lucas, contributed largely to the literary fame of the congregation of the Maurinites, and personifies its twofold character of ardent monastic piety, and persevering literary labors. He spent nearly his whole life in monastic retirement. He was b. in 1609, in St Quentin, Picardy, early joined the Benedictines, and on Oct. 24, 1632, took vows in the abbey of the Holy Trinity, Vendome, which belonged to the congregation of St. Maurus. He soon displayed extraordinary zeal in his devotions and literary studies. His superiors called him to the central cloister of the congregation, St. Germain des Pres, in Paris, and made him principal of the library. He arranged catalogues and enlarged it. He acquired a great knowledge of

books, and of the entire literature of theology and history. His attention, however, was chiefly given to the collection, printing, and publishing of rare and hidden MSS., and he soon gathered the treasures of most of the Benedictine abbeys of France and adjacent countries. He cheerfully loaned his MSS. to others, and maintained an extensive correspondence with other scholars. But for 45 years he scarcely ever left his cloister. He superintended the publ. of Hugo Menard's first ed. of the Ep. of Barnabas (Paris, 1645, 4to). He next publ. the collected works of Laffranc of Canterbury, adding some sketches of saints and other tracts (Par. 1648, fol.). Then he issued a list of old ascetic writings (Par. 1648, 4to.); the first ed. of all the works of Abbot Guibert of Nogent, &c. (Par. 1651, fol.); a rule for Anchorets, by Grimlaicus, a priest of the 9th cent. (Par. 1653). The rapid accumulation of MSS. compelled him to publ. his *Veterum aliquot scriptorum, qui in Galliae Bibliothecis, maxime Benedictorum, supersunt, Spicilegium*, 13 vol. 4to., Par. 1655-1677, of which *De la Barre* publ. a new ed., with the addition of many MSS. subsequently discovered by Baluze and Martene, Par. 1724, 3 vols. fol. Finally, he contributed the material of the *Acta Sanct. ord. S. Benedicti*, which Mabillon published in his own name. He died, after a protracted illness, April 29, 1685. (See Du Pin's *Bibl. d. auteurs eccl.*, XVIII. 1445; Nicéron's *Nachrichten*, &c., publ. by Rambach, XVI. 73-79.) A. VOGEL.*

Dagon, a god of the Philistines (Judges 16 : 23, &c.; 1 Sam. 5 : 1, &c.; cf. 1 Macc. 10 : 83). Gaza and Ashdod are mentioned as places where he was worshipped, and where he had temples, priests, feasts, and images, until the times of the Maccabees. Jerome, on Is. 46 : 1, names those and other cities of Philistia, as seats of the Dagon cultus. From the passages above quoted, we gather that he was a chief god of the Philistines, that their princes participated in his feasts, and worshipped him. To him they ascribed their national prosperity. And the existence of places with his name, Beth Dagon (Joshua, 15 : 41; 19 : 27), and Caphar Dagon, mentioned by Eusebius, shows how widely his worship was anciently extended. According to Philo of Biblos, p. 26, Dagon belonged to the gods of the first rank in the land.

According to the physical idea which lies at the basis of this divinity, Dagon, like Atergatis (see Art.), was a fish-god. The simplest and only correct etymology of his name proves this. The etymology of *Philo* and the *Lex. græc. nom. hebr.* in Jerome, Tom. II. 202, $\bar{\text{ד}}\bar{\text{ג}}\bar{\text{ו}}\bar{\text{ן}}$ = barley,

is erroneous. It is, indeed, approved by Beier in Selden, 289, Orelli in Philo, and Movers in Ersch, Phönix. 405, b., who compare Dagon with Ζεύς ἀρότριος or ἀρούραιος , the superintendent of agriculture. But it appears from 1 Sam. 5 : 4, that Dagon, like Atergatis, was represented with the tail of a fish and the bust and hands of a man. If, in this passage, $\bar{\text{ד}}\bar{\text{ג}}\bar{\text{ו}}\bar{\text{ן}}$ is in apposition to the head and hands, it must designate the fish-body of the idol, as even Kimchi saw, who translates: *tantummodo forma piscis relicta est in eo*. Kimchi immediately refers to an ancient tradition: *Ajunt, Dagoni infra ab umbilico suo*

fuisse formam piscis, propterea vocatur Dagon, et supra ab umbilico suo formam hominis, quemadmodum dicitur etc. (cf. Beier, 299). Abarbanel, also, says: *Dixerunt sapientes, Dagonem habuisse formam piscis ab umbilico qua superiora, et qua manus et pedes humanum*. But Dagon must not be identified with Atergatis. The former is a male, the latter a female deity (cf. 1 Sam. 5 : 3, 4, both the Hebrew and the LXX.). He is spoken of as male in a myth in Philo, 28, which assigns a wife to him. And the son of Atergatis, Ichthus (= a fish), can have been none other than Dagon (see ATHENÆUS, VIII., 346). It is true that fish-deities, like doves, are the usual symbols of female fecundity. But the fish is also a symbol of water, and hence of all those vivifying powers of nature which, in warm climates, are chiefly brought into operation by means of water. And the gods which pour these fructifying streams upon the thirsty earth, are usually regarded as males, like the cloud-gathering, rain-causing Zeus. How such gods came to be styled fish-deities, is explained in the Art. Atergatis. And this expansion of the signification of the fish-symbol explains how such a god as Dagon might also be regarded as a god of agriculture. (See SELDEN, *de Diis Syris*, II. 3; WINER's *Lexicon*.) J. G. MÜLLER.*

Daillé, John, one of the most learned Reformed theologians of the 17th cent. was b. in 1594, at Chatellerant. From 1612, for seven years, he enjoyed the company of Du Plessis-Mornay, in Saumur, as teacher of his nephew. In this capacity he travelled through Italy, Switzerland, Germany, Holland, and England. After two years' absence from his native country he returned, resumed his studies, and, in 1623, was ordained. For a while he labored as preacher at the castle of Mornay, arranged the memoirs which the latter left behind, and, in 1625, was appointed preacher in Saumur. But in 1626, already, he was called to the congregation in Paris, where he labored with great distinction, as a preacher and an author, until his death, in 1670. His work, *De usu patrum in decidendis controversiis*, Genev. 1656, is especially prized. It appeared in French as early as 1631, entitled *De l'employ des pères*, &c. An English translation of this (attributed to Thos. Smith, M. A. of Christ's College, Cambridge) was issued in 1651. A revised American ed. of this has been publ. by the Presb. Board of Publ., Philad. 1842. Daillé dates the corruption of the Christian Church from the 4th cent. — He occupied the post of president of the last national French Reformed Synod, at Loudun, 1659. As such, he labored to quell the excitement raised against Amyrant (see Art.), and vindicated him against the charge of Universalism, in an *Apolo-gie des Synodes d'Alençon et de Charenton*, the mildness of which towards the condemned doctrine was especially disapproved in Holland. The sermons of D. have been issued in several volumes. — His only son, Horace, died as a religious refugee in Heidegger's house, Zurich. (See BAYLE, Art. *Daillé*.) HERZOG.*

Damascus is one of the most ancient and important cities of Syria. In the O. T., the name is given in three different forms (see 1 Chron. 18 : 5, 6; 2 K. 16 : 10, &c.); in the N. T., simply

Δαμασκός. The Syrians call it *Darmsûk*; the Arabs *Dimasckk* or *es-Scham* (the name of the country). The etymology of the word is obscure. To say nothing of earlier derivations (comp. *STEPH. Byzant. ed. Westermann*, p. 97; *MICHAEL. Suppl. ad Lex. Hebr.* II. 455, sq.), among modern scholars, *Simonis* derives it from

דָּמָא and דָּמָא = to be red, in reference to the color of the earth around D. *Gesenius* traces it to its Arabic name = *properavit, strenuus fuit*, referring to its commercial activity (*Thesaur.*, 346); although Arab etymologists refer the signification of the name to the rapid building up of the city (see *SHULTEN's Jud. geogr.*; *LEX. GEOGR.*, ed. *Juynboll*, I., 409). *Hitzig* (see *Ztschr. d. deutsch. morgenl. Gesellsch.*, VIII., 219, &c.), even traces the name to the Sanscrit *tām-āksha* = *red-eyed*, with reference to the god Dionysus, whom he identifies with King Damascus, the founder (*JUSTIN. XXXVI.*, 2) of the city. The antiquity of the city may be inferred from *Gen. 14:15; 15:2*. From *Gen. 15:2* some concluded that it was built by Abraham or Eliezer (*D'HERBELOT, Bibl. Orient.*). We find the first reliable notices of the city in *2 Sam. 8:5, 6; 1 Chron. 18:5, 6; 2 Sam. 10:6, &c.; 1 Kings 11:23, &c.; 15:18, 19; 2 Chron. 16:2-7; 1 Kings 20:1-34; 22:1, &c.*, in connection with accounts of hostilities between the Kings of Judah, and Israel, and those of Damascus (see *Aram, David, Ahab, Ahaz, Hazael, Rezin*). — After the battle of Issus, Damascus fell into the hands of Alexander M. (*ARRIAN. II.*, 15; *CURT. III.*, 12, 13), and then was attached to Seleuc.-Syrian empire (see *1 Macc. 11:62; 12:32*. Cf. *ERSCH & GRUBER, Encycl. Th.*, 22, Abth. 2, p. 114). Pompey reduced Syria to a Roman province (B.C. 64). Herod the Great erected baths and theatres in D. (*Jos. B. J.*, I., 21, 12). Paul was converted on his way to D. (*Acts 9*), and subsequently its governor (see *Aretas*) sought to apprehend him (*2 Cor. 11:32*). After its conquest by Alexander numerous Jews settled there, and had several synagogues (*Jos. B. J.*, I., 2, 25; II., 20, 2; *Acts 9:2*); many early embraced the gospel (comp. *Acts 8:1; 11:19*). Subsequently D. became the seat of a Christian Bishop (*ASSEMANI, Bibl. Orient.*, II., &c.). The city was taken from the Christians by the Moslem under the Caliph Omar (*ABULFED. Annal. I.*, 222; *ELMACIN.*, 21); they still hold it. At first it belonged to the Caliphate, but it was rent from that by Achmed ben Tulun, 877. Subsequently it stood successively under the Ikshidite, Fatimide, and Seljuk dynasties, until Hulaku put an end to the rule of the Seljuks, 1260. In 1516 Selim I. took the city from the Mamelukes, and incorporated it with the Turkish empire (see *HAMMER, Gesch. d. Osman. Reichs*, II., 481, &c.). — Damascus lies on the eastern base of Antilibanus, in a well-watered (*2 Kings 5:12*) fertile plain, the beauty of which led Orientals to call it one of the four terrestrial paradises. Of the streams which water it from the adjacent mountain, the *Barada*, has been identified with the Abana, and the El-Fidsche with the Pharpar of *2 Kings 5:12*. But the El-Fidsche is rather a strong and beautiful fountain, which, after a short course flows into

the Barada (see *KITTO, Journal VIII.*, July, 1853; *BIBLIOTH. SACRA*, 1848, p. 763). According to *Robinson and Thompson (Bibl. Sacra*, 1849, 366-71) and *Porter (KITTO, l. c.)*, it seems clear that the Pharpar is the present A'wadsch, which rises in Mt. Dschebel Heisch (Hermon), flows south of Damascus, and, without touching the city, is the principal stream in its vicinity. It enters the Barada near the sea. The Barada (called *Chrysorrhoas*, by *STRABO*, XVI., 520; *PLIN. V.*, 18(16); *PTOL. V.*, 15; but by *STEPHAN., Byz.*, and *Δαμασκός, Βαρδίνης*) rises in the elevated plains of Zebedâni, in Antilibanus, is swollen by many tributaries, and enters the plain of Damascus near the village of Dummar. From this point it supplies a number of canals dug for the irrigation of the plain, and which render it exceedingly luxuriant in vegetation, but also generate fevers. It empties into a small lake, the Boheiret el-Merdach, about 15 miles E. of Damascus.—The city itself is one of the most regular and cleanly of Oriental capitals, and contains about 109,000 inhabitants, viz. 75,000 Mohammedans and Druses, 14,000 Christians, 5000 Jews, and 15,000 foreigners, &c. The houses are externally mean, but magnificent within. The streets are narrow and long (one running from N. E. to S. W. is thought that named in *Acts 9:11*). Among its public buildings the splendid mosque of Caliph Walid ben 'Abd el-Malik (formerly a church dedicated to John the Baptist) is most prominent (see *HAMMER, l. c.*, 484). The castle in the western part of the city is said, by Richter, to have been built during the crusades. Damascus, also, has its sacred localities. About 1½ miles E. of the city the place is shown where Paul was converted. In the city the houses of Judas and Simon (*Acts 9:11, 17, &c.*), and the window from which Paul escaped (*2 Cor. 11:33*) are pointed out. The reputed house of Naaman has been converted into a hospital for lepers. (Sources: *ABULFEDA, geogr. ed. Reinaud*, p. 252; *The Travels of EBN JUBAIR ed. Wright*, 262-301; *Ztschr. d. Deutsch. Miss. Gesellsch.* VIII., 346; *VITRINGA, Comm. in Jes. I.*, 652-4; *Pococke*, II., 171; *TROILO, Orient. Reisebeschr.*, 575, &c.; *RICHTER, Wallfahrt. im Morgenl.*, 138; *ROSEN-MÜLLER, Bibl. Alterth.*, I., 2, p. 284; *ERSCH u. GRUBER, l. c.*)

ARNOLD.*

Damasus, Popes. I.—Born 306, probably in Rome, was Archdeacon of the Church in Rome from 355-366, and then became B. of Rome. The opposition between himself and the Deacon Ursicinus, though decided in favor of D. by Valentinian I., gave rise to sanguinary strifes, and to a protracted schism, which extended to other provinces. To keep the schismatic clergy from falling a prey to the temporal rulers, who were still mostly heathen, and often subjected those clergy to the torture, Gratian decreed (378) that the Roman Bishop should have full jurisdiction over those clergy of the hostile party who had not been expelled from Rome, and guaranteed to him, at the request of a Roman Synod of the same year, the necessary support of the temporal authorities.—Damasus contended against Arianism, and held a Synod in Rome, 368, which condemned the two Illyrian Bishops, Ursacius and Valens; and another in 370 which

condemned Auxentius, of Milan. He likewise endeavoured to settle the Antiochian schism, and attended the Council of Constant. 381. He was intimate with Jerome, who, at D.'s suggestion, undertook to revise the Latin version of the Bible. After his death he was canonized. His anniv. is Dec. 11. His writings (especially letters and poems) have been thrice publ. by *Ubal dini*, Rome, 1638; *Merenda*, Rome, 1754; Paris, 1840.—II. Bishop of Brizen. Elected Pope in 1048 through the influence of Henry III., but died in 23 days after his elevation. The suspicion that he was poisoned has but a slight basis. Herzog.*

Damianus, St., named commonly with his brother, St. Cosmas. These two Sicilian physicians who, in the time of the Diocletian persecution, maintained privately their loyalty to their faith, were ordered by the procurator Lysias to sacrifice publicly to the gods; refused, were tortured and beheaded (303), and therefore canonized. Their bodies are said to have been conveyed to Rome, where a church was built to their honor, and the 27th of September devoted to their memory, on which day Luke 6: 18-23 is read, because they were physicians, and have been, throughout the middle ages, the acknowledged patrons of physicians and apothecaries; and their pictures are to be known by the apparatus of medicine and chemistry in the background. The eleventh century, in its Jerusalem zeal, even created a Cosmas-Damianus order of knighthood, the members of which were sworn to protect, succor, and heal pilgrims on their road. But the order soon sunk under the unfavorable conditions of the times.

2. **Damianus**, a Monophysite Patriarch of Alexandria († 601), who explained the doctrine of the Trinity much as Sabellius had done. The Godhead (*θεοτης*) of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost was an essential quality (*ουπαρξεις*), distributed between them so, that *together*, not each for himself (*καθ' αυτον*), they were God, and their union constituted the divine *μιαν ουσιαν και φυν*. His disciples were called Damianites, and also Angelites, from their meeting place in Alexandria, the Angelium; and by scoffers Tetradites, because, worse than the Theites, they had four Gods, Father, Son, Holy Ghost, and that higher, absolute *φους*. (ALT.)

3. **Damianus**, or Damiani, Peter, born at Ravenna, 1007, of poor parents with a large family, who gave the newcomer so poor a welcome, that the wife of a neighboring priest had to plead with his mother to save him from cold and starvation, and thereby preserved the life of one who lived afterwards to abolish the very name of "a priest's wife." His parents soon after dying, Peter fell to the care of a poor married brother, who sent him, half naked and half starved, to feed swine. At a still later time, another and older brother, named Damianus, took the boy; and being himself a clergyman, and rapidly lifting himself in his profession, seems to have inspired the whole family, and especially to have rescued Peter from his miserable condition, and put him upon the high-road to become the prop and pride of them all. Peter, in gratitude, took his brother's name, as Eusebius did his friend's, Eusebius Pamphili. He studied in

Ravenna, Faenza, and Parma, soon returned to his native place to teach, and won honors and wealth. But, at the age of 30, he unexpectedly left all, and became a hermit. This was no sudden inward change, however, in his life. His rude and passionate soul had early accustomed itself to submission to a foreign will, and insight not his own, and to the joys of humility and self-subjection. From a brutal world and a brutalized clergy, he turned his wondering gaze upon those heroes of extreme renunciation and self-torture, who, since the close of the tenth century, had edified people and princes in Italy. Taking example especially from his fellow-countryman, Romuald, the disinterment and glorification of whose body had determined him to a holy life, he began his self-inflictions. To master his lustful instincts, he would leave his bed at night, stand in the neighboring river until stiff with cold, then run around a church or other sacred place, repeating multitudes of psalms, until the first hour for prayer in the morning. Clad in haircloth, and denying himself all kinds of necessities, he daily housed and fed the poor and sick much better than himself.

But longing to bring some great offering, he cast behind him honor and earthly happiness for ever, and betook himself to the society of the hermits of Fonte Avellana, near Gubbio, with whom he had before some acquaintance, a society established about A. D. 1000, by Ludolf, one of Romuald's friends. Here he soon so distinguished himself as to become, first, Prior, then Abbot, and teacher and master of discipline besides to all the other cells and cloisters in the neighbourhood. A fiery zeal for penance then ruled among the hermits; they plagued themselves with innumerable prayers, ceaseless fastings, and other self-imposed deprivations, punishments and tortures, considered as wholesome means of discipline, as well as justifying and meritorious works. Error was systematized into madness; religion shrunk within the circle of the psalter and scourge; naked monks lashed their own shoulders, before the assembled convent, with rods and leather thongs to the music of the psalms, a hundred blows to a psalm, or 15,000 blows to the entire psalter, an equivalent satisfaction for 5 years sins. This glowing folly a scholar of Damianus, one Dominicus (called Loricatus, because he added to all his torments a suit of iron armour on his naked body) carried to perfection, when, to gain time and multiply the blows, he preferred the inner and more rapid to the uttered and of course slower recitation, and succeeded thus in absolving 12 psalters in one day, lashing himself to death. A reaction followed which Damiani had to oppose with his pen, while he softened his followers' zeal with a general order that whipping should not be compulsory, nor exceed 40 psalms, or 4000 blows at once. Damiani enlarged and established the hermit congregation of Fonte Avellana (which, in 1570, after its complete decline into worldliness, was merged in the Camaldulensian congregation of St. Muran), and made his personal renown its glory. Men soon told marvels of his power, similar to those of Moses, and even those of Christ, and these soon raised him to an eminence in the Italian Church

which made him head and leader of the new and strict monasticism, and, afterwards, of the whole of that energetic party which, inspired by extreme ascetic and subjective church ideas, demanded a thorough reformation of the clergy. Damiani, the admirer, became the successor of Romuald, before whom Pope and Emperor had bent, but excelling him by virtue of the fact that, not from the saddle of the war-horse, but from the professor's chair he had entered the cell, and, therefore, not only by speech and character alone, but with the pen, he could, as one of the cultivated men of his day, explain his heart to the world. But he wanted Romuald's simple natural greatness, and even that of some of his own disciples. The wide and various activity to which he felt himself called, or which he was compelled by others to exercise, limited his independent influence on the age. His first appearance was as Censor, in an epistle from the wilderness to Pope Gregory VI., requiring him to set aside unworthy, and especially Simonist bishops, naming him of Pesaro as one of the worst. When Henry III. entered Italy, Damiani's saintly fame was in its bloom, and the emperor used it to make popular his great schemes of reform, allying himself to the hermit as Otto III. had allied himself to the knight. The Synod of Sutri was, perhaps, one of his suggestions. Henry recommended him to the new Pope, Clement II., and bade him go to Rome and declare what should next be done. Damiani joyfully confided in Henry's powerful regulations for a permanent change in the order of things, and was well pleased to exert his influence to realize his own convictions, but knew too much to go to Rome in person. From the mysterious invisibility of his cell, therefore, he sent his warnings forth to Clement, to strike and spare not against criminal and obstinate bishops, some of whom he named. To Leo IX., in the same way, he sent his celebrated *liber gomorrhianus*, in which he describes the sodomies of the clergy, but into which, also, he had gathered with an all too credulous pen a thousand slanders, and described sins of the flesh with shameless carefulness. He denounces the lazy indifference of the upper orders, and declares all married and unchaste unmarried priests thrust from the Church, but in the end confesses that this unchastity had gone so far, and became so universal, that it was to be handled not too roughly, lest the whole Church fall into ruin; that all penitents were to be restored to their places to carry on the sacred duties of religion. Leo received from this literary popular saint his rare manuscript with extraordinary marks of pleasure and respect, decided in favour of its theory in regard to all the clergy who had fallen from chastity, but also formularized still more precisely Damiani's inconsistent conclusion. The Pope himself was vacillating between a more subjective and a more objective expression of the character and powers of the Church, the priestly office and the sacraments, and now he hesitated in his measures of reform. Clearer sighted and firmer was Hildebrand, his follower, but virtual master in Rome; a man who, when Gregory VI.'s designs to elevate and free the Church, had come to naught,

had looked on from a distance and convinced himself of the existence of elements of power which a bold successor of St. Peter might summon, and marshal to victory against the dominating secular power without the Church, and the debased and world enslaved clergy within its walls. And one of the mightiest of these elements he had found to be the trans-Alpine old Benedictine monkery, which had won for itself, with the higher clergy, an independent and very respectable position in the form of the congregation of Cluny, feeling itself also called to take part in the ordering of the Church. In Italy the anchorites had split irreconcilably with the Benedictine Cœnobites, and this was Hildebrand's great obstacle; for he himself was a Benedictine, and looked forward to making Monte Cassino the vestibule of monasticism, the headquarters of the Papacy, the school of future Popes, after men had learned that Cluny in these respects was not indispensable. But Monte Cassino and the rest of the old foundations had been brought into disgrace by Romuald and the ascetics, and held themselves aloof from the popular furor. Yet any attempt at reformation must steady itself by this mighty reaction against the evil case of Church and world. Especially the spirit of the populace in the cities, dangerous alike to the hierarchy, the monarchy, and the aristocracy, must be put to service. The papal autocracy must, by means of the people, hold in check the political rulers and the combined spiritualities, and first, for this object, must organize a popular insurrection against the impure clergy, independent of Rome, and, therefore, favorable to the nobility; and so these hostile elements must be harmonized in an unconditional subjection to the Roman chair for a struggle for the freedom and purity of the Church. This plan Damiani furthered, without knowing it, and without devoting to it an orderly and steady activity. He had known Hildebrand under Gregory VI., and rejoined his ranks as a reformer under Leo IX. These greater men understood, laughed at, and watched over his weaknesses. He jestingly calls Hildebrand, in his letters, his flattering tyrant and Saint Satan. They also knew where his strength lay, and honored and used him with the boldest confidence. He negotiated with Monte Cassino, and fixed decisively upon Italian monkery his own chivalric asceticism, his extravagant credulity, and his inspiration for the limitless power of the Pope, which grew until, after the death of Henry III., we hear no more of an Imperial vocation to examine and reform the Church. In 1058 Stephen X., the first anti-imperial Pope, called Damiani to Rome, and, after a hot struggle, compelled him to become Bishop of Ostia and head of the College of Cardinals, to which he immediately addressed an earnest missive, and another to Desiderius, abbot of Monte Cassino. During the unworthy papacy of Benedict X., he kept up his saintly zeal by diligent preaching; but well weary of it by the time Nicholas II. ascended the throne, and opened the war of Hildebrand by sending Damiani, 1059, as legate to Milan, where a democratic opposition to the high nobility and clergy had allied itself with a puritanic opposition to an en-

slaved and depraved clergy. He seized the opportunity, by help of the enraged people, to subject the successors of St. Ambrose to the successors of St. Peter, and to form in all the bishoprics of Italy popular associations in the service of the Pope. Damiani was sent to Milan with Anselm, of Badagio, who had opposed the Archbishop on the people's part, and had been removed for that reason to the bishopric of Lucca; and he was daring enough to risk his whole mission by publicly seating his colleague on his right hand, and the Archbishop Guido on his left. This indignity to their independence roused a fearful uproar among the noble Milanese, but Damiani with the utmost confidence and decision, enunciated unheard-of dogmatism respecting the sole investiture of the Roman Bishop by Christ, and of all other Bishops by him; proclaimed it heresy to withhold the highest honor from Rome, or not to honor other churches as belonging to Rome. The Archbishop succumbed to this effrontery and pacified his clergy. The subjugation was complete, but the subjected in their turn wrenched the deadly weapons from the legate's hands, declared unreasonable the unsparing persecution of all the clergy for Simonists and Nikolaitans, as he had advised; and compelled him to solemnize his victory simply by compelling all, the Archbishop not excepted, to renounce simony, submit to churchly penance, and reinstate the learned and more moral of them in their offices. The radicals, the puritans, or "*pataria*," as they were called, had not, indeed, all their wishes granted, but were wonderfully emboldened by the humbling of the clergy and the strengthening of Rome. Damiani now informed Hildebrand of his success, laid down the Cardinal's robe, and, disgusted that his hot, unpractical zeal could not accomplish all at one blow, feeling out of his sphere in the regiment of the Church, debarred from the indulgence of his darling penances, and in danger of sliding down into a maelstrom of worldly sins, he fled back to his wooden bowl, his psalter, and his scourge. But he had become too great for his cell, and the voice of Hildebrand called him out again and again into the spiritual fight. The death of Nicholas, in 1061, made open a field for the two great, clearly marked, and sharply opposing parties. The friends of the absolute power of Rome were also the enemies of simony, worldly learning, licentious living, and the marriage of the clergy; therefore, the friends of a free and useful, scientific, and matrimonial life for the clergy in alliance with an upright municipal and national Christianity, found themselves ranged beneath the banners of the States and of the Empire. The Empire made its intention plain to propose no disciple of Hildebrand for the papal throne. Hildebrand resolved to elect a Pope himself; and only preferred Anselm, Bishop of Lucca, to the most prominent and popular man of the party, Damiani, because he felt that he would be a more docile, skilful and cunning instrument. Anselm became Alexander II. The Upper-Italian party made Cadalous, Bishop of Parma, Pope Honorius II. Damiani hesitated not a moment to accept an extraordinary mission to assist Alexander, and

with marked success. We find him in Florence, rousing the *pataria*, led by the Camaldulensians, to cry "down with the Bishop," as a Simonist, and, after a long conflict, Peter the Fiery granted the Florentines what they wished. We find him at Monte Cassino, performing miracles, making stricter rules, and enriching the liturgy. As legate in France in behalf of monkery, he freed the abbey of St. Medard from its invader, and secured to Cluny its privileges against the Bishop of Macon. We see him received at Cluny with the highest honors, and charmed with the piety of that powerful and learned place. The Council of Mantua, in 1064, at which he was not present, declared for Alexander, in whose defence he had written several books. He was father confessor to the dowager empress Agnes, who retired, in 1062, to the Romish cloister of St. Petronella, and gave to her written advice when, in 1065, she was sent across the Alps to influence her son, Henry IV., who wished to divorce his newly married wife; and Archbishop Sigfried of Mayence was inclined to gratify him, if, in return, he would compel Henry of Thuringia to pay tithes; but the Pope decided, when it came before him, as all former Popes had done, for morality against licentiousness, and a stringent marriage law was, with honorable firmness, decreed to curb the boundless and changeable lust of the powerful. This was, moreover, good policy, since a contest for the upper hand between the King and the papacy was inevitable and close at hand; and it was just the time to show the people that Rome was the guardian of virtue and right, and the highest judge of good morals upon earth; nor could it have had a better representation in such an affair than the aged and honored Damiani, strong in virtue, and immovable in courage, before whom the father and the mother of the King had bowed themselves. In 1069 he again left his cloister for Frankford and Mayence, warned the Archbishop, and by threats and adjurations charged the King to maintain the marriage bonds. Henry was compelled to yield. It was the last great act of Damiani. At home, however, he wrote indefatigably to Pope and Cardinals, Bishops and monks, and to his intimates among the laity admonishing and instructing epistles. Even in poetry, he let his natural wit and humor flow. His best epigrams were on Hildebrand. He was not always quite friendly with Alexander, who had suppressed his *Liber Gomorricus*, fearing lest its shameless statements of the lewdness of the clergy might bring the sacred office into contempt in the eyes of the laity, and lead directly to the immorality which it lashed. But Damiani had an extremely high opinion of his book, and treated Alexander's crafty and covert measures with very little respect. Unpleasant words passed at last between them upon the Church of Gubbio, which seemed to be negligently governed, whereupon Damiani recounted his efforts and sufferings for the Pope and complained bitterly of his treatment, yet soon after forgot his grievances in a new service. The Archbishop of Ravenna was dead, and the bishopric must be subjected to Rome. Returning from this work successful, Damiani fell sick of a fever at Faenza, and died

Feb. 23, 1072, one year before the tragedies commenced, which he had done so much to bring upon the stage.

John, a monk, one of his scholars, wrote a life of Damiani, from fresh monkish and family traditions; but, with a narrow comprehension, pictures him only as the hero of the monastery (*Acta SS. mens. Febr. 3, 406, sqq. Acta SS. ord. S. Ben. sec. VI. p. II, 245, 599, sqq.*). The annals and chronicles of the 11th century, and especially Damiani's own numerous writings, furnish us a fuller and wider view. These were given first completely collated by Constantinus Cajetanus, of Monte Cassino, in 4 folio volumes, at Rome, 1606. Later editions appeared at Paris, 1610, 1642, 1663, and at Venice, 1743. Jacob Laderchi, of the Oratorians, treats at greatest length of Damiani in his book, *Vita S. Petri Damiani S. R. E. Cardinalis Episcopi Ostiensis in VI. Libros distributa*, T. T. III, Romæ, 1702, 4. Compare, also, Mabillon, in the *Annals of the Benedictine order* (T. IV. V.), and Schröckh in the *Christian Church History* (Th. 22, s. 523-545).

ALBRECHT VOGEL. — *Lesley*.

Dan was Jacob's first son by Rachel's maid, Bilhah (Gen. 30 : 3, &c. ; 35 : 25), and the progenitor of one of the most numerous tribes of Israel (Numb. 1 : 39 ; 26 : 41), only Judah and the double tribe of Joseph exceeding it. But the circumstance that in Numb. 26 : 42 (cf. Gen. 46 : 23) only a single branch of Dan is named, the Shuhamites, indicates a rapid decline of this tribe. During the exodus, Dan, with Asher and Naphtali, was located on the north side of the tabernacle (Numb. 2 : 25, &c.), and led up the rear (10 : 25); it was therefore associated with the cognate tribes of Joseph and Benjamin (LENGERKE, *Kendân*, I. 477, &c.). Accordingly, Dan should have occupied a corresponding locality in Canaan (Josh. 19 : 40, &c. ; cf. Jos. Ant. 5, 1, 22). But the Danites were never able completely to wrest the district assigned to them from the powerful Amorites, who seem to have retained portions of it to the time of Solomon (1 K. 4 : 19 ; cf. Judges 1 : 34, &c. ; Josh. 18 : 1, 3, &c.). Of the cities allotted to Dan (Josh. 19 : 40), many, as Ekron and Joppa, never were secured by them; others (like Beth-She-mesh) fell into the hands of Judah, as did also Eshtaol and Zoreah (Josh. 21 : 16 ; 1 Chron. 6 : 59 ; Josh. 15 : 33 ; Judges 18 : 1-12). During the expedition against Jabin, under Deborah, Dan "remained in ships" (Judges 5 : 17), and seems, therefore, in part, at least, to have dwelt along the coast. But soon after, a portion of this warlike and enterprising, though greatly diminished tribe, seems to have quit its narrow limits, moved northward, and suddenly taken the rich and flourishing city of Laish; probably a Sidonian colony, situated near the sources of the little Jordan (cf. *Robinson's Palestine*, II. 439). This city and its adjacencies were then occupied by Dan (see Judges 20 : 1 ; Josh. 19 : 47 ; *Movers, Phönik.* II. 2, 159, &c.). On their way to Laish, the Danites robbed one Micah of Mt. Ephraim of sacred objects, used in an unlawful image-worship of Jehovah, and persuaded a Levite, who had been serving Micah, to join them. After taking Laish, they set up Micah's

graven image, and made it the centre of their worship (Judges 18). This continued until the exile. After the revolt of the ten tribes, Jeroboam made Dan one of the two chief cities of their worship (1 K. 12 : 29, &c. ; 2 K. 10 : 29). The location of Dan brought its new inhabitants into active traffic with the neighboring Phœnicians, for it lay on the main road from Phœnicia to the Euphrates, and became a station for passing caravans. Another portion of the Danites remained in the district originally assigned to them, near Eshtaol and Zoreah (Judges 13 : 2, 25 ; 16 : 31), but seem to have been overpowered by the Philistines, and then to have merged into the more powerful tribe of Judah; so that the above-named colony was the only distinct representative of the tribe remaining at the time of the exile. This may be the reason why, in Rev. 7 : 6, Dan is omitted.—This sketch of the tribe, as well as the heroic deeds of Sampson, illustrates the appropriateness of Jacob's benediction, in its allusion to the import of Dan's name, to *judge*, and of the saying of Moses, Deut. 33 : 22. (See EWALD, *Gesch. Isr.* II. 1, 292, &c., 305, 322, 343, &c. ; III. 1, 153, &c.)

RUETSCHI.*

Danæus, *Lambert*, known as the author of the first system of Ethics, treated separately from Dogmatics (see *Stud. u. Krit.* 1850, p. 22, &c.). He was b. at Orleans, 1530; first studied law, then theology. Of his many works, the *Ethices christianæ, libri tres*, 1577 (improved 1582), is best known. He also wrote a *Physica christ.* and a *Politica christ.* His strict Calvinism appears in his *Loci communes*. (See ADAMI, *vita*.)

HERZOG.*

Daniel. The name of this prophet is borne by an O. T. book, which has exerted the most decided influence upon N. T. literature. It is intimately related to the apocalypse of John, and to its predictions even he who is the way, the truth, and the light for science also, directs special attention (Matt. 24 : 15). Its genuineness was not disputed for nearly 2000 years, excepting by the heathen Porphyry (in his *Λόγος κατὰ χριστιανῶν*). Its spuriousness, however, upon the premises of rationalistic criticism, seems to have gradually become a more unquestioned fact from the time of Semler and Eichhorn. Even the historical reality of such a person as this Daniel has been recently contested, and that upon the very evidence which has hitherto been thought to prove his existence. Beyond the book bearing his name, Daniel is mentioned but thrice in the O. T., Ezek. 14 : 14, 20 ; 28 : 3 ; and, as Hitzig affirms, in a way in which a cotemporary would hardly be named. But Hitzig's affirmation is arbitrary. Daniel is named between Noah and Job, because, as N. was a righteous man of the old world, and Job a righteous man of the ideal world, Daniel represented, intermediately, the cotemporaneous world. If Daniel was brought to Babylon early in the reign of Jehoiakim, he must have been 50 years old in 572 (Ez. 29 : 17), and must by that time have been the wonder and admiration of all his fellow exiles. So that the mention of him by Ezekiel corroborates the statements of the book of Daniel. Daniel's grave is still shown in Susa. People of all religions perform their devotions at it;

and an insult offered to it would be punished with instant death.—The book of Daniel stands, in the Hebrew Bible, between Esther and Ezra, for historical reasons. It is placed among the hagiographa, not among the prophecies, because these were the writings of such as were specially called to the prophetic office: i. e. of proclaiming orally, or in writing, the word of God. Though Daniel, like David, and Solomon, possessed the gift of prophecy, and therefore may be called a prophet, he was not a prophet by his office and position. Origen, (see ENGELMANN, Ueber d. Charism. 113), says correctly: *Non si quis prophetat, ideo propheta est. Ac profecto si quis propheta est, is quidam prophetat, sed vero qui prophetat, non continuo etiam est propheta.* This position of the book, therefore, casts no suspicion on its genuineness (HENGSTENBERG, Beiträge I., 23, &c.).

The chief objections of modern criticism, to the genuineness of the book, are undisguisedly based on its wonders and predictions. And even Porphyry's sneers are exceeded by those of Hitzig, who would persuade us that Onias IV., a cotemporary of Antiochus Epiph., wrote the book.—That wonders occurred during the period of the exile is not surprising. It had been foretold that such (as in Egypt) should attend the termination of the Babylonian exile (Micah 7:15). Neither can the minute particularities of the book disturb us, since overwhelming external and internal proofs show that it is Isaiah who (chpts. 40–66) so minutely describes Cyrus, more than 150 years before his birth, and also foretells the grandeur and energy which the word of God, as it would then be spoken, should possess (Is. 51:15, &c.). It should even call forth a new heaven and a new earth. This was fulfilled in Ezekiel, but still more in Daniel, who takes up the vision where the perspective of Isaiah's prophecy had narrowed down to a point, and opens it anew. All the prophets after Isaiah merely unfold his prophecies. Daniel's intensive and comprehensive prophecies sustain a similar relation to those of subsequent periods, and, after prophecy ceased, to the history of the next succeeding ages. The speciality and extent of his predictions do not, therefore, invalidate his book. These peculiarities are explained by his position in the history of redemption, and by his own personal position, at a heathen court, among magi courtiers. This gave his prophecies an universal character. The wide and enduring influence of prophecy, exercised in such circumstances, is seen in the repetition of Balaam's (Numb. 24:24) in Dan. 11:30. But if Balaam's words were so enduring, how much more abiding would be the influence of a prophet like Daniel!

The plan of the book of Daniel corresponds with that of the other O. T. prophetic books. Facts and chronological order impinge, the former prevailing. There are two divisions: history, c. 1–6, and visions, c. 7–12. In c. 1–2:4, the language is Hebrew; from 2:4 to c. 7 Aramaic; thence to the close Hebrew, the visions being intended for his own people. The radical correspondence of its Aramaic with that of Jer. 10:11, and of Ezra affords circumstantial proof of the date of its composition. It also contains

many foreign words, probably of Arian derivation, and three names of musical instruments, which sound like the Greek words *ξύλας*, *συμφωνία*, and *ψαλτήριον* (3:5), and point to the age of the Seleucidæ. And it is quite reasonable to suppose that Greek musical instruments should then have been known in so commercial a city as Babylon (see Brandis, Allg. Monatschr., 1854, 2). The Hebrew of Daniel bears special resemblance to that of Ezekiel, which is doubtless included in 9:2, and Habakkuk. In a word, the character of the language corresponds with that of the period to which it claims to belong.—Among the historical facts reported in the book, the following require explanation. In 1:1 it is said Nebuchadnezzar took Jerusalem, &c., in the 3d year of Jehoiakim's reign. That Jehoiakim was also led captive to Babylon is clear from 2 Chron. 36:6, &c. (see LXX.). But how could this have happened in J.'s 3d year? Josephus' explanation (adopted by later Jewish chronology), that it occurred in the 3d year of J.'s tributary bondage to Chaldea (2 Kings 24:1) is unavailing. For c. 2 dates from N.'s 2d year, whilst his 1st is the 4th of Jehoiakim, the year of the battle of Carchemish, which decided N.'s conquest of frontier Asia, and soon after which he became sole monarch. The siege of Jerusalem, therefore, must have been one connected with that battle, until which J. was a vassal of Egypt, not of Chaldea. And as the book of Kings mentions but one campaign of N. against Jehoiakim (2 Kings 24), it must be this in Dan. 1:1. But Jerusalem cannot have been taken in the 3d year of Jehoiakim. It is obviously improbable that this should have been done before the battle of Carchemish, and Jeremiah 25 expressly makes the Chaldean rule in Judea begin in Jehoiakim's 4th year. Hence J.'s 3d year must be considered the extreme *terminus a quo* of N.'s coming to Jerusalem. In Jehoiakim's 3d year, N.'s army moved (during Nabopolassar's lifetime yet); in J.'s 4th year, Pharaoh Necho was overcome at Carchemish (Jer. 46:2); then followed the subjugation of Jerusalem (cf. Jer. 36:9). Jehoiakim was dragged to Babylon, and then sent back (LXX., 2 Chron. 36:8; 2 Kings 21:18) under pledges of vassalage, to Jerusalem. After 3 years he revolted, but died before N. could again reach Jerusalem.—In c. 2 a new difficulty meets us. If we could assume that D. reckoned the term of tuition from Jehoiakim's 3d year, and N.'s reign from J.'s 4th year, the problem could be easily solved; the designation of N., as king of B. (1:1) would then be, obviously, a prolepsis. But the difficulty is not insuperable even if we hold that Jerusalem was taken after the battle of Carchemish. Its full, satisfactory solution, however, must await more accurate historical evidence of the date of the commencement of N.'s rule, than Berosus furnishes, who merely says that at the opening of the campaign N. had not yet succeeded his father to the throne.—The narrative in c. 5, has been often assailed. Profane lists of kings name no Belshazzar, and it is not clear whether on the night of the feast only B. was slain, or the Chaldean kingdom was also overthrown. Daniel's explanation of *upharsin* and the connection of 6:1 with 5:30.

favors the latter; but it is striking that 5 : 30 mentions only the former fact, whilst the latter is intimated in other accounts (HEROD. 1, 191; XENOPH., *Cyr.*, 7, 23. Comp. Is. 21 : 5). Profane history is, otherwise, unfavorable to this view of 5 : 30. Herod. says Babylon was taken under Labynetus II. Berosus (in JOSEPH., c. *Ap.*, 1, 20) makes Evil-Merodach, son of Nebuchadn., N.'s next successor. Then followed Neriglissar, Labosordach, and finally Naboned, whom Cyrus, after taking Babylon, banished to Caramania. But these accounts may be harmonized with those in Daniel in the following way : 1) Belshazzar is the youth Labosordach, i. e. Nabo-Sadrach (Bel-Nabo); for the interference of the queen (5 : 10) implies the youthfulness of the King, and B.'s allusion. v. 13, favors this supposition (cf. 6 : 1). 2) The book reckons B.'s years from the death of Evil-Merodach (see Jer. 27 : 7), since B.'s father Neriglissar, being merely a son-in-law of Nebuchadn., could reign only in B.'s name. Hence Evil-M. was murdered after reigning two years, and B. after reigning 4 years and 8 months, during 4 y. of which time his father was regent. 3) The dynasty of Nebuchadn. ceased with B. (comp. Dan. 9 : 1 with Jer. 27 : 7). But now Astyages, the Median king, considered himself the heir of the Chaldean throne, and Naboned, elevated by the conspirators who slew Belshazzar, became his vassal, but soon leagued with the Lydian king and revolted. This led to the war, first against the King of Lydia, then against Naboned. After Cyrus took Babylon, Astyages appointed his younger brother Darius (the Cyaxares of Xen.) King of Babylon. — The abbreviated statements of Dan. 5 : 30; 6 : 1, remarkably agree with this scheme. The dynasty of Nebuchadn. became extinct with B.; for Naboned, even according to Berosus, is only *ῥῆς βασιλείας* *ἡ βασιλεία*. The Chaldean kingdom, indeed, continued, but merely as a Median inheritance. The treasonable interregnum of Naboned was terminated by Darius, the Mede, (son of Darius (Cyaxares) the brother of Astyages), seizing the government. This Darius is undoubtedly the Cyaxares II., of Xen., (*Dárajavus* is the general title of ruling kings). The Cyropedia may be a mere historical romance; but this coincidence proves that the Darius of Dan. 6 : 1, is not a purely imaginary person. Even recently an inscription was found with the names of Cyrus and Cyaxares, and Cyrus is made the son of Cyax. (*u. ak. shat. ri* = *Uwak-shatra* = sole monarch). If Xen. was right, why not Daniel? (See Deutsch. morgenl. Ztschr. 8, 3, 547; BRISSONIUS de regno Pers., 1, 1, c. 14, 130; DUNCKER, *Gesch. d. Alterth. II.*, 672, &c.).

With c. 7 the visions begin. Passing over other points of less difficulty we ask : is it probable that the little horn, in 8 : 9, which persecuted the people of God, is Antiochus Epiph., and that in 7 : 8, &c., a king springing from the Roman empire? The general character of both agrees; both are the anti-Christ, symbolized by a little horn which rises up against three other horns. Is it probable that the three horns in c. 8 are post-Alexandrian Greek rulers, but those in c. 7, Roman rulers? May it not rather be supposed that the variations in the de-

scription no more require two persons, than those in the delineation of the four empires in c. 2 and 7 require but two. Furthermore: by 9 : 27 the enemy rages a $\frac{1}{2}$ week = $1 + 2 + \frac{1}{2}$ year, which accords with 7 : 25; whilst the duration designated in 12 : 7 forbids a reference of the matter to a pre-Antiochian period. How unlikely that different events should be measured by the same time? And yet to Daniel's eye they must have been closely associated; for there is no intimation that a long period lay between the Antiochian persecution and the troubles of what Daniel considered the last times. — The most reliable solution of this problem is this. The prophecy of the anti-Christ applies to several events, each one of which, successively, more fully exhausts its import. Its first, partial fulfilment was accomplished in the person of Antiochus Epiphanes. A subsequent one occurred in the destruction of the temple by the Romans (comp. Matt. 25 : 14, with Dan. 9 : 26, &c.). Its final, and exhaustive, fulfilment awaits "the end of days" (2 Thess. 2 : 4). For it is a law of the history of Redemption that the fulfilment of a prophecy will constantly repeat itself, until its significance has been fully exhausted. The Antiochian afflictions of the Church were not the last. The book of Daniel, however, seems to predict them as the last, (comp. Is. 10, and Hab. 2), because the prophet's horizon was bounded by them. But the limits of his horizon did not bound the view of the spirit of prophecy in him, or circumscribe the true intent of the prophecy itself.

Those who deny the genuineness of this book, derive proof against it from the fact that its eschatological visions date immediately from the time of Antiochus Ep. But such inferences would displace the history of all prophetic literature. Is. 7-12 must then have been written in the midst of the Assyrian troubles. And the LXX. version of Daniel was probably made about the time assigned by these opposing critics to the origin of the book; for 1 Maccabees adopts some LXX. expressions, and this version contains other traces of having been prepared near the time of the Antiochian persecution. But if we compare the larger uncanonical additions found in the LXX., the prayer and song of the three young men after 3 : 23, Susanna, &c., with the original Hebrew-Chaldaic form of Daniel, these apocryphal legends afford strong proof of its true prophetic character. — See, besides the works already named, HÄVERNICK, *Neue krit. Untersuchungen*, 1838; AUERLEN, *Der Prophet D. u. d. Offenb. Joh.*, &c., 1854; HOFFMANN, *Weissagung u. Erfüllung I.*, 276-316. For the literature upon the subject, KEIL, *Lehrb. d. Einl. in d. A. T.*, 1853). DELITZSCH.*

Dante Alighieri, born at Florence in May, 1265 (Par. XXII., 112-120), died at Ravenna, Sept. 14, 1321, two centuries before the Reformation, to the history of which his biography, nevertheless, strictly belongs, as one of those numerous connecting links between the earliest and latest self-adjusting and self-restoring efforts of the Christian Church. The latter half of his life was spent in exile and misery, to which, however, he owed his best spiritual experience, and we the Divine comedy. After various and

active services to his native country, including military service, and after a two months possession of a priory in the summer of 1300, he received from the hands of the Guelph faction, to which he was obnoxious, his first sentence of punishment and banishment, Jan. 27, 1302; his second, March 10, 1302; and his third, Oct., 1315. His goods were confiscated, and himself driven from home and family. The charge against him was barratry, or the undue application of his powers of office to his private benefit, a charge evidently untrue, since he condemns this sin expressly to the lowest hell in his *Inferno* (XXII., 53, 87-136; XXI. 41), and since his final sentence was based solely on the ground of contumacy. His wife was Gemma di Donati, and of his six children but three survived him, Pietro, Jacopo, and Beatrice. His descendants, by the female line, still continue at Verona, where he first found a refuge (Par. XXII., 70), and Count Serego Allighieri has dedicated many writings to his illustrious ancestor. (Compare Victor de Saint-Maure's *La div. Com.*: Par., 1833, tom. 1, p. 219. M. Valérie, *Voyage historique et littéraire*, tom 1, p. 293, 313). The origin of his name, on the male side, was unknown even to himself (Par. XVI., 43-45). His whole life was devoted to Church and State, not only in the speculative learning spirit of Mary, but in practical Martha service; but the bloom of his life was *poetry*, in which all his thinking and doing, all his science and will, were concentrated and crystallized. Not a branch of human activity or knowledge was strange to this Christian theologian and philosopher preaching the gospel; this statesman, soldier, jurist, honoring the law; this historian analyzing mediæval and ancient history; this physician and astronomer demonstrating from visible nature the invisible and eternal power of God. But his crowned genius was poetry, transcribing from the dictation of his spirit what his spirit saw, (*Inf.* 11, 8; *Prg.* XXIV., 52-54), accompanied from his earlier youth by song and music on the one side, opening their ears to the melodies of Paradise (*Prg.* II, 112-114; *Par.* XXIII., 97-102), and on the other the descriptive art inventing the divine architecture of Purgatory (*Prg.* X., 28-102; XII., 16-69). It remains only to analyze his literary history.

1) *Vita Nuova*, or New Life, was the first love of his young life of undoubting immediate faith, in which his morning star is seen to rise and set again. Beatrice is the true and actual incarnation, or, as he expressly calls it, the *anagogical allegory*, lying at the base of the corporeal real. With this, 2) the *Convito* is closely connected, both in contents and in form, consisting of 15 tracts and 14 cantos, of which but 4 tracts and 3 cantos are complete, the rest being found elsewhere. At the feast the star of love again goes up, but in another form and with painful vacillations of the pilgrim's heart between the upper and the lower worlds, and faith-knowledge, or activity of a spirit overcoming the doubts of reason, is seen following the earliest and more childlike faith (*Par.* IV., 124-132). Then comes 3) his *Canzoniere*, a *sestine* of cantos, sonnets, ballads, and madrigals, not all implicitly accepted as genuine by critics.

Then 4) two books, *de vulgari eloquio*, in Latin, treating first of speech, man's privilege, then of the Italian as a mother tongue, and of its dialects, and, finally, of the forms of poetical and oratorical art. 5) His *Epistole*, in Latin, of which 14 ed. were collated by Ales. Torri (1842), reveals all the circumstances of the statesman, theologian, and poet. 6) A *Questio de duobus elementis aquæ et terre*, is also ascribed to him as written at Verona, in 1320, a year before his death, treating scholastically the *elevation or emergence of land*, and its final and efficient cause as the concealed-sense or world-allegory. More authentic is, 7) his celebrated *De Monarchia*, the date and prompting cause of which are to this hour disputed among the critics. Boniface VIII., in the bull *Unam sanctam*, Nov. 24, 1302, had vindicated the supremacy of the Pope over his vassals, king and emperor, and condemned as Manichæan dualism the co-supremacy of the empire over the Church; and now Dante proves that the two powers of Church and State were co-equal, like two swords divinely and immediately bestowed, as the old Saxon code had announced a century before. He compares the Jewish people after Abraham, with the Roman people after Æneas, as chosen by God for universal dominion (*comp. Com.* IV., 3-5). But the celebrated *Defensor pacis* of Marsilius, of Padua, following in 1328, and the imperial diet at Rens, in 1338, showed that the freedom of the empire was rather helped on than hindered by Dante's book, which Pope John XXII, at Avignon, forbade and condemned to the flames in spite of the opposition of the Emperor Louis of Bavaria, and his Pope, Nicholas V. It has been translated into Italian, in 1499, by Marsilius Ficinus. 8) The *Rime Sacre*, or seven penitential psalms, and the Credo—all in triple measure—were first discovered by Abbot Quadris, in 1752, and are not yet accepted as certainly genuine. The traditions are that he wrote them to prove himself no heretic, or as *Tertiary* in the Franciscan Order (*Inf.* XVI., 106; XXVII., 67) as a century later the Troubadour Folco, of Marseilles, had joined the Cistercian order (*Par.* IX., 37-42). Luther also began his translation of the Bible with these seven psalms, in 1517. 9) The *bucolics* of Dante, in Latin hexameters, letters, addressed to the poet, John de Virgilio, at Bologna, are the dying swan notes of Dante; *dum loquor, en comites! et sol de monte rotabat.*

But the ripe fruit of Dante's life, borne through its whole latter half, is, 10) the *Commedia* (afterwards *divina Commedia*), in *terze rime*, in 100 songs, the first of which, an earnest memorial to death encircling life in mid career, introduces the 33 next, which describe the knowledge of self and sin as a journey through the hells down to the centre of the earth, where rebellion against God is punished in Lucifer, and treachery to Church and State in Judas, and Brutus and Cassius; then 33 songs describe the course of penitence through purgatory on to the earthly paradise, and all the forms in which the dualism of Church and State appeals with warnings to the soul in a procession of grand visions. Then follow 33 songs of the saved soul passing through all the starry spheres

of heaven, from the moon up to the highest empyrian of the celestial paradise, where the restless soul finds rest and full enjoyment, and freedom from the hunger and thirst of all desire; and the poet, proved and weary with his eight days' pilgrimage, is vouchsafed the sight of the Triune Deity, and in its midst the God-humanity, and the taste of the powers of the future world. In this divine poem are concentrated not only the poet's life, but all the myths and legends of antiquity. Here all life has reached its term, *al fine di tutti i disii* (Pr. XXXIII. 46), and explanation. Here is glorified whatever in his early *vita nuova* is seen by faith afar off, in misty vision; whatever in his Feast is arranged and examined by science on all sides; whatever in his songs and sonnets is wailed or chanted by the tenderest sentiment, turning its loves and hopes on woman, and baring its heart to the woes of the world; whatever of eloquence his book on language teaches, or of worldly wisdom his letters exhibit, we have it here, enthroned in majestic order, like the assembling at the final judgment. The hint of America in the midst of the world ocean, given by his *dissertation on land and sea*, here comes in again; and every admonition to obedience, virtue, alms-giving, self-continnence, and sacrifice, scattered through his treatises on the monarchy, his sacred songs, and his eclogues, is here repeated, intensified, and enlarged to its true and noblest form.

The inexhaustible literature upon Dante, since the time of Jacopo della Lana, claims some notice, especially the *Bibliografia Dantesca* of Viconte Colomb de Batines (1845, 1846). German translations, most of them with notes, have appeared, in prose by Bachenschwanz, at Leipzig, 1767, 8, 9; by D. Hörwarter and Von Enk, at Innsbruck, 1830, 1; and in rhyme by Kannegieszer, 1820, fig. 1825, 1843; Streckfusz, 1824-34; Bernd. von Guseck, 1841; in imabico, without rhyme, by Philalethes, 1839, 40, 49, and by Kopisch, 1842. Partial translations at Braunschweig, 1763, in the "Versuchen über den Karakter und die Werke der besten italienischen Dichter," and by A. W. Schlegel, 1794-7, and by K. Graul, 1843. Among Germans of this cent. whose works upon D. have merit, we name F. W. Schelling, 1803; H. Leo, *Hist. of Italy*; Uhden; Ad. Wagner; F. C. Schlosser; Al. von Humboldt; Dr. Blanc; K. Witte, B. R. Abeken; Oeynhausien and Karl Förster of Reumont; Dr. C. G. Carus; Dr. Lutterbeck; Dr. C. B. Schlüter; Prof. K. Hegel; Dr. E. R. Arndt, Bähr, Wegele, Ruth, Bellermaun, Nordmann. — It is not to be doubted that in Germany, Dante, like Shakspeare, wins a deeper sympathy as time advances, although many learned men, to whom the spirit of Dante was foreign, have been precisely the ones to advance most diligently and worthily the study of his works. Lately (1853), Bernh. Tauchnitz has published an edition of the *Div. Comedia*, after the Bartolinian Codex in Udine (on the German border, where Dante found a friendly asylum for a time), at Leipzig, where the first German translation was made, and where is still extant, in the Pauliner-Kirche, an ancient monument of Markgraf Dietzmann's of Meissen, with an inscription in elegiac verse, ascribed by tradition to the Florentine poet, and learnedly

annotated by Dr. Nobbe, of Leipzig. See also a commentary on Dante, from the evangelical standpoint, by Dr. Baumgarten Crusius, *De doctrina Dantis Aligerii theologica* (1836), and the writings, since 1834, of C. F. Göschel. In France there appeared, in 1854, *Dante hérétique, révolutionnaire et socialiste. Révélations d'un Catholique sur le moyen age*, par E. Aroux ancien député; and *Dante, révolutionnaire et socialiste, mais non hérétique. Révélation sur les Révélations de M. Aroux et défense* D'Ozanam, par Ferjus Boissard. Nothing remains but the appearance of a book on Dante, neither revolutionary nor socialist, but heretic, to make the quarrel complete.

O. F. GÖSCHEL. — *Lesley*.

Darius (on coins *Dariawusch*, which nearly corresponds in sound with the Hebrew name, and is an official, royal title). In the O. T., three Persian kings of this name are mentioned: 1. *Darius the Mede* (Dan. 6 : 1), a son of Ahasuerus (9 : 1; 11 : 1). As in 6 : 28 he is called the immediate predecessor of Cyrus, he seems to correspond with Cyaxares II., whom Josephus (*Ant.* 10, 11, 4) calls a son of Astyages, an uncle of Cyrus, and who, according to *Xen. Cyr.* 1, 5, 2, succeeded his father A., but surrendered the government to Cyrus (1, 4, 22; 4, 58; 5, 5, 44), to whom he gave his daughter, Amyasis (*Ctes. fragm. ed. Lion.* p. 7), in marriage. Others suppose that Astyages, Cyrus' grandfather, himself is meant, because Herod. 1, 109, says he had no male issue, and that Cyrus was his immediate successor (so *Euseb.*). But Astyages was so well known that it was unnecessary to name C.'s father; and Darius was politically so insignificant that it was more in point to mention A.—2. *Darius*, son of Hystaspes, after the murder of Pseudo-Smerdis (*Ezra* 4 : 7), obtained the crown, as one of the seven chief Persian princes. He was a son-in-law of Cyrus, reigned from 521-486 B. C., and greatly enlarged his kingdom by conquests. He is known in history for his expeditions against Greece, and in the O. T. for his favor to the Jews (*Ezra* 6 : 10; *Hag.* 1 : 1; 2 : 1; *Zech.* 1 : 1; see *Theol. Stud.* 1854, 1).—3. *Darius the Persian* (*Neh.* 12 : 22) must be D. III., or Codomannus (1 *Macc.* 1 : 1). Upon the relation of Darius I. to Cyrus see *Cyrus*.

VAHINGER.*

David, the second king of Israel (1055-1015, B. C.), was the youngest of eight sons of Jesse, (1 *Sam.* 16 : 10), whose family was among the most influential in the tribe of Judah (see *Judah*, tribe of). Among his ancestors were Nahshon (*Numb.* 1 : 7; 2 : 3, &c.; *Ruth* 4 : 20), Boaz, and three heathen women noted in the O. T. history, *Thamar*, *Rahab*, and *Ruth*. Thus, in this family we see how the promise to Abraham (*Gen.* 12 : 3) strove, consciously or unconsciously, after its fulfilment towards the heathen. The remarkable preservation of piety in this family, amid adverse circumstances, is exhibited in the book of *Ruth*.—Of this family David was the noblest scion. He was reared according to the simple manners of his times. Even his youth was eventful (1 *Sam.* 17 : 34, &c.). He early acquired a reputation for his poetic and musical talents (1 *Sam.* 16 : 18). At this period of his life the prophet Samuel was sent by Jehovah to Jesse's house, to anoint one of his sons as future king

of Israel, in Saul's stead. David had to be called home from the flock he was tending. Neither he, nor the family, probably understood the significance of the anointing; at least matters moved on with them as before. But from that day the Spirit of the Lord, which departed from Saul, rested upon David. As a cure for his troubled spirit, music was recommended to Saul; and the known proficiency of David upon the harp led to his being called from Bethlehem to the court. He soon won the king's favor, and became one of his armour-bearers. Ere long a war with the Philistines called Saul into the field, and David being thought too tender for warfare returned to his father's flocks. But one day his father sent him to the army to obtain tidings of his brothers. There he heard Goliath's taunts, saw the terror of the Israelites, and learned Saul's offer of his daughter to the man who should overcome the giant. David accepted the challenge, and with his sling and a few pebbles in his hand, and divine faith in his heart, slew the foe. Thus 1 Sam. 17:22-58. But modern criticism pretends to find many contradictions between this account and 1 Sam. 16; 21, &c. These "contradictions," however, may be easily explained. Joab (2 Sam. 18:15) had *ten* armour-bearers. Saul had probably a much larger number. In times of peace these were members of the court, on whom the king conferred the post as a mark of personal favor. But when war broke out he needed men skilled in battle as his armour-bearers. David's deficiency in this respect appears from 1 Sam. 17:38-40. Hence his return home during the war. His being called a man of war in 1 Sam. 16:18, is (as even *Winer* admits) merely a prolepsis. The inquiry of Saul in 17:55, &c., has reference to David's family descent and relationship, which Saul, in his state of mind, might easily have forgotten. The assertion that 17:54 is against historical facts, is itself unhistorical (cf. Josh. 15:63; Judges 1:21); and the cavil that David is said to have taken Goliath's armor to his own home, whilst Goliath's sword is subsequently found at Nob, surely presents no insuperable difficulty (17:54; 21:9).

That David's victory saved all Israel was acknowledged by Saul and the people. But when the women sang David's praises, Saul's envy was excited: he remembered Samuel's words (15:28). Whilst Saul's dislike of David grew into hatred, his children became more warmly attached to him, especially *Jonathan*. Saul was pledged to give David his eldest daughter *Merab* in marriage, but broke the promise. Meanwhile David won the heart of a younger daughter, *Michal*. In this Saul saw a plan of getting rid of David. He consented to his marriage with Michal upon a condition which seemed likely to prove fatal to David (18:25). David, however, more than succeeded, and Michal became his wife. During continued hostilities with the Philistines, David increased his fame as a hero—but also Saul's hatred. Saul attempted to assassinate him, and to induce others to aid in the plot. Jonathan befriended David, and, with Michal's aid, enabled him to escape to Samuel at Ramah. Several attempts of Saul's servants to bring him back were thwarted. At length

Saul himself went after him, but he too was seized by the Spirit, and failed. Jonathan then attempted to reconcile his father to David, but unavailingly, and, after renewing their oath of mutual friendship, David fled to Nob, to consult the urim and thummim. *Ahimelech*, supposing him to be a special messenger of Saul, gave him food and Goliath's sword. He then fled for safety to Achish, king of the Philistines. On being detected he feigned madness, and thus escaped to the cave of Adullam, near Bethlehem, where 400 men gathered around him—mostly relatives whom Saul persecuted. Saul learned from *Doeg* what had been done for David at Nob, and took bloody vengeance on the priests there. Only *Abiathar* escaped, and fled to David with the urim and thummim. David's parents, to escape Saul's vengeance, had moved into Moab.—David's company daily increased, but he strictly refrained from all hostilities against Saul. On the contrary, when the Philistines besieged Keilah, he hastened to its relief. Saul commanded his army to surround Keilah, and seize David, who, by divine admonition, fled to the wilderness of Ziph. Here, also, Saul's men had enclosed him, when another invasion of the Philistines drew them off. But as soon as those were repelled, Saul resumed his persecution of David, who had fled to *Engedi*. There Saul fell into David's power, who piously refrained from harming him. David's noble conduct wrung from Saul a humiliating confession of his own meanness.—David's subsequent forbearance toward the churlish Nabal exhibits him in a similarly noble light. (But in 1 Sam. 25:1, *THENIUS* is right in reading *Maon* for *Paran*). After Nabal's death David married his widow, *Abigail*, Saul having given Michal to another. Soon after this David abode in the wilderness of Ziph, and Saul again came out against him with 3000 men; but David, with 600 followers, fled once more to Achish, who welcomed him as a reputed enemy of Saul, and assigned Ziklag as his abode. Whilst maintaining this ambiguous and fatal position, David engaged in several expeditions against the southern foes of Israel, the Amalekites, Gezrites, Geshurites. But a new war broke out between Achish and Saul, and showed the peril of David's position. The suspicions of the Philistine lords afforded him relief. Instead of fighting against his own people, he returned to Ziklag, and repelled some Amalekite freebooters. But the joy of his victory over them was dampened by the tidings of the death of Saul and Jonathan (2 Sam. 1:19-27).—David then went to Hebron, and there, in his 30th year, was chosen king by the tribe of Judah. *Abner*, however, had *Ish-bosheth*, Saul's son, proclaimed king of the other tribes, at Mahanaim. This schism continued 7½ years, when the eleven tribes (*Ish-bosheth* having been assassinated by one of his own men, whom David punished with death for the deed) joined David, and had him anointed at Hebron. Then David moved to Jerusalem, took Mt. Zion from the Jebusites, and built a tower upon it. After a victory over the Philistines, he turned his attention to the reorganization of the worship, which, since Eli's time had fallen into disorder. He probably then already thought of building

a temple, and in this view had the ark brought to Zion. But Nathan, the prophet, was directed by the Lord to tell him that it must be built by a man of peace, not by a warrior. Accordingly David dropped his plan, and devoted himself to the firmer establishment, and extension of the theocratic state to the limits prophetically prescribed (Gen. 15:18; Ex. 23:31; Deut. 11:22-24). Thus the choicest country between the Euphrates and the Nile was acquired, and an equal and independent position secured between the great eastern and western powers represented by those rivers. His extreme severity, especially towards the Ammonites, must not be ascribed only to the customs of the times. He also inflicted a judicial punishment, as the Lord's instrument, for their crimes and idolatries. But, in the midst of these wars, he was ensnared in the double sin of adultery and murder, for which God reproved him through Nathan, and punished him with the death of Bathsheba's child and other domestic afflictions—the violation of Tamar by her half-brother, Amnon, for which he was murdered by her full brother, Absalom, who then fled to his maternal grandfather, the king of Geshur. Absalom was not allowed to see David's face for five years. Meanwhile, Absalom courted popularity among the lower classes, and had himself finally proclaimed king in Hebron. David humbled himself under these judgments, and fled. But soon an army of faithful friends gathered around him. A battle was fought with the rebels in the wood of Ephraim, and Absalom perished. David's intense grief at Absalom's death was not merely the operation of natural tenderness, but anguish at the thought of the evils which his own earlier follies had entailed upon his house (2 Sam. 12:10; Ex. 20:5). This rebellion was scarcely quelled when another threatened, caused by the envy of the other tribes at that of Judah; this also was soon extinguished (2 Sam. 20). Here (2 Sam. 21) an account of a three years' famine is inserted, which probably occurred earlier. To judge correctly of the measure of relief adopted, the ancient oriental views of the solidarity of the family, and of blood-revenge must be duly considered. David next ordered the people to be numbered, against Joab's counsel, and the warning of Gad, the seer. For this sin, the Lord threatened vengeance. Of three evils, David preferred falling into the hands of the Lord, and 70,000 people perished of the plague. The sin of numbering the people was two-fold. 1. David was not an autocratic, but a theocratic king, and arrogated authority not belonging to him, in adopting such a measure without God's approval or command. 2. But the chief sin lay in the *purpose* of this census. David's martial exploits had reached the limits divinely set for them. To have pressed them further would have converted the theocratic state into an universal monarchy. His past achievements and present circumstances favored such an ambitious project. Why should not David become a world conqueror, and Jerusalem the metropolis of an universal empire, as Alexander and Rome subsequently became? The history of the world proves that when a conqueror has once advanced upon his course of

victory, no hand can arrest his progress but God's. The census showed that there were 500,000 men of war in Judah alone, and 800,000 in Israel, though not all the tribes were numbered. Hence the Lord rebuked this ambitious scheme, which was so contrary to his own purpose in establishing Israel. By the plague David was punished for his pride, and the people for their repeated insurrections against the Lord's anointed.—David had now waxed old, and appointed Solomon his successor. A conspiracy formed in favor of Adonijah was discovered by the vigilant Nathan, and subdued. To guard against similar attempts, David had Solomon at once proclaimed and anointed king (2 K. 1). Feeling that death was at hand, he gave directions for the punishment of Joab and Shimei, whose merited penalty had been delayed, on account of their peculiar participation in his own sins.—David's personal character has been violently assailed by such men as *Bayle*, *Voltaire*, *Tindal*, &c. They overlook the fact that the Bible by no means describes him as faultless, but faithfully reports his crimes, and makes him humbly deplore and confess them with his own lips (Ps. 51, &c., &c.). At the same time his virtues cannot be denied.—His relation to the history of redemption is most peculiar and remarkable. The aim and import of the O. T. history, to prefigure, prophesy, and testify of Christ, concentrate in him as in a focus. He is the progenitor of Christ after the flesh, and the blessing of the promise is transferred to him (2 Sam. 7). Thenceforth all the prophets describe Christ as Jesse's branch and David's son. His *kingdom* is an emblem of the Messiah's; his *life*, in its special providences, a type of the Messiah's, through humiliation to exaltation, through sufferings to glory. Hence so many of his psalms (see Art.) contain prophetic allusions to Christ, who is his son and his Lord. (See *CHANDLER'S Life of David*; *DELANY'S* do.; *EWALD*, do., Lpz. u. Gera, 1795; *HESS*, *STOLBERG*, H. *EWALD*, in their histories of David; *NIEMEYER*, *Karakter. d. Bib. IV.* 125, &c.). *KURTZ*.*

David of Dinant. The Synod of Paris, 1209, besides condemning Amalric (see Art.) condemned some heretical writings, and, among the rest, *quaternuli magistri David de Dinant*. Hence it is inferred that David was an adherent of Amalric, though this does not necessarily follow. Nothing further is known of him. But he seems to have founded a school, for, according to *ALBERTUS M., summa*, p. I. tr. 6, q. 29, art. 2, there were *quidam hæreticis* who followed him; and *TH. AQUINAS*, in *sec. sent. lib. dist. 17, q. 1, art. 1*, designates *quidam moderni philosophi* as adherents of David.—(See *KRÖNLEIN*, de genuina Amalr. a Bena, &c., Giss. 1842; *Stud. u. Krit.* 1847; p. 272, &c.). *HERZOG*.*

Deacon (*διακονος*) is, in general, every one doing service, especially Church service, but, more particularly, one officially appointed to subordinate duties. In progress of time the ideas received special limitations. As the Church was primitively organized mainly upon the model of the synagogue, there were, besides rulers and elders, other officers, corresponding to the *ἐκκλησιασται* (Luke 4:20, see *VITRINGA, de synag.* III. P. II. c. 4). Those officers who

joined the new congregation no doubt retained their functions (Acts 5 : 6, 10; see ROTH, d. Anfänge d. chr. K. 1837, p. 162, &c.). In the course of time, however, a more effective arrangement became necessary, and *deacons* were appointed to have charge of the alms, serve at the agapæ and Lord's table, and to assist the elders (Acts 6 : 1-6). They also seem to have taken part in teaching (1 Tim. 3 : 8-13). The example thus set in Jerusalem was followed elsewhere; and afterwards the strict separation between the clergy and people led to more distinct rules for this office. Thus Ignatius says: *Diaconi non ciborum et potuum ministri sunt, sed eccl. Dei ministri* (ad Trall. c. 2, &c.). In the 3d cent. they were enjoined to persuade the rich to acts of charity, to warn the unruly, &c. (see *Apostolic Ch. Directory*, c. 23, &c.; *Apost. Constit.* III. c. 19; II. c. 57; comp. JUSTIN M., *Apol.* I. c. 67). At a subsequent period they were often compared to Levites (ISIDORE [† 636] in c. 1, § 13, *diss.* XXI), and corresponding rules, &c., were applied to them (Numb. 8 : 24; *Conc. Carthag.* III. a. 397, c. 4 [c. 5, *dist.* LXXVII. c. 14, *Can.* CXX. q. I.]; *Conc. Agath.* a. 506, c. 16; *Tolet.* IV. a. 633, c. 20 [c. 6, 7, *dist.* LXXVII.], &c.; *Novella*, CXXIII. c. 13). Clement V., at the Council of Vienna, 1311, required them to be at least 20 years old (1 Chron. 23 : 24, 27; 2 Chron. 31 : 17); the Council of Trent required them to be in their 23d year (see HARTZHEIM, *Conc. Germ.* IX. fol. 128, 129). In the Romish C. the deacon occupies the lowest grade in the *hierarchia ordinis* (*Conc. Trid.* s. XXIII. c. 17, *de ref.*) belongs to the *ordines majores*, and is therefore bound to celibacy. The *Pontificale Rom.* defines his duties thus: *Diaconum oportet ministrare ad altare, baptizare, et prædicare*. As the priest's assistant, he is called, *Episcopi auris et oculus, item et os cor et anima* (*Const. Apostol.* II. c. 44). He baptizes by the Bishop's approval (TERTULL. *de bapt.* c. 17; c. 13, *pr. dist.* XCIII. *Gelas.* a. 494, &c.). Previously, he also assisted in confession, &c., but later, was allowed to officiate only in the act of reconciliation (REGINO, *de causis Synod.* I. c. 300, &c.). Sometimes he preached, but usually only read the Scriptures. The deacon is ordained by the Bishop by laying on of hands, but without unction (c. 12, *dist.* XXIII., *Nicol.* I. a. 964; *gratiam vers.* c. 23, *Can.* I. q. VII. § 4). Hence, and for other reasons, it is disputed whether the consecration of a deacon is a sacrament, or only a sacramental rite (BENED. XIV. *de synodo*, lib. VIII. c. 9); and whether he possesses a *character indelibilis*. The original number, seven, became the rule (Acts 21 : 8), although more or less were occasionally appointed according to circumstances. (Concerning deacons in the Rom. C., see THOMASSIN, *vetus ac nova eccl. discipl.* I. 1, c. 51, 52, 53; II. c. 29-33. BINTERIM, *Denkw.* &c., I. 335-86. CASP. ZIEGLER, *de diaconis*, &c., *vet. eccl.* Viteberg, 1678. BINGHAM, *Orig. eccl.* II. c. 20. AUGUSTI, *Denkw.* XI. 194, &c.) In the *Greek C.*, the position and functions of the deacons are the same as in the Rom. C., only they may marry (see *Celibacy*).

In the *Evangelical C.* the office varies in its character. (See *Anglican C.*) In the *Lutheran C.* deacons are such as were chaplains or assist-

ant ecclesiastics in the Rom. C. They became the second parson, or in distinction from the first, as the parson, they were called preachers. If there were more than two, an archdeacon and subdeacon were appointed. At first the deacons were subordinate to the parson, but they soon acquired an equality, and performed like functions. They were paid out of the common funds, which mostly consisted of the town legacies; hence the office of deacon and magistrate were often combined. Recently the title second and third parson has been substituted for that of deacon. — From the office in this form must be distinguished deacons as associated with elders. The Reformers desired to restore the office in its primitive sense (Luther's works, *Walch* XIII., 2464), and rules to this effect were early adopted (*Richter*, *K.-ordn.* d. 16 Jahrh. I., 116, 117). — The *Reformed C.* from the first earnestly attempted this restoration of the office (*Richter*, l. c. I., 66, 122-3). Calvin regarded the office as one of the four essential to Church government (*Geneva Ch.-directory* in *Richter*, l. c. I., 346. *Conf. Gallicana*, art. 29; *Belgica*, art. 30, 31; *Bohemica*, art. IX.).

H. F. JACOBSON.*

Deaconesses were appointed by the primitive Church to serve their own sex in matters to which the deacons could not with propriety attend, though they sometimes assisted the brethren also (Rom. 16 : 2). The women named in Rom. 16 : 12 were probably deaconesses. No other traces of the office are found in the N. T.; Tit. 2 : 3; 1 Tim. 3 : 11; 5 : 9, &c., cannot allude to such. Tit. 2 : 3 refers to the reception into the *ταγμα χηρών, χηρικών*, among the distinguished class of *πρεσβυτείδες*, of such widows as were for their sex, what presbyters were for men (see CHRYSOST. *hom.*, 31, *de diversis N. T. locis*; EPIPHAN. *haer.*, 79, 4; TERT. *de virg. vel.*, c. 9; probably also HERMAS, I., v. 2). The 11th can. *Conc. Laodic.*, which abolished the office, calls them *viduæ seniores* in distinction from deaconesses, to whom the title widow was soon synonymously applied, because widows seemed best suited for the office; though such were not exclusively selected, much less aged widows. In Tertullian's time a maiden of 20 years was admitted in *viduatum* (*De virg. vel.*, c. 9). The *Cod. Theod.* does fix the 60th year, with reference to 1 Tim. 5 : 9; but the *Conc. Chalc.* reduced the age to 40 years. They were installed by the laying on of hands and a benediction (*Constt. apost.* VIII., 19). But the *Conc. Nic.* forbid this, lest it should be thought they were designed *εἰς τὸ ἱερατεῖον* (EPIPH. *haer.*, 90, 3). They attended the poor, the sick, prisoners, and sometimes assisted in preparing female catechumens for baptism (4th *Conc. Carth.*, c. 12; *Constt. Ap.*, VIII., 28). Though the preparation of the catechumens may have devolved upon presbytresses. The office soon ceased. In France it was abolished by the 1st Synod of Orange, 441, c. 26. It never existed in Germany. The title was retained but to designate prioresses in nunneries. According to BONA, *rer. lit.* I., 25, 15, it was first fully abolished in the 11th cent. There were still deaconesses in Constantinople at the close of the 12th cent. (BALSAMON *Comm. in Conc. Chalc.*, c. 15). But the Jaco

lites retained them. What led to the abolition of this office was the fact that, after Constantine M., the State assumed the care of the poor and sick, and infant baptism by affusion became more common. **HERZOG.***

Deacons' and Deaconesses' Houses.—We select these terms thereby at once to designate something different from the diaconate in the primitive sense. The terms deacons and deaconesses, as they have recently become current in different portions of the Evangelical C., express a new form of religious activity, which, however recent, seems to have widely and permanently enlisted the zeal of Christians. The particular terms themselves may not be the most happy; *Brethren's* and *Sister's houses* might be preferable. But the name is a small matter, if there be unanimity in regard to the thing itself. And although what has thus far been actually accomplished, might hardly be thought worthy of a separate article in this work, the idea which underlies this new movement, and its relation to corresponding beneficent operations in the earlier history of the Church, invest it with peculiar importance.

These institutions are not a resuscitation of the primitive apostolical diaconate, but an evangelical remodelling of those earlier ecclesiastical corporations, orders, &c., which aimed to relieve the poor, the sick, the forsaken, prisoners, and children, &c., but which were interrupted at the time of the Reformation. The want of such charities has of late again come to be deeply felt. By their abrogation, not only were vast pecuniary means diverted from their beneficent current, but a large amount of personal Christian labor, devoted to deeds of mercy, lost. And yet all the Reformers maintain that it is the duty of the Church to care for the poor, sick, &c., and that to neglect this is to deny the Lord himself. Abundant quotations in proof of this might be made here from their writings, and from the directories of that period. Whilst they exposed the evils of the various monastic and nominally charitable institutions of the age, they advocated the substitution of such modified forms of beneficence, as would afford a proper field for the cultivation and practice of Christian love and mercy, and, at the same time, secure to the needy proper relief (see **LUTHER**, *Walch's* ed. of his works, XIX., p. 1801, No. 55; pp. 1937, 2064, 2236; 1797, &c.; 781, § 70, 71; XII., p. 373, § 76). And yet such modifications were not then devised and adopted. Although some of the property obtained from dissolved monastic, &c., institutions, may have been appropriated to the establishment of schools, poor-houses, &c., the ecclesiastical fraternities themselves were wholly annulled. There were, indeed, sufficient reasons for their abrogation. They had become radically corrupt and dead; they were devoid of true faith and piety; they had long been an occasion of great offence (*Walch*, XIX., p. 1797; 1830; 780). It is no reproach, therefore, to the Reformation that it abolished them. They had fulfilled their mission, and properly made way for something better. And yet the evangelical substitutes failed to appear. The leaders of the Reformation, and the Church during that and the

subsequent period, were too intently engaged in spreading and establishing true doctrine, and restoring religious morality, to allow of their giving due heed to the claims of Christian charity, and it was but rarely that a voice was heard to plead these claims, as was done by *Balthasar Meissner*, Prof. in Wittenb. († 1626), in his tract, *Consilia theol. de quibusdam defectibus in et ab eccl. Evang. tollendis*.—A remarkable parallel occurs during the 17th cent. between the Evang. C. of Germany and the Romish C. of France. After the suppression, in France, of the Brethren of the common life, the Romish system of Orders took a new start, and almost exclusively for practical purposes, but upon the basis of the Romish error of righteousness by works. It thus presented the most decided contrast to the views of the Reformed C., and a justification of the zeal of the Reformers against such institutions. The Evangelical parallel to this movement was exhibited in the rise of *A. H. Franke's* orphan house in Halle, which became the parent of many daughters. About the same time a Bible Union and Preacher's Seminary arose in Halle, the latter of which sent forth thousands of pious ministers. But still there were no fully incorporated charitable institutions. The earliest approximation to these is found in the *Consortium theologicum* of Valentine Löschner, in Dresden. In those days, however, the renewed Brethren's Church (Moravians), became a vast missionary *ordo* of the Evang. C., which labored not only to spread the Gospel among heathen, but to revive true piety among nominal Christians. The seed of faith and love thus sown was preserved amid the overflowings of infidelity, and even amid the divine judgments which visited State and Church during the 18th cent., until at length the time came for it to sprout and yield fruit. We shall briefly notice some of the charitable fraternities which have thus far been organized upon this new evangelical basis, limiting our review to societies of brethren or sisters exclusively devoted to services of mercy, under the control of the Evangelical Church.

I. Brethren's Houses.—In each of these institutions the members are called (and call each other) brothers. Their bond of union is that of living faith in Christ. Only such are admitted as have already acquired some Christian experience. They must, except in that of Beuggen, be 20 years old, free from military service, from engagements of marriage, and cannot marry unless special permission is obtained. After undergoing a *novitiate* the brethren engage in the duties of the institutions, which are usually devoted to the care and training of, mostly poor, children, and also of the sick. They impart instruction chiefly in the Holy Scriptures, but also upon subjects belonging to a general education. In this respect the education imparted in the Brethren's houses corresponds with that of the public schools, without their being, properly, seminaries. Still there is a difference in the aims of the several houses themselves: at Beuggen the object is to train teachers, whilst at the Rauhe Haus they admit thoroughly trained teachers. The children, besides being instructed, are also taught some useful occupation; and

after their dismissal they maintain an intimate relation with the house, applying to their old teachers for counsel and advice.—The *Brethren at Beuggen*, in Baden, belong to the institution established there in 1820, which is also a house of correction for children; it has thus far had 500. The Brethren devote themselves to the instruction and training of the poor. Of 163 who have belonged to it, 143 have been sent out, who have had about 7200 children under their care at a time. They labor mostly in Switzerland, but are also spread among Germans in Russia, Hungary, N. America, Africa, and the East Indies. The institution is under the direction of Inspector Zeller, who also edits a *Monthly sheet*, containing reports of the doings of the Brethren.—The institution at *Lichtenstern*, Würtemberg, opened in 1836 for the training of teachers of poor-schools, is a daughter of that of Beuggen, and has the same aim. It contains 60 children. Since 1839 there have been 67 Br. in connection with it, who have had 2680 children under their care at one time. Their public organ is the *Süddeutsche Schulbote*. The Inspector is the Rev. J. Völter.—The *Brethren of the Rauhe Haus*, at Hamburg (since 1833), devote themselves, primarily, to the children's institute of the Rauhe Haus. Thus far 393 children have been admitted. The fraternity now numbers 170 members, from all parts of Germany; 40 of them are at present in the House; the other 130 are laboring at almost as many different posts. All the members have previously acquired some trade. In the House they occupy seven different departments "Convicts" called respectively: Nain, Emmaus, Bethel, &c. There is a theologian at the head of each department, as a chief assistant and counsellor; under him each "Convict" has a convict master, novice-master, a Schriftführer, and an elderly experienced Brother, as a family-brother, who has immediate charge of a family of 12 boys. There are strict rules for the management of each department, and the regulation of its duties. There are periodical two weeks' meetings of the Brethren, under the direction of the principal, in which the Brethren alone take part, and consult together in reference to the common objects of the institution.—Each day's labors are begun and ended with a common religious service, which all, numbering with the children about 200 persons, attend; during the day the Brethren alternately teach and labor in familiar intercourse with the children.—The Brethren sent out maintain intimate fellowship with those who remain at the institution, by reading every Sunday a passage of Scripture annually appointed for each Sunday, by a stated monthly concert of prayer, by communing twice a year, on the same Sunday, in whatever place they may be at the time, by means of a common fund raised out of their own means for mutual relief, and the relief of their bereaved widows and orphans, by frequent correspondence, and circulars issued from the institution, and by the "*Fliegende Blätter*" there published.—The 130 Br. sent out, are scattered abroad in Germany, Russia, Turkey, Italy, England, Texas in the United States, and serve in a great variety of capacities, as city missionaries,

as superintendents of houses of correction, teachers, colporteurs, &c. &c.—The above-named theological assistants form the "candidates'-convict," which now has nine members. Thus far 44 such theologians have belonged to the institution, the most of whom have been called to congregations, and 18 of whom have engaged in part, or permanently and entirely, in the service of the "inner mission" of Germany. Four of them have undertaken the establishment of corresponding institutions at Duisburg, Erlangen, Züllichow, and Neinstädt.—The *Institution of Deacons*, in Duisburg (since 1844), under Inspector Engelbert, connected with a "candidates'-convict," is a house of refuge and hospital; it accommodates 30 children. About 51 Br. have thus far been attached to it, of whom 20 are still in Duisburg, whilst others are laboring at different places. Their public organ is the "*Sonntagsblatt für innere Mission*."—The *Brethren's Instit. at Düsseldorf*, under Director Georgi (since 1847) has 14 members. Down to 1851 ten Br. had been sent out as managers of houses of refuge, and teachers. Their organ is the "*Menschenfreund and the Düsseldorfer Kinderzeitung*."—The *Brethren's Instit. at Züllichow*, near Stettin (since 1850), and that at *Neinstädt* (1850), have but recently commenced operations. They are beginning to send out Br. into Pomerania and Saxony, who labor to educate and aid the poor, and as colporteurs. The organ of the Neinstädt instit. is the "*Volksblatt für Stadt u. Land*."

II. *Institutions of Deaconesses*.—1. In Germany. The parent of all these is that of *Kaiserswerth* on the Rhine, founded by minister Fliedner, 1836, and which has greatly excelled all others in its efficiency. Planted in the midst of a Romish population, and beside Romish charitable societies (the Sisters of Mercy, Sisters of the child Jesus, &c.), this evangelical institution has continually grown, and given new proof of the energy of the principle of justifying faith, which animates it. It embraces seven branch institutions, which are united into one whole: a hospital which annually accommodates 600 sick persons; a teachers' seminary which has already educated 500 female teachers; an infant-school with 40 children; a small orphans' house for girls; an asylum for released female convicts (the earliest institution of this kind); an asylum for females of diseased minds, opened in 1850; a maternal institute for deaconesses, 1836. This last is more or less served by all the others. Those admitted (unmarried women under 40 years of age) become sisters on probation, and after being found worthy, are installed as deaconesses. They either become *teachers*, or, which is more usual, assume the care of the poor and sick. They continue in the institution, discharging these duties, until they are sent to some designated post of labor, from which, however, they return again, when the work assigned is accomplished. They pledge themselves to five years' service as deaconesses. To 1853 it had 163 sisters, of whom 119 were deaconesses. More than 100 are laboring beyond the institution, in private houses, in 26 public hospitals, in orphan asylums, asylums for the aged, infant-schools, &c., in almost every part of Ger-

many, but especially along the Rhine; also in Berlin, London (the German hospital), Pittsburgh, Constantinople, Smyrna, and Jerusalem. They have found it impossible, thus far, to respond to all the applications for help.—There is a separate house, Salem, for such members as have become sick, or exhausted in the service.—Similar institutions exist in Dresden (since 1847), Berlin (1847), Ludwigslust (1847), Breslau, Königsberg (1850), Stettin and Karlsruhe (1851), Stuttgart, Neudettelsau, &c.—2. In France there are at present two such institutions; one in Paris: *Instit. des Diaconesses des églises evang. de France*, founded, 1841, by Pastor Vermeil. It has six branches, a hospital, a Magdalen asylum, a house of discipline for young girls, a manual labor school (*apprentissage*), to train female domestics. It has 20 sisters in Marseilles, Montpellier, &c. The other Diaconessate is in Strasburg, and was started by Pastor Härter of that city, 1842, who has since then conducted it. It has a hospital, a Magdalen house, a house of correction for discharged female culprits, and a school for young servant girls. Of its 60 sisters, those sent out are mostly engaged in Alsace.—3. In Switzerland. The institution, founded in 1842 by Pastor Germond, at Echallens, fell a prey to the revolutionary fanaticism of 1848, and was transferred, in 1852, to St. Loup, where sisters are trained to take charge of the sick, and of orphans. There are 19 sisters belonging to it, and the hospital contains 30 beds. Some of the sisters have spread as far as Turin and Toulouse.—On Nov. 10, 1852, another institution was opened at Riehen, near Basel, and similar ones exist at Boudry and Berne.—4. In Holland one was opened at Utrecht in 1844. It has 14 sisters. Besides admitting sick persons into the hospital, the sisters attend them in private houses, and in stations in the hospital at Nymwegen. They also serve in the Magdalen asylum of Pastor Heldring, in Steenbeck. Similar sister-associations exist in Groningen and Amsterdam.—Besides the above there are similar institutions in Stockholm, Sweden, Pittsburgh, United States,¹ and in London (the instit. of Nursing Sisters, started by Elizabeth Fry; *St. John's House*, 34 Fitzroy-square; "the Sisters of Mercy," in Davenport and Plymouth; and the "House of Mercy," in Clever, near Windsor).—(See *Flüedner's Armen-u. Krankenfreund*, Oct., 1853; *Nathusius' Volksblatt*,

1854, No. 20; *Barnes*, Church of the Future; *Thiersch*, Vorles. über Kathol. u. Protestant. I., 280; *Rothe*, Ethik, III., 422, &c.; *Sartorius*, von d. heil. Liebe, III., 94). WICHERN.*

Deborah.—1. A nurse of Rebecca (Gen. 24: 59; 35: 8; Judges 4: 5).—2. A prophetess and judge in Israel. She was the wife of *Lapidoth*, and belonged to the tribe of Ephraim. She owed her influence to her prophetic gifts, and obtained a place among the judges of the land, by being employed as Jehovah's instrument in delivering Israel from Jabin's tyranny, which had oppressed the land for twenty years. Then Deborah, as the Lord's prophetess, required *Barak* to lead the hosts of Israel to battle, promising that Jehovah would give the foe into his hands (see *Barak*). Deborah's answer to Barak (Judges 4: 6) has been misconstrued by some into language of derision and scorn. It does imply that there was something lacking in Barak; this, however, was not *natural* courage, but full confidence in the prophetic authority of Deborah's call. After the overthrow of the enemy, D. celebrated the victory in a glorious song of triumph (Judges 5), the authenticity of which is now freely admitted by all critics. (Commentaries have been written upon it by C. H. HOLLMANN, Lips., 1818; KALKAR, Othin., 1833; KEMINK, *Ultraj.*, 1840; HERDER, Geist d. hebr. Poesie, II., 235, &c.; BÖTTGER, Bibl. Stud. d. sächs. Geisteslch., I.-III.; J. v. GUMPACH, Alttest. Studien: Heidelb., 1852, p. 1-138). KURTZ.*

Decalogue, from ἡ δεκαλογία sc. βιβλος or νομοθεσία, the common name for the Ten Commandments among the Greek fathers; or the Ten Words (LXX. οἱ δέκα λόγοι, τὰ δέκα ῥήματα) which constitute the groundwork and the sum of all the laws of Moses (Ex. 20: 1-17, and ch. 21-23; comp. 24: 7; 34: 28; Deut. 4: 13; 10: 4); hence called *the covenant* (Deut. 4: 13), which Jehovah is represented as having himself declared unto Israel, whilst the other laws were proclaimed by Moses. Comp. Philo de decal. § 5, ed. Mang. II. 183. They were engraven on both sides (Ex. 32: 15) of two tables of stone, which, as the testimony of Jehovah to his people, were preserved in the ark, in the holy of holies (Ex. 25: 21²).

The decalogue is recorded also in Deut. 5: 6, et seq. Apart from minor variations (for the most accurate collation, and variations from Samaritic text, vid. Vet. Test. ed. Kennikott, vol. I., p. 149), the principal differences between these records pertain to the *fourth* and the *tenth* commandments. In Exodus, the rest of God after the six days of creation is assigned as the reason for the Sabbath; in Deuteronomy, the deliverance from the bondage of Egypt. The tenth commandment begins, in Exodus, Thou shalt not *covet* thy neighbor's *house*; in Deuteronomy, Thou shalt not *desire* thy neighbor's

¹ Instead of these more completely organized institutions, many Evangelical churches in the U. S. have *Dorcas* and other charity societies, the general aim of which is the same. These are, indeed, comparatively limited and irregular in their operations; and yet the relief which they annually afford to the sick, the poor, and especially by providing necessary comforts for destitute children, is in the aggregate very considerable. In this way thousands are fed, clothed, and cared for, who do not share in other more public charities. This proves, at least, the existence of a spirit of Christian compassion kindred to that which has led to the organizations described above, and affords ground to hope that permanent and effective schemes of Christian charity will ere long be generally adopted.—Thus far the Episcopal churches and Friends of this country, have exhibited the most zeal and liberality in the founding and maintenance of asylums and hospitals for the infirm, aged, and sick. Such institutions exist in all our principal cities.

² On this passage to be explained by reference to 34: 1, vid. Hengstenberg, Beiträge, III. p. 387; and Bertheau, die sieben Gruppen mosaischer Gesetze, 1840, p. 98.

³ Hitzig maintains that upon the second table was engraven an entirely different decalogue, that, namely, which is recorded in Ex. 34: 12-26; vid. his "Ostern und Pfingsten im zweiten Dekalog." For criticism see Hengstenberg and Bertheau.

wife. The Septuagint conforms the order in Exodus to that of Deuteronomy; but the change is not sustained by any of the other old authorities.

Division of the Decalogue; vid. Treatises by Sonntag, in Theol. Studien, 1836; also by Züllig, ibid. I. II. 1837; especially Geffcken on "Eintheilung des Dekalogus und den Einfluss derselben auf den Cultus, 1838.

There are three methods of enumeration. The first method, which came to prevail in the Romish Church through the influence of Augustine, and is retained by the Lutherans, holds Ex. 20: 2-6 to be the first command, the essence of which is expressed in v. 3, verses 4, 5, and 6 being regarded as merely explanatory. "Thou shalt not covet thy neighbor's house" is then taken for the ninth; and "Thou shalt not covet thy neighbor's wife, nor his man-servant," &c., for the tenth. Yet Augustine (Quæst. in Exod. 71) decides in favor of the order as given in Deuteronomy; and is followed among modern biblical scholars by Sonntag.

The second and third methods of enumeration agree in holding the prohibition of the different species of lust to be but one command, the tenth; but differ in the division of the first and second. The second method, current among the Jews, takes Ex. 20, v. 2 to be the first commandment, and v. 3-6 to be the second, the one being regarded as requiring faith in God as the all-perfect being, the other faith in him as *one* God, and prohibiting idolatry; whilst the third method, received by the Greek Church, the Reformed Church, and by Socinians, takes v. 3, "Thou shalt have no other gods before me to be the first, and v. 4-6 to be the second.

Of these methods the most ancient historical testimony is in favor of the *third*. Compare Josephus, Ant. III. 5, 5; Philo quis rerum div. hæc. § 35. M. I. 496, de decal. § 12, M. II. 188; and Origen, homil. in Exod. 8 (ed. Lommatsch, tom. IX. p. 91). Origen is acquainted also with the conception of the first command, which is peculiar to the first method, but knows nothing of a division of the tenth; for he raises the objection: *quodsi ita putetur, non complebitur decem numerus mandatorum. Et ubi jam erit decalogi veritas?* The first clear trace of the Jewish or second enumeration is to be found in the Gemara of Babylon (Tract. Maccoth, 24 a.). As regards the Romish, or Augustinian, conception of the first commandment, the remark ought to be made that it is sustained by one of the two accentuations which accompany the masoretic text, and by the Jewish collection of Sabbath Lessons; and, it is very probable, was handed down by ancient Jewish tradition.

The decision of the question as to which of these methods of enumeration is correct, depends properly on a consideration of the internal structure of the decalogue; and this results, without doubt, in favor of the third, or Philonian method.—The theory which limits the *first command* to v. 2 (Ex. 20) is contradicted by the form of the verse itself; as Origen remarks: *hic sermo nondum sermo mandati est, sed quis sit, qui mandat, ostendit. Verse 2 exhibits the being of God, and deliverance from the bondage of Egypt as the ultimate ground of all the obliga-*

tions of Israel; and resembles the formula which introduces and concludes the commands given in Lev. 18 (comp. Lev. 19). Hence the connection of v. 2 and 3 is very intimate. Israel shall have no other gods before Jehovah, because he revealed his power over heathen gods and his faithfulness to his people in bringing them out of the house of bondage. Thus also does the argument lose its force, which is derived in favor of uniting v. 2-6 into one commandment, from the opinion that, if v. 3 be taken as a separate command, it seems to have no basis; for v. 2 is not merely introductory to the whole decalogue, but a special reason for the first command in verse 3.

The separation of v. 2-6 into two commands is sustained decidedly by the difference as to matter between v. 3 and v. 4. The requirement to worship Jehovah only does not as such prohibit the worship of Jehovah under the form of an image; and the prohibition in v. 4 and 5 does not specify, as some Lutherans claim (e. g., Gerhard, loci ed. Cott. v. V. p. 244), the worship of heathen gods, but pertains to a particular form of the worship of Jehovah.

As regards the last command, a division may indeed be justified by the record in Deuteronomy, according to which we may make a distinction between *cupiditas impuræ voluptatis* and *cupiditas inordinati lucri*. But the record in Exodus is undoubtedly the original one; and according to this, no essential difference can be shown to exist between the ninth and tenth commands, as given in the Romish method of enumeration. Hence even Luther combines the two in his Catechism. Other variations affect the order only in which the other commands follow each other; and show that the Jews and primitive Christians used greater freedom in the enumeration of the commandments than prevails in modern times.

Another question pertains to the division of the Decalogue into *two tables*, in reference to which the O. T. contains no express declarations. If the Philonian, or third method of enumeration be correct, five commandments must be assigned to each table, as was done by Philo and Josephus (Ant. III., 6, fin.). (Comp. Iren. II., 42 [24, 4]). Each of the first five is distinguished from the rest by being referred to a ground or motive, and by the formula, "the Lord (or Jehovah) thy God." The first table develops love to God, the second, love to man. (Matt. 22: 37-39). The command to honor father and mother is put on the first table, because the relation of children to parents is that of devotion to the representatives of God on earth; and, standing last, it forms the transition to the duties of the second table.—Eph. 6: 2, has been frequently cited to prove that the second table begins properly with the command to honor father and mother; and Ambrosiaster, accordingly (Ambrosii opp. ed., Paris, p. 248), has assigned *four* to the first, and *six* to the second table. The usual reply is, that this command, though last on the first table, may be designated as the first in the Decalogue to which a promise is annexed. But the correct explanation of Eph. 6: 2, is: "which is a first or principal command in a promise, that is, be-

cause it is connected with a promise." Interpreted thus, the passage has no bearing upon the position of the command on the tables of the Decalogue. — (Comp. Winer, *in loco*.) Calvin, also (Inst. II., 8, 12), whom the Reformed Church follows, decides in favor of the division into four and six, because if the fifth is put upon the first table, we ignore *religionis et caritatis distinctionem*; and refers to Matt. 19: 19. — In the Romish and Lutheran Church, on the other hand, it became usual to refer *three* to the first, after the example of Augustine, and *seven* to the second table. (Comp. Cat. Rom. ps. III., C. 5, 9, 1, and Luther's Larg. Cat.). This division receives some support from the circumstance that *three* and *seven* are sacred numbers, and that thus the tables are nearly of equal extent.

Following Philo, we may analyze the contents of the Decalogue as follows: The first com. of the first table affirms the principle of monotheism in opposition to polytheism in the first command; and in the second, the immateriality of the divine being in opposition to the deification of nature. In the third, it enjoins reverence for God in all the actions of life by specifying a violation of reverence which is most likely to occur. In the fourth, it establishes public worship by affirming one of its fundamental elements. In the fifth, it recognises the parental relation as of divine authority by commanding children to honor their parents, and thus lays the foundation for the sanctification of social life.

The second table is evidently determined by the threefold conception of actual sin — of the hand, mouth, and heart (Ps. 24: 4) — frequently occurring in the O. Testament. Thus Thom. Aq., Savonarola (vid. Rudelbach, Savon. and his Times, p. 406), Hengstenberg, Beitr. III., p. 600. The law forbids, first, sins in act, namely, injury done to the life, the matrimonial relations, and the property of a fellow-man; then forbids sins in word, or injury done to his good name by falsehood; and finally, forbids even the desire to possess what another possesses, thus revealing the obedience required by the law to be a spiritual or internal obedience, which can become complete only in the sanctification of the heart. This exposition of the last command is sustained by the manner in which the verb *לֹא תִחָדָד*, is always used in Deuteronomy. It is assumed also by Paul in Rom. 7: 7, comp. Prov. 6: 25. — The unity and completeness of the Decalogue affords a striking proof of the genuineness of the Pentateuch.

The theological controversies touching the Decalogue, have reference to the *extent* and *dignity* of the law which it proclaims. Vid. Baumgarten's Unters. theol. Streitigkeiten, edited by Semler, Vol. III., p. 226, et seq.

The spiritual warfare which the fathers of the Reformed Church waged against the idolatrous practices of the Romish Church, led them to lay special stress on the prohibition of image-worship, Ex. 20: 4. Zwingli viewed the Romish method of enumeration as a mutilation of the Decalogue productive of the worst consequences; yet insisted that, whether counted as the first or a part of the second, the prohibition of image-worship should by no means be omitted. (Vid. Geffcken, p. 33 and p. 267, et seq.). The cate-

chism of Leo Judæ (1534), contains it as the second. (Geffcken, p. 270). Hence, it is an error to refer the introduction into the Reformed Church of this method of enumeration to Calvin. Ex. 20: 4, however, only forbids the use of images as objects of adoration, whilst the Reformed theologians condemn any connection whatever of images with Church cultus; and thus give the prohibition an application that goes far beyond the literal meaning of the words. (For Zwingli's view, vid. Zeller, das theol. System Zwingli's, p. 107). In expounding the second command, Calvin is content to say: *duo tantum hic vetat, ne quas faciamus imagines vel Dei effigendi vel adorandi causa*; (Cat., Genev. ed., Niem., p. 141; comp. Inst. II., 8, 17), but in applying it he concurs in the extreme views of Zwingli. (Geffcken, p. 52).

Here the controversy hinged between the Reformed and Lutheran Church as to the true method of enumeration. Luther retained the Romish enumeration, because averse to any change which could be avoided without prejudice to the gospel; and the fanaticism of Carlstadt gave him occasion to maintain that the divine command does not prohibit the making of images, but only the conversion of images and pictures into idols, or means of idolatrous worship. In this matter freedom of conscience must, therefore, be allowed (Luth. Erl. Ausg., XXIX., p. 144, 148). This position led the Reformed theologians to accuse the Lutherans of mutilating the Decalogue, and doing violence to the Word of God. The Lutherans in turn not only vindicated Christian liberty in *diaphoris* and exposed the extravagance of the Reformed, but endeavored also to defend the Romish enumeration as correct. (Comp. Gerhard; Pfeiffer, dub. vex. cent. I., loc. 96; opp. Vol. I., p. 124; and Walch, Einleit. in die Religionsstreitigkeiten ausser der evan. Luth. Kirche., III., p. 409).

Following the Church Fathers, the Reformers held the Decalogue to be a complete summary of the moral law. It is the *lex moralis* in distinction from *lex ceremonialis*; (Apol. A. Cf. ed. Rech., p. 60; Loci Com. ed. Arg., p. 357; Cal. Inst. II., 8), and contains the *aeterna Dei regula*, which is essentially the *lex naturæ*; Christ added nothing to the Decalogue, but only expounded it. But a distinction must be made between that which is essential and non-essential, permanent and transient; and among the latter, not only Luther and Melancthon, but Calvin and other Reformed theologians included the sanctification of the seventh day. (Riveti explic. decal. in opp., Vol. I., p. 1335). It was left for Puritanism to maintain the sanctification of the Sabbath as a permanent moral obligation; yet in transferring the obligation from the seventh to the first day of the week, it evades the logical consequences of its own theory. (West. Conf. Ch., 21). For the controversy on the identity of the Decalogue and the moral law, vid. Baumgarten's Unters. theol. Streit. III., p. 229; and Buddei theol. mor., p. 369.

Another controversy sprung up between orthodox theology and Socinianism, as to the *dignity* of the Decalogue. Socinians admitted it, indeed, to be a summary of the moral law of the O. T., (the fourth command, a part of the ceremonial

law, excepted; Cat. Racov. q. 268), but regarded its contents as greatly inferior to that of the moral precepts of Christ. (vid. Fock, Socinianismus, p. 560, et seq.). At a later period, however, they went much further; denying all moral significance to the Decalogue, they viewed it simply in the light of a civil enactment.

OEHLER.—Gerhart.

Decapolis (Matt. 4: 25; Mark 5: 20; 7: 31) is the name of a district lying *beyond* the Jordan, including ten cities and their suburbs (Jos. Vita, c. 9; PLIN., *hist. nat.*, V., 16, 17). It lay in the N. E. part of Palestine, near the sea of Galilee, and its inhabitants were mostly *heathen* (Luke 8: 26, 37, 39; Jos., *B. J.*, 3, 9, 7). The Romans, about the time Archelaus began to reign, placed it under the Syrian governor (EWALD, *Isr. Gesch.* 3, b. p. 517), so that it was reckoned with Syria (Jos. Vita, c. 65). Under the Romans it enjoyed peculiar advantages (Jos., *Ant.*, 14, 4, 4; 17, 11, 4, &c.). Pliny names the cities in the following order: Damascus, Philadelphia (the Rab-bath of Deut. 3: 11; 2 Sam. 11: 1), Raphana (1 Macc. 5: 37), Scythopolis (Bethshan, 1 Sam. 31: 10), Gadara (opposite Scythopolis, and chief city of Perea, Matt. 8: 28; Mark 5: 1), Hippon, Dion, Palla, Gerasa, and Canatha. It is noteworthy that Damascus occurs in this list; for Jos., *B. J.*, 3, 9, 7, says Scythopolis was the largest city of Decapolis, whereas Damascus is much larger than S. And instead of Raphana, PROLEX., 5, 15, puts Capitolias. LIGHTFOOT, *hor. hebr.*, 563, &c., adds Cesarea Phil., Caphar-kanaïm, Capharzemach, Beth-goberim, and Orbu, otherwise unknown towns. Although these cities were not geographically connected, they were commercially leagued together, for the special advantage of their predominantly Greek population; the number thus associated may have varied at different times. (See EWALD, *l. c.* 2, p. 336, &c.). Whether this league was formed before or after the time of Herod M., is unknown; but it probably terminated with the destruction of Jerusalem. VAHINGER.*

Decius was elected Emperor of Rome by the army, in 249, and soon after confirmed the choice by a victory over Philip, at Verona. Decius ascended the throne with vast schemes. He was determined to restore the power of the city as the ruling metropolis of the empire, to resuscitate the ancient Roman spirit, and restore its institutions and religion. In the execution of these schemes he had to suppress civil wars, repel Barbarian invasions, overcome rivals, and check the aspirations of ambitious generals. He divided the government, appointed Cesars, and placed them over the provinces. But this endangered the unity of the empire. To save this he had to remove everything which tended to increase the peril. Now one of the most threatening social powers within the empire was Christianity, which had been tolerated so long, without being suspected as in its nature inimical to the ancient Roman institutions and religion, that it had almost imperceptibly increased and spread into all parts of the Roman world. Personally Decius, like Trajan, was hostile to Christianity only as he thought it a political league. It seemed necessary, therefore, to the successful prosecution of his schemes, that Christianity

should be exterminated. He accordingly ordered a general persecution in 250. This persecution is usually reckoned the seventh; but its extent, severity, and effects entitle it to be called the first general persecution in the Roman empire. Persons suspected of being Christians were required to sacrifice to the gods, and offer incense to the image of the Emperor. Those who refused were warned, mildly punished, then, if they persisted, put to death. The property of those who fled was confiscated. The effect was terrible, and many denied their faith. Numbers fled to the deserts, and became the forerunners of monasticism. But thousands remained steadfast, and were honored as confessors. The leaders of the congregations were most severely dealt with (see *Cyprian* and *Dionysius*). Among others who fled were the seven Ephesian youths, who hid themselves in a cave, where they are said to have fallen asleep, and not to have awaked for 200 years.—Decius died (251) without accomplishing his object. The Church, purified by the fires which had consumed much bad material, came forth brighter and stronger than ever.—(See *Lapsi*; EUSEB., H. E., VI., 40–42; CYPR., *sermo de lapsis*; GFRÖRER's K.-gesch., I., 553–6; BURCKHARDT's *Zeit Const. d. Gr.*, p. 22. Cfr. PAULY's *Realencycl.*, II., 880).

A. VOGEL.*

Defensor matrimonii.—The Romish C., ordinarily, allows of divorce only as to connubial intercourse (*separatio quoad mensem et thorum*), the bonds of marriage remaining unbroken (see *Marriage*). A complete dissolution of those bonds is secured by an *annulling* of the marriage. In order to correct the growing evil of doing this on frivolous grounds, Benedict XIV., in an encyclical letter of Aug. 26, 1741, *Quamvis quaternæ vigilantia*, and a bull of Nov. 3, 1741, *Dei miseratione* (*Bullar. Magn. ed. Luxemb. T. XVI. fol. 41, 48, &c.*), directed attention to the matter, and required each Bishop to appoint some duly qualified person in his diocese as a *matrimoniorum defensor*. It was made the duty of this officer to attend the courts before which applications for the entire annulling of marriage came, and oppose them, even to the last appeal, unless, after thorough investigation, they were found to be entirely justifiable. The office was soon established throughout the Romish C. It is an admirable one, and is worthy of universal introduction. Austria and Prussia have, in part, adopted the measure (see *v. Savigny, Darstellung d. in d. preusz. Gesetzen über d. Ehescheidung unternommenen Reform*, Berlin, 1844).

H. F. JACOBSON.*

Dei gratia.—St. Paul usually speaks of himself as being called to the apostleship "by the will of God" (1 Cor. 1: 1). It was natural for Bishops, who thought themselves successors of the apostles, to employ a similar designation. Felix of Rome, 356, styles himself, *Per gratiam Dei episc.* Afterwards *Dei* or *Christi nomine*, *miseratione*, *miser cordia*, were used by ecclesiastics, as well as by civil officers. *Rothaire*, in his edict for the Lombards, 643, calls himself, *in Dei nomine rex, anno Deo propitiante regni mei octavo* (WALTER, *corpus jur. Germ.* I. 683). *Ethelbald: divina dispensatione rex Merciorum*, 716. Since Pipin, *Dei gratia* has been in vogue,

Charlemagne used it, and, since the 7th cent., the German Bishops (PERTZ, *Monum. Germ.* III. 33). Subsequently other expressions were added, especially, *apostolicæ sedis gratia*, or *providentia* (HARTZHEIM, *Conc. Germ.* I. 43); so Adalbert, Archb. of Mayence, in a letter to Calixtus, 1121, and Eberhard II., B. of Bamberg (PRZ, *thes. noviss. anecdot.* VI. 368). But the phrase came into general use first since the 14th cent. (See GEISLER, *de titulo; Nos Dei gr. Lips.* 1677, 4to; TILESII, *de sensu tituli: Nos Dei gr. Regimont.* 1723, 4to.; HEUMANN, *de tit.: Dei gr. Gotting.* 1727, &c.; MABILLON, *de re diplom. lib.* II. c. II. § X.; BINTERIM, *Denkw.*, &c., I. Th. II. 150, &c.) II. F. JACOBSON.*

Deism. — The term is used in a *metaphysical* and in a *theological* sense. Metaphysical Deism, a system of modern origin, holds, in opposition to Atheism, that there is a God, and, in opposition to Pantheism, that he is not only to be distinguished from the world, but is also separated from it. His relation is external. Once created, the universe moves on in its course according to the laws of nature, without the interposition of God. Theism, on the contrary, holds an internal relation of God to the universe; namely, that he has created, and now preserves and governs it as a whole and in all its parts.

Theological Deism teaches that Christianity is a system of natural religion — a faith in God which is according to the dictates of the reason. Whatever is not conformable to the human understanding is to be set aside as being no part of the Christian religion. As to its matter, Deism is *naturalism*; for it takes natural religion to be the norm and the sum of revealed religion. As to its form, it is *rationalism*; for it accords to the reason the right, independently of all authority, to examine and purify the Christian religion.

This species of Deism arose in England during the 17th and 18th centuries, under the influence of the Reformation, of philosophy, and general culture, combined with that of Socinianism, the criticisms of Spinoza and the social condition of France. The progress of the Reformation in England being one of violent conflict, many parties sprung up in opposition to the Established Church — a state of things that awakened a desire to find some basis upon which all the divisions of Protestantism might unite. — Francis Bacon, of Verulam, († 1626), reduced knowledge to experience as its source (Empiricism), and thus originated a particular school of philosophy, whose influence modified the general culture of the nation. Though he drew a clear line of distinction between knowledge and faith, theology and philosophy, and based the belief of Christianity upon the word of God, some of his disciples applied the principle, that philosophy is an induction from experience, to Christianity also. Thomas Hobbes († 1679) developed the principle to its last results. All knowledge is derived from sensation (Sensationalism instead of Empiricism), and will from sensual desire: hence, good and evil as such do not exist; nor is there a moral law: religious faith and worship have arisen partly from perverted reflection upon experience, partly from fear and have been "formed" into posi-

tive religion by founders of governments and lawgivers: the Scriptures aim at the establishment of a kingdom of God; its teachings may in part be above reason, but cannot be against it: the Church is a society, dependent like a civil corporation upon the will of the sovereign, who, as its head by divine right, determines what is to be taught and believed. The influence of these principles upon the general mind was deep and broad. Deeper and broader still, however, was the influence of John Locke († 1704). Deriving all knowledge, all religious and moral ideas, from two sources, sensation and reflection, he ascribes to the reason the authority to decide upon the reality and true meaning of Revelation; and maintains that, though Revelation communicates truths in the simplest style which the reason could not have discovered, or at best could have apprehended only under a scientific form, it can nevertheless communicate such truths only as do not contradict the reason. The reason does, indeed, not originate, but it can comprehend, Christian truth. Thus Locke strengthened the rationalistic tendency, though on account of his belief in Revelation many orthodox Christians adhered to him.

The line of Deists, however, begins properly with Edward Herbert, Lord Cherbury († 1633), a civilian and a scholar, who unfolded his religio-philosophical theory in two larger works: *De veritate*, 1624, a critique on knowledge, and *De religione Gentilium*, 1633, a critique on faith; and in two smaller works: *De causis errorum*, and *de religione laici*. Herbert regards religion as the highest specific attribute of man; and reduces it to five elementary truths: 1, The existence of God; 2, the duty of adoration; 3, virtue and piety as the principal constituents of adoration; 4, the duty to be sorry for sin, and forsake it; 5, Divine retribution in this life, and in the next. Natural religion, he maintains, originally pure, degenerated through the innovations of the priests; and the Christian religion, resting on these same principles, was corrupted by the hierarchy. Nevertheless these five main pillars of pure religion, lying back of all questions which divide religious parties, remain unshaken; and are sufficient for the attainment of salvation, even without a revelation. Revelation is not necessary, though not impossible, and even under certain conditions credible. — Charles Blount († 1693), author of *anima mundi*, 1679, and of *Oracles of Reason*, 1695, adopted the theory of Hobbes concerning the authority of State in matters of religion and the five articles of Herbert, in connection with the notion that an originally pure pagan religion was corrupted by the pretended revelations of selfish priests; and though he did not attack Christianity directly, sought nevertheless to bring it into disrepute by means of wit and satire (1660–1689).

After the revolution of 1689, when William III. was elevated to the throne, the freedom of the press established by law, and the *Reasonableness of Christianity*, propounded by Locke, became the received maxim, the seeds of Deism, previously sown, began to sprout and grow rapidly. John Toland, an Irishman of considerable learning († 1722) published a work, entitled *Christianity not mysterious* (1696), in

which, adopting the Lockean method, he attempted to show that the Gospel was neither contrary to, nor yet above reason; that the truths of revealed religion, because useful and necessary, were as easily understood as the known properties of wood, air, or water. To establish so extraordinary a theory, Toland argued, from the nature of the reason and of knowledge, from the Bible and the Church fathers, that there were no mysteries in primitive Christianity; but that, in the course of time, they were foisted in by a spirit of accommodation to Judaism, and to paganism, and by philosophy. A violent controversy ensued; the book was publicly burned by order of the Irish parliament; and the author escaped a judicial prosecution only by a sudden flight from Dublin. Toland was followed by Anthony Collins, a personal friend, and a disciple of Locke. In 1713 he published anonymously a *Discourse on Free-thinking*, in which, opposing blind submission to authority, he vindicates free thinking, that is, thinking without faith, as the right of man, which should never be restrained; for it is allowed by the Bible itself; the prophets of the Old Testament were free-thinkers; Christ would have men search the Scriptures; and Paul acknowledges the freedom of human judgment when he reasons from premises; besides, the men most distinguished for virtue in every age have been free-thinkers. This book, pervaded by a spirit of bitterness towards Christianity, the Church, and mankind, called forth numerous replies, of which that by Bentley, the celebrated philologist, is the most ingenious and forcible. Yet all the opponents of Collins and Locke agreed with them that there can be no absolute contradiction between the reason and revelation, and that thought must be free; *free*, however, they meant in the true sense of the word, and not led captive by the prejudices of infidelity. A work by Whiston on prophecy gave occasion to Collins, ten years later, 1724, to attack indirectly the evidences for the divine authority of Christianity, in *A Discourse of the Grounds and Reasons of the Christ. Rel.* After criticising the hypotheses of Whiston, he proceeds: The principal evidence for the truth of Christianity is certainly to be found in prophecy, but must be drawn from it by means of allegorical interpretation: each new revelation is based upon a previous one; thus the truth of Christianity depends upon the revelations of the O. T.: that Jesus of Nazareth is the promised Messiah, the fundamental doctrine of the Gospel, can be proved from the O. T. only; for neither miracles nor the authenticity of the books of the N. T. can establish the truth of Christianity: if, therefore, the proof derived from the O. T. be valid, Christianity rests unshaken upon its true foundation; if not, it is groundless. But the proof which the writers of the N. T. derive from prophecy, depends upon typical and allegorical interpretation; apostolic Christianity, accordingly, is based upon types and allegories; hence if, with Whiston, allegorical interpretation be rejected as weak and fanatical, the foundation of the Christian religion is destroyed.—The whole argument tends to make the impression that Christianity is of doubtful authority, because

the only possible method of establishing its truth is not conclusive. In the controversy which arose, some maintained that Christianity does not rest positively upon the O. T.; others that the prophecies of the O. T. have actually been fulfilled; whilst some admitted that, in single instances, the evangelists and apostles erred in their interpretations. The discussion of the evidences from prophecy led to a discussion of evidences from *miracles*; and the allegorical method of interpretation was transferred from the one to the other. Thomas Woolston († 1731) endeavored to show (*Discourses on the Miracles of our Saviour*, 1727–30) that, if the narratives be taken literally, the historical truth of the miracles must be called into question; and, therefore, concluded that the letter of the narratives, as it conveys no rational sense, must contain a mystical meaning. That is to say, the New Testament is not to be understood literally, but allegorically. The most forcible reply to Woolston was the examination of the Witnesses of the resurrection, by Sherlock; a work that, 15 years afterwards, provoked an attack upon the evidences of the resurrection, by Peter Annet († 1768). Laying aside the restraints of allegorical interpretation, Annet took ground against the conception of a miracle; discarded the miracles of Paul; impugned his character; and betrayed a spirit of proud hostility to the whole Gospel history.

When Deism had come to the conclusion that there is nothing mysterious in Christianity, that the liberty of reason in matters of religion must be unlimited, and had repudiated the evidences derived from prophecy and miracles, the question arose: in what, then, does the positive truth of Christianity consist? The answer was: the substance and end of the Christian religion is *morality*. This was the thought unfolded by Shaftesbury († 1713) (*Characteristicks*, 1714). The created world is a harmonious whole; the morally good consists in the beautiful; and the beautiful is the end of religion and the perfection of virtue. Virtue is its own end; hence, the promise of reward in heaven is prejudicial to virtue. A decided but cunning enemy, Shaftesbury concealed his hostility under cover of indirect attacks upon the Christian faith.

The most complete summary of Deism was brought out in 1730, by Matt. Tindal († 1733). The work is entitled, *Christianity as old as the Creation; or, the Gospel a republication of the Religion of Nature*. True religion, this “great apostle of Deism” agrees, is natural religion; and consists in the practice of morality, in obedience to the will of God, or in a manner of life which is agreeable to the reason of things. Natural religion is absolutely perfect; hence revealed religion cannot add anything to it, nor detract from it. The Christian religion is identical with natural religion; in as far as new, it is a restoration of those original principles taught by nature, which have been distorted by superstition. As revealed religion coincides with the religion of nature, reason must sit in judgment on all the doctrines of the Christian faith. The fundamental idea of Tindal was shown to be contrary to history, and untenable, by J. Conybeare, in his *Defence of Revealed Religion*;

though, like many others, he fails to recognize the essence and true dignity of Christianity. The complement of Tindal's a priori deductions is a work on the *True Gospel of Christ*, by Thomas Chubb († 1747), the glove-maker. Chubb examines the discourses of Christ, in order to determine his doctrines, precepts, and design; and infers from them that Christ enjoins those things only as duties which are in themselves obligatory; that it was his mission to revive a sound view of morality, and reduce it to practice by the organization of pious associations; and that the Gospel is, therefore, not a matter of belief, but a system of morality, which is identical with the religion of nature. Applying this method of reasoning to the Old Testament, Thomas Morgan († 1743) perverted the history of the Jews, arrayed the teachings of the New Testament against those of the Old, rejected the atonement and other doctrines as the dregs of Judaism, and, in opposition to Judaistic Christianity, proclaimed himself proudly a "Deistic Christian." Lord Bolingbroke, carrying out the principles of Tindal, Chubb, and Morgan to their legitimate consequences, viewed religion as a measure of State policy, re-affirmed the pure Gospel to be nothing more than natural religion, rejected the doctrines of the Church as the foolish innovations of men, and dismissed the effort to reconcile true philosophy to the Scriptures as vain.

The opinion now began to prevail that reason and revelation are irreconcilable, and Deism, in doubt of its own theory, passed over into skepticism, which was fully developed by Hume († 1776). Thus, the entire effort to reduce Christianity to natural religion by a process of logical reasoning, resulted in doubting the truth of all religion. English Deism operated as a strong support to the naturalism of France and the rationalism of Germany.—Vid. View of the principal Deistical writers, by John Leland; Versuch einer vollst. eng. Freydenker-Bibliothek, by Thorschmid, 1765–67; Gesch. des engl. Deismus by Lechler, 1841.

G. V. LECHLER. — Gerhart.

Demoniacs. Among all the miracles wrought by our Lord, the healing of demoniacs, or those possessed of devils, formed the most remarkable class. They are so, partly, because of the difficulty of ascertaining definitely the nature of the disease, as it is described in the N. T.; partly, because no completely analogous cases occur, either in the O. T., that of Saul being only similar (1 Sam. 18 : 10 ; 19 : 9, 23), or since the times of Christ and his apostles; for the mere assertions of persons psychically disordered that they are possessed, require, at least, more thorough investigation.

To throw light on this obscure subject, we must first compare the expressions of the N. T. concerning demoniacal possessions, as to the appearances presented; then examine the different views on the subject; and finally, endeavour to decide concerning it, agreeably to the spirit of the Christian faith, and the settled principles of natural science. — The N. T. often speaks of the entire class of these afflicted persons, and designates them as οἱ δαιμονιζόμενοι (Matt. 4 : 24; Mark 1 : 32), and as ἐνοχλούμενοι ἀπὸ πνευ-

μάτων ἀκαθάρτων (Luke 6 : 18). The evil spirits producing this state are called δαιμόνια (Matt. 10 : 8; Mark 1 : 34, 39; 3 : 15; 6 : 18; Luke 9 : 1; 10 : 17), or, indiscriminately, πνεύματα (Matt. 8 : 16; Luke 10 : 20), or πνεύματα ἀκαθάρτα (Matt. 10 : 1; Mark 3 : 11; 6 : 7; Luke 6 : 18). The curing is called, with reference to the spirits, ἐκβάλλειν (Matt. 8 : 16; 10 : 1, 8; Mark 1 : 34, 39; 3 : 15; 6 : 13); with reference to the possessed, δραπετεύειν (Luke 6 : 18; 7 : 21), or ἰάσθαι (Matt. 15 : 28); and of the disciples of Christ it is said, τὰ δαιμόνια or τὰ πνεύματα ὑποτάσσεται αὐτοῖς (Luke 10 : 17, 20).—That the N. T. writers do not here mean only physical disorders is admitted, even by the chief rationalistic expositors. Δαιμόνια means evil spirits in the service of Satan, the prince of the kingdom of darkness. But who are these evil spirits? Are they fallen angels, or departed souls of ungodly men? Josephus thought they were the latter; and the Pseudo-Clementine Homilies consider as demons the souls of the giants, who, Gen. 6 (in this view) had been begotten by devils with the daughters of men. But all such conjectures have no value, except as they are found to agree with the Scriptures. There is no reason for taking the term ἀκαθάρτος in a sense which it long ago lost. The LXX., in places without number, uses the word to signify not merely "unpurified," but simply "impure;" and so, in Matt. 3 : 30, an unclean spirit is mentioned, which cannot be a human soul, but only Satan himself. The wicked spirits in Rev. 16 : 13; 18 : 2, cannot be departed souls, but devils. It is thus by far the most natural to understand by those δαιμόνιοι, real devils, i. e., fallen angels.

But a more important question is, what these spirits did in their victims. Their connexion with the men is indicated variously; by the word δαιμονιζεσθαι, "to be possessed of a devil," which defines nothing; by ἐνοχλεῖσθαι, "to be vexed, tormented" (Luke 6 : 18); by δεῖσθαι, "to be bound" (Luke 13 : 16); by ἔχειν πνεῦμα, "to have a spirit" (Acts 8 : 7; 16 : 16); in Josephus by εἰσδύεισθαι, "to intrude" (Wars, 7, 6, 3); by ἵστασθαι, "to take one's abode in" (Ant. 6, 11, 2);—the severing of that connection by ἐξελθεῖν, "to go out" (Matt. 8 : 32, &c.); which of course presupposes the ἵστασθαι of Josephus, though not necessarily a mere mechanical fixedness in space, but a dynamical inbeing, a working, as is implied by the "binding" and "vexing." That a change was produced in the bodily functions, by an influence foreign to the human constitution is manifest throughout. The soul loses power over the body. An alien force has intervened, producing disturbance and constraint in the command of the soul over the bodily organs. But the conscious soul itself is never displaced by the demon, is not the seat, or directly the subject of his influence. He acts on the nervous system, and produces phenomena like those commonly witnessed in the bodily states under other sorts of nervous derangement. The influence is not upon the moral nature, but upon the invisible element of the physical system. Judas, indeed, was morally affected by Satan (John 13 : 27); but Judas was a hardened sinner, and not a demoniac.

The phenomena were various. 1. A sort of

magnetic *clairvoyance*. The demoniacs knew Jesus to be the Son of God, while yet this mystery had not been published. The damsel at Philippi had this clairvoyant faculty with reference to Paul and Silas (Acts 16 : 16). 2. Raving, as in bursting fetters, in going naked, and in violent outcry. 3. Epileptic spasms. 4. Loss of speech. The mute must have been clearly distinguishable from ordinary cases of natural infirmity, since other dumb persons are never called demoniacs. In Mark 9 : 17, the dumb lunatic was not disabled by any crippling of the lingual muscles, nor by being deaf from birth, but by nervous disturbance, running into frantic delirium. Thus, too, the mute demoniac, Matt. 9 : 32. 5. Lameness in the body (Luke 13 : 11), which must have been analogous to the cases of aphony. So also Matt. 12 : 22, with the person blind and dumb. And 6. In Matt. 17 : 15, the influence produced lunacy, and Mark 9 : 18, emaciation [or, as some explain the word, convulsive rigidity]. In this person last mentioned, we observe the union of the most complicated phenomena. Epilepsy, preceded by frantic shrieks, with morbid inclination, on approach of the attack, to frequent dangerous places, in the vicinity of fire and water; coincidence of the spasms with the change of the moon; continued dumbness (perhaps as idiotic stupidity); together with emaciation, as a natural consequence of the fits. In all these diverse symptoms there appears the distinct impression, as well in the patient as in the people around, that the case is caused by an alien influence. In the raving Gadarene, even the power of speech was under the control of the demons, who speak, not in his name, but with his organs, Mark 5 : 9; Luke 8 : 30. Even the appeal, *μη με βασανίζης*, Mark 5 : 7; Luke 8 : 28, must have come from the demons; being connected with the clear recognition of Jesus by his name.

Thus much of the *effects* of the influence. It is further remarkable that a *plurality of demons* could exert their pernicious power in one man. Supposing this derangement a psychical phenomenon, we may still inquire whether it might not have become *possible* by some *moral fault*. But the person in Mark 9, and the parallels, who had been possessed *from childhood* decides against this, and makes the affliction appear as a mere misfortune, a fruit of the general sin. The other thirteen out of fourteen cases may as well be taken for misfortunes as this. There is certainly, as *Lange* says, a just and clear distinction to be made between abandoned sinners and demoniacs, between the sphere of demoniacal suffering, and that of demoniacal acting. The passage, Matt. 12 : 43, concerning the unclean spirit, who, finding his house swept and garnished, returns with seven other spirits worse than himself, does not oppose this view. It does not require us as a general rule, to account for one's being possessed of a demon, by supposing the person guilty of special sin; though in *particular cases*, a predisposition to become subject to the influence may have been produced or heightened by gross vices.

As to the manner of healing the demoniacs: The Lord cast out devils "with a word." He gave the disciples the same power; and even one

unknown to the disciples, cast out devils in the name of Jesus. Nay more. When Christ says (Matt. 12 : 27), "If I by Beelzebub cast out devils, by whom do your sons cast them out?" he implies that even unbelieving Jews could do this; though, as appears from Acts 19 : 13, they sometimes failed. Josephus relates (Ant. 8, 2, 5), that demons were cast out by incantations and medicines, pretended to have been derived from Solomon. *Justin Martyr* (Dial. c. Tryph. cap. 85) speaks of those who used arts in exorcism as the heathens did, and says the demons will not be subjected by any name of kings, just men, prophets, patriarchs, but only by the name of God. — It is remarkable that the demons, before they came out, vented their rage on the possessed (Mark 9 : 20; Luke 9 : 42); that the possessed himself dreaded healing (Mark 5 : 7; Luke 8 : 28); and that the disciples of Jesus were dispirited. The demons (Luke 8 : 31) were afraid of being compelled to go out into the abyss, and preferred to venture into the swine, not foreseeing the uncontrollable and disastrous rage of the animals under the strange distraction.

Concerning the different opinions relating to the scriptural statements on the subject of demoniacs, little need here be said. Down to the last century, the accounts in the New Testament respecting the character and the cure of these maladies, were received uniformly in the spirit of religious faith. Opinions varied only as to who or what the demons were, and not at all as to the fact of their existence, or their influence over particular persons. The doctrine drawn out by the scholastics related not so much to the fact or the nature of the diabolical possession, as to the power of casting out the devils (exorcism) (comp. Thomas Aquinas and others). The presumption was that demoniacs continued to be met with. Gisb. Voetius (III. p. 1157, etc.) gives a collection of Catholic forms of exorcism. The power of exorcism was considered by the Protestant scholastics as a *charisma sine infallibilitate eterna salute connectione*. These discussions acquire some practical importance from the application of exorcism in baptism. When the heathen Germans were converted, every adult applying for baptism solemnly promised to renounce the devil and his works. This simple vow passed, strangely enough, into a form of casting out devils, became joined in this form with infant baptism, and has thus been received into some portions of the Lutheran Church. It is here and there claimed, lately, as an indispensable part of the baptismal rite. But the subject of the rite is not a demoniac; and the moral bondage under sin, which is quite another thing, cannot be removed by exorcism.

When we recollect that the 16th and 17th centuries were the flourishing period of witchcraft, we are not surprised that in the 18th and 19th there came a mighty change. As it had been readily assumed that demoniacs were continually found, and all real or pretended phenomena of that dismal aspect were freely ascribed to the devil and his angels, so, upon the vanishing of this delusion, when the principle alleged to be devilish comes, at the present, to appear as something altogether natural, we are liable to

take the cases given in the times of Christ and the apostles as only *natural* phenomena, not then understood. But while *Grotius* himself has left demonism unquestioned, while not only *Hermann*, *Gronau*, *Zeibich*, *Marek*, *Deyling*, and *Storr*, but even *Ernesti*, have adhered to the old view, the first to raise doubts have been *Hobbes*, *Bekker*, and *Wetstein*. *Semler* was the first to assert that the New Testament demoniacs were cases of common disease; and after him came *Gruner*, *Farmer*, *Timmerman*, *Cäsar*, *Kirchner*, *Winzer*, *Nanz*; and from them this view passed into all the rationalistic writings.

Since the *effects* of the influence on demoniacs were *derangements of the nervous system* and the *corporeal* organs of the soul, it requires but the least acuteness to pronounce them nothing more than diseases. Diseases they were, to be sure; if the cerebral action were disturbed even to madness; as much a disease as inflammation of the brain. If a demon could so impair the spinal marrow as to bring on epileptic fits, the effect is as much a disease as would be the desiccation of the marrow from natural causes. But what does this comparison of *effects* decide? The question still remains: Were the diseases from natural causes or demons? Rationalism can show *no* proof that they might not have been caused by demons. The objector must assert his own opinion, that there are no fallen spirits, that no influence can reach men from the spirit world; and take that as his proof that the demoniacs of Scripture were only cases of natural disease. Is it objected that the heathen, before and at the time of the Saviour, believed in demoniac influence, and therefore the faith was a mere superstition of the age? The demons of classical antiquity were gods, not devils, and there is no analogy between them as to the effects ascribed to them. But even if the cases were alike, would it follow that the doctrine of demoniac influence was a mere superstition, because the heathen believed it? Is the belief of the existence of the moon a superstition, because the heathen speak of the moon? If it could be shown at all that the belief in demoniacal sufferings and torments had its root in the old heathen belief in corybantism, and that this view passed over to the Jews, there might be some show of reason in the above conclusion. But we have seen that heathenism, prior to Christianity, had no knowledge of *possession*, in its proper sense; that its Bacchantes, Corybantes, &c., bore no comparison to demoniacs. The heathen might, of course, have learned from the Jews to consider evil spirits as the cause of those phenomena; or their instinct might have led them to the same conclusion. They might have recognized demoniacal influence in those real cases of it which occurred to them, or have erroneously attributed all similar diseases (as epilepsy), to a like cause. But it by no means follows that their consciousness of the existence of such influences, rested upon superstition. The rays of revelation which illumined Israel, cast glimmerings of light into the heathen world; and beside the realm of prophecy, we see that of a human presentiment, which, though obscured by error, concealed a germ of truth. Assuming, therefore, that even prior to the time of Christ the heathen meant,

by their *στυγεροὶ δαίμονες*, not the general influence of malicious, inimical deities, but *individual* demons possessing individual bodies (souls from Tartarus), it by no means proves the N. T. doctrine of demoniacs false.

Equally invalid is the objection that *demoniacal possessions do not now occur*. We do not meet this with a mere contrary affirmation; for how should we prove their occurrence? There are insane persons who, indeed, *regard themselves* as possessed, but further investigation is needed to verify those impressions. Truly evangelical physicians, who have paid attention to this subject, declare they have never met with a case of real possession. The only complete proof of possession, in my opinion, would be, if, upon being *commanded* in the name of Christ, the unclean spirit should come out, and the patient be relieved of his sufferings. But just such proof the N. T. furnishes. Even Jews succeeded in effecting such release (Jos. Ant., 8, 2, 5, comp. Matt. 12: 27; and Justin, *dial. c. Tryph.*, c. 85); and though, through blindness, they used some formulas from Solomon's writings, or roots and bandages (Just., *l. c.*; Jos. *l. c.*, and *B. J.* 7, 6, 3), they attributed to them no medicinal effect, but merely some magical influence. The cures, therefore, were effected by the *command* uttered in Jehovah's name, and in spite of the attending superstitions. They must, therefore, have been cases of *real possession*; for a mere bodily disease cannot be cured by a command.—But here again rationalism has taken refuge in the assertion that it was a mere *fixed idea* which took possession of the mind, and could, therefore, be expelled by a mere authoritative word. This view must excite the laughter of all physicians to insane asylums. They know that "fixed ideas," which are the result of some physical derangement, cannot be permanently cured by such illusive frauds. Until the corporeal cause of them is removed they will remain *fixed*. So of demoniacs.—But, it is said, that *possession* was a bodily disease, cured by the command of Christ; and that the cases are called demoniacal possessions, merely in *accommodation* to the Jews who supposed them such. Apart, however, from the consideration that this theory of accommodation ascribes to the Lord conduct at variance with morality and truth, we find many passages in which he discourses upon the subject of *possession* in a purely theoretical way, and without having *an actual case before him*, assumes the reality of such cases, develops a theory of them (Matt. 12: 25, &c.), and never utters a word to undermine the common belief in them (Matt. 10: 8; 12: 43, &c.; 17: 21; Luke 10: 18, &c.; 11: 24). Those, therefore, who persist in maintaining this view soon find themselves driven to hold, that *Jesus himself was in error upon the subject, and in bondage to the erroneous prejudices of his times!* But the *absurdity* of this rationalistic inference, converts it into a proof that the foolishness of God is wiser than the craftiness of man.—Most untenable of all is that wavering half-way scepticism which combines the opinion that Jesus erred in regard to these cases, with some faith in his divine mission and power to work miracles. Whilst those who hold

this view accede that supernatural powers dwelt in the person of Jesus, they arrogate to themselves a superior ability to decide upon the precise nature of the maladies he cured. But they never saw N. T. demoniacs, to say nothing of curing them. Jesus, however, both saw and healed them. Why then should their opinions of the nature of the malady prevail against the judgment of him who commanded the storm and the waves, and could, moreover, look into the very heart of man? The sceptic's Christ, who is in doubt as to the nature of demoniacal possessions, is not the Christ of the Bible, still less the Son of God, but the fiction of modern conceits. — *Decided infidelity*, alone, can, consistently with itself, assume that Christ *erred* as to the cause and nature of possessions. Such infidelity may then reconcile itself with the N. T. in its own way. It may take refuge in the absurdity of *natural explanations of miracles*, and represent its Christ as applying all sorts of medicines (wholly unknown to modern pharmaceutics) working rapid cures, behind the backs of his disciples and of other witnesses; or may seize that most wonderful of all hypotheses — *the hypothesis of myths*. But to him who has learned to know Christ as his Saviour and Redeemer, as the Son of God who overcame sin, nature, and death, will, for the sake of the person of his Lord, receive what he has taught concerning demoniacs, as the depth of wisdom, before which his own limited and defective knowledge must bow in submission. Let the external appearances and symptoms of the malady seem ever so analogous to natural disorders of the nervous system and the mind, Christ declares that it was caused by the operations of the spirits of darkness, fallen angels, who insinuated themselves between the soul and its more delicate corporeal organs, subjected the latter to their pernicious influences, and thus produced those fearful disturbances of mind and body. The question, whether such cases really still occur, is irrelevant. For as it cannot be legitimately inferred, that because there were demoniacs in the time of Christ, the period of the sharpest conflict between light and darkness, therefore there must be such cases now; so neither can the reverse proposition be urged, any more than it could be argued that, because the dead do not now arise, Christ did not arise from the dead.

The business of *evangelical and unprejudiced natural science*, therefore, can only be to assume the facts as set forth, and then to attempt to show their relation to the known laws of psychology, physiology, and nosology. A fact which lies beyond and above all natural investigation, is the existence of a kingdom of darkness, a host of fallen angels. Christ teaches that there is such a kingdom, and this satisfies a healthy reason. And that which Christ and his apostles (Eph. 6: 12) affirm concerning the influence of those fallen angels upon mankind, we see corroborated by daily experience. Over against the Providence of God, we see the caricature of a quasi-providence of evil, which no human conspiracies serve to explain. Without and against their own will, hostile human powers have worked into each others hands. And there

are times when no very keen scent is necessary to perceive the fumes of the abyss, which often intoxicate millions at a time, and often penetrate, like a subtle poison, the heads and hearts of the most pious people, seeking to render Christianity sickly, and the salt unsavory. — That beside this influence upon the religious moral sphere, like influences upon the physico-psychical sphere are *possible*, can be the less controverted, since the former influence is not to be considered a purely spiritual one, operating directly upon the will of man (for this would destroy man's freedom and responsibility. See GISEBERT VOZET., I., 943, sq. BURMANN, *Synops. theol.*, I., 46, 54), but upon the lower faculties of the soul, and through these upon the imagination, and because these very faculties, with their organs, are open to the most manifold operations.

Thus we reach the physiological sphere. Who the fallen angels are, and what their powers are, we must learn from the teachings of Christ. But the constitution of human nature, and the union of soul and body, lies open to physiological observation; so that, however, difficult and problematical even this sphere of inquiry may be, we still can obtain definite and reliable data. — We begin with those more external maladies, which are most analogous to the sufferings of the possessed, in their appearance and symptoms. — *Epilepsy* is no disease, but merely a symptom, for which there may be various causes; these, however, are mostly to be found in the spine or brain. — *Lunacy*, also, is no disease in itself, but the effects of an excitability attending various disorders of the nervous system, under lunar influences. The injurious influence of the moon is not unknown in northern latitudes, but shows itself most in warmer climates. (Ps. 121: 6, comp. REIL, *Archiv. f. Physiol.*, I., 133; KRETSCHMAR, *de astr. in corpus hum. imperio*: Jena, 1820.) — *Blindness, aphony, gibbosity of the spine*, are also maladies which may arise from divers causes. Only let us remember here, that there is a hysterical aphony arising from mental dulness and an eclipse of the soul, and likewise a hysterical gibbosity, and in warm countries, with nervous persons, a blindness caused by looking into the full-moon. Insanity, frenzy, and all falsely called "soul diseases," are, according to the results of the most recent investigations, not diseases of the soul, but of the more delicate corporeal organs of the soul. The recovered insane person is the same individual after as before his disease. The substance of the soul lies deeper than earthly consciousness, and in its knowledge, will, and character remains intact, whereas the action of man's consciousness of earthly objects may be checked if the requisite bodily organs are crippled. In such cases there is a reaction of the soul and body upon each other. The influence of the soul upon the body is well attested by physiognomy, &c. Covetousness, which is a purely spiritual vice, may fix itself in the brain, and become a monomania. So, indeed, of every vice. In like manner the body may act upon the soul, by a reflex influence of the overexcited organs (in vices) upon corresponding desires, and by influences which have their seat in re-

manner in the soul, but in the body only, and which do not excite desires, but disturb and confuse the consciousness; thus by wounds on the head, nervous fevers, poisoning of the blood, &c. That bodily sufferings resulting in such maladies may be the effect of sin, no one will deny; but even then the sin is only the mediate cause of the insanity.—But when consciousness has once lost its balance, the innate evil desires, freed from restraint, break out most violently in the beclouded soul.—Now, in *all* these maladies—from epilepsy to madness—the *immediate* cause of suffering and derangement is a diseased irritation of single nerves, or of the entire spinal and ganglionic system, or of the membranes of the brain. We know, also, that such *irritation* may be produced by other than grosser corporeal, material means, as, f. i., in animal magnetism. If, therefore, it is possible for men to act upon each other through the medium of nervous influences, then the same nervous system may be susceptible of analogous influences streaming over into it from a non-human being, from a fallen angel. The influences of the latter may be different, more violent and terrible. But it is still, in every case *an excitement of the nervous life*, and the phenomena will be similar.—There is, therefore, not a single point, in regard to which the teachings of Christ concerning demoniacs, contradict the results of physiological investigation. Nay, both are in full harmony. There is nothing inconceivable, even, in the fact that a number of demons work together upon *one* human nervous system.—Neither can it be doubted that the nervous system of *animals*, is susceptible of similar, and even of higher degrees of excitement (as the horse) from external causes, than that of man. There is, consequently, nothing unreasonable in the case related in Matt. 8:32. DR. EBRARD.*

Denmark.—1. *Introduction of Christianity.*¹—Before the 9th cent. the Christian religion made little impression upon the inhabitants of Denmark. They had, indeed, heard much of its progress in other countries, but still clung to their old worship. The first missionary, *Willebrord*, of Utrecht, is said to have landed in South Jutland or Schleswig, not far from Ripen, in the beginning of the 8th cent., and met with a hospitable reception from the king of that region; but, according to Alcuin's account, he found the Danes a savage people, and the king more cruel than a wild beast, and harder of heart than a stone. He succeeded in getting, partly perhaps by purchase, 30 boys, whom he intended to educate for future missionaries. One of them, of noble descent, was *St. Sebaldus* (Siwald), who afterwards went to Germany and labored with great success at Nuremberg, where he died. Of the others tradition says nothing.

By degrees, however, Christianity and civilization approached the frontiers of Denmark. Charlemagne had subjugated the Saxons, and imposed upon them the laws, civil and ecclesiastical, of the Frankish empire. But the Eider put a bound both to his conquests and his con-

versions. He left the district of Holstein without a complete church organization, and when he concluded a peace with the neighboring Danes (811 and 813), made no stipulation in favor of Christianity. Although the beginnings in Holstein were very weak, confined to two or three strongholds, which afforded protection to the missionaries, it was something to have a Christian state on the borders of Denmark, and the final conversion of the Danes was only a work of time. To the Carolingians this must have been a matter of great importance; but the Danes were a free people, and little inclined to obey a foreign ruler; they could scarcely brook the sway of their own petty kings. Hence their conversion had to be accomplished chiefly by the power of the Word, aided by friendly negotiations and political events. Men were not wanting, who, braving all toil and danger, were willing to labor for the good of souls, until a knowledge of the truth and the progress of civilization gradually brought about a complete change among the rulers and the people. This explains why two centuries elapsed, during which Christianity overcame far greater obstacles in other lands. But the long struggle was not without advantage; for when at length the Christian faith, planted by German teachers and strengthened by English influence, gained the victory, its diffusion was more general, and its root firmer than among the other nations of the North.

The beginning of the work was occasioned by the political relations of certain chiefs in South Jutland to the Frankish emperor, and for nearly a century it was confined to that portion of the nation inhabiting the peninsula of Jutland. There, shortly after the death of Charlemagne, a dispute for the throne arose between two princely houses, and the pious emperor, Louis, made prompt use of the circumstance. His first envoy to King Harold Klak, who sought his aid, was the Archbishop Ebbo, of Rheims, a Saxon by birth, zealous for the conversion of the heathen. In 822, as legate of the Pope, Ebbo reached the city of Hedeby, now Schleswig, and preached to the King and the people. The next year he was sent with other imperial envoys to the court of the rival king, and thus penetrated further into the country; but, although during his stay in Holstein, he only made short journeys over the Danish borders, he did not cease to educate native Danes to act as missionaries. One of these, *Ansfried*, was afterward sent to Sweden; but the quiet labors of Ebbo, who returned to his diocese some years later, were greatly enlarged by his successors. When, in 826, King Harold was compelled to yield to the sons of Godofried, he fled to the court of the emperor, and was baptized with his wife and child at Ingelheim. Many of his people followed his example. All he saw there made a deep impression, but the most important fruit of his visit, was the sending forth of the apostle of the Danes, *Ansgar*, (see Art.), who laid the foundations, pointed out the means, and sowed the germs of Christianity far and wide, with permanent results.

Rembert, his successor in office (865–888) opened communication with New Corvey, and

¹ E. Pontoppidan, Annal. eccl. Dan. dipl. 1 Th. Copenh., 1741. Münter, Kirchengeschichte v. Dänemark u. Norw. Cop. 1 Th. Leipz., 1823. N. M. Petersen, Danmarks Hist. in Hedenold, 1–3, D. Kbh., 1834–37.

and introduced the use of compurgators; in certain cases the fire-ordeal was retained, even in ecclesiastical law, until wholly set aside by the Papal legate in 1222. St. Canute, who took great interest in the welfare of the slaves and freedmen, as well as the extirpation of pirates, attached new and heavier penalties to several crimes, *e. g.*, death to murder, theft and robbery; but the mode of judicial procedure in Denmark continued as of old. Hence there was no inquisitorial process in criminal cases; all action proceeding only from the offended party or his avengers. And this state of things made it necessary for the church, not only to instruct the people by word and doctrine, but to assume also civil and judicial functions. When this began it is hard to say. At first the heads of the Church used only spiritual means; in 1055 they compelled King *Svend Estridson* himself, by threat of the ban, to put away his beloved queen on account of consanguinity, and after perpetrating, in 1071, a bloody deed, he had to atone for it by severe penance before the church-door. The King submitted, but whether the civil law gave power to the clergy to enforce a sentence, we do not know. No trace of it stands on record. There existed, however, ecclesiastical courts over which the Bishops presided. They took cognizance of offences against the Church, but in the course of time their jurisdiction became so widely extended as almost to overshadow those of the State. Still, amid all the confusion they may have exerted a beneficial influence upon the morals of the people.

The same may be said of the system of guilds, first introduced from England, as regards the security of the citizen. The first guild was established in honor of *Canute the Saint*; the second, in honor of *Canute (Knud) Laward*, who was killed in 1131, and canonized in 1170; the third, in honor of *Eric Plougpenning*, who was murdered in the 13th cent.; but besides these three royal guilds, there was a vast number of others composed of workmen and traders, all of which hallowed their bond of brotherhood by religion, and enriched the churches with altars and vicarships. They outlived their age, and in the end proved an injury to public morals as well as to the administration of justice.

In the great revolution of the 12th cent., the Church also took part. The German emperors, as in the 10th cent., then strove to make the spiritual band a stepping-stone to supremacy over Denmark, but with just as little success. The Archbishop *Absalon* led and supported the kings in maintaining their independence. This movement, in connection with many internal discords, promoted the transition from a democratic to an aristocratic monarchy. During the reign of *Eric Eiegod* the whole people still participated in the public counsels, but under *Waldemar the Great* (1157-82) the peasantry were forbidden to appear armed at the diet, and with the loss of arms went their vote, and at length they remained away altogether; only in the courts of justice did the freemen retain their old privileges. The kings began, after the fashion of the Bishops, to style themselves such "by the grace of God," and when the people rebelled on several occasions, and Waldemar had won

the throne for his family by the sword, he had himself crowned by the Archbishop in 1157, and his minor son chosen as his successor, and crowned afterward in 1170. The canonization of his father, *Knud Laward*, which was connected with the coronation of his son in Ringsted, served also to increase the dignity of the crown. The king now drew around him the lords, who took the place of the people. The clergy at that time had acquired great possessions, in part by the entrance of men of the most distinguished families into their ranks, and in part by gifts. The dissensions after the death of King *Niels*, compelled the Bishops and their noble allies to place themselves at the head of public affairs, and when *Waldemar* had united the kingdom under his sceptre, he advanced the nobility, and appointed from their number royal bailiffs, or feudatories, over the whole realm. Against these two classes of lords an insurrection broke out in Schonen in 1180, but it only served to strengthen the power of both. The government was gradually established on this basis, the provincial laws were recorded and greatly multiplied, and at length a general statute-book, that of Jutland, appeared in 1241. All this was accomplished by the help of the great men of the Church, for, during the whole period, the crown and the crosier stood in the most friendly relation to each other.

The progress of the hierarchy was not a little furthered by the archbishopric. This office, till 1223, was in the hands of two allied families, the last of which (*Skjalm Hvides*), in the 12th and 13th centuries, gave to the Church 11 Bishops and Archbishops; both sprang from the race of *Palnatoke*. The first Archbishop, *Ascer* or *Ansgar* (1104-37), put an end to the intercourse with England. His nephew and successor, *Eskil* (1137-77), took a lively interest in the monastic system. Educated at Hildesheim, he entertained a profound reverence for the great *Bernard*, of Clairvaux; he paid him a visit, kept up a constant correspondence with him, and filled his new monasteries with monks from Citeaux and Clairvaux. They are said to have done good service in uprooting the remains of heathenism and promoting morality. He finished also the cathedral of Lund in 1145, and increased greatly the splendor of the worship there, besides enlarging the school attached to it. Coming into collision with the government in *Waldemar's* time, he spent 7 years abroad, and at length, with the consent of the Pope, resigned his office into the hands of *Absalon*, in order to end his days at the tomb of *Bernard* († 1182). *Absalon* (see Art.), more renowned for his heroic deeds and statesmanship than for theological and scientific culture, but strong in his love for the fatherland and the Church, did the most for the organization of both.

In 1201 he died. *Andreas Sunesen*, his nephew, succeeded him (1201-23). Like him in patriotism and zeal for the Church, he surpassed his predecessor in learning. In the times of these Archbishops, intellectual culture in Denmark rose to its acme. The first Danes, who strove after higher knowledge, had visited Bologna; in Lucca, and at Piacenza *Eric Eiegod* had founded *hospitia* for their accommodation; later,

they frequented German schools, like Hildesheim, but from the middle of the 12 cent. found their way to Paris alone, and very many men of the first families entered its famous University, where then already a *Collegium Danicum* (the second in order of the many colleges) was established. The "Paris-clerks" received the best positions at home, and frequently maintained with the first men of the age (as Bernard and Innocent III.) a correspondence, which must have exerted upon them a great influence. Many French monks also, among whom was *William* of St. Genoveva († 1203), went to Denmark. One fruit of this love of science was seen in the first native contributions to the history of the fatherland. Through the persuasion of Absalon, the national sagas and traditions, up to 1187, were collected and published by *Saxo Grammaticus* and *Svend Aagesen*. The canon law was brought into use and explained by *William*, former abbot at Ebelholt. *Andreas Sunesen* expounded the civil law in Latin, and as he was a Doctor of Theology, and had, perhaps, taught it in Paris, where he had been at least once Rector of the University, he composed in verse, also in Latin, a work on Christian dogmatics, and another on the Seven Sacraments. *Homer*, Bishop of Ribe († 1203), founded a considerable library, and books were important articles of presentation in the will of Absalon. The least of this circle of men was *Gunner* (1221-51), one of the framers of the Jutish code. Some Danes also who remained abroad have won a name in literature. Schools there were likewise at home, attached to the cathedral-churches and in the monasteries; but none of them rose to any eminence; we know that *Gunner* taught many of the younger clergy in his own house. But this fair dawning light of science was extinguished toward the middle of the 13th cent., by the unhappy conflicts which sprang up between the throne and the hierarchy. The troops of mendicant monks, who, from 1221, thronged into the country, may have aided also in bringing about a change in the spirit of the age.

The monastic system formed itself, according to the circumstances of the new Church, in the usual way, and nearly all the Danish *lords' convents* (*Herrenklöster*)¹ belong to this first epoch of the middle ages. Those founded by Canute the Great seem chiefly to have been designed for the spread of the faith; hence some of them in the cities were converted into chapters or took their place, whilst others gave way to unions of the parochial clergy. In the country they did not flourish, and most of them went down in the 12th cent. The oldest monks were the Benedictines, who came from England; yet we find early traces of the Cluniacs, who were then called in Denmark "the Black Friars," but only a single cloister of this order (that of All Saints in Lund) survived for any length of time. The 12th cent. was the golden period of the Danish monasteries; kings, bishops, and nobles vied with each other in doing them

honor. The Benedictines continued to flourish; but the Cistercians, through the favor of Eskil and Absalon, seem to have acquired rapidly many large and wealthy convents; the Premonstrants and Augustinians followed after. The monks of these orders, or at least the heads of the convents, were brought from Citeaux and Clairvaux; from the same source Eskil obtained Carthusians, but they soon left a land, whose climate did not agree with their rule. The monasteries did little for the strengthening of Christianity, but much for civilization and general culture, the instruction of youth, and the preservation of the sciences. The first book, written in Denmark, was produced by an English Benedictine in the monastery of St. Canute at Odense. Saxo and Svend Aagesen were monks, and Absalon commanded the Cistercians of the monastery in Sorø, founded by him, and richly endowed by his father, to note down the events of the times, and from other cloisters were issued, not only chronicles of the same kind, but also historical biographies, and the first work on medicine (*Henrik Harpestreng*, † 1244). The language used was Latin. Here reigned a fresh love of poetry and historic narrative, the last reflected splendor of a national life, soon to be smothered by stupid legends and spiritual bondage. Monasticism itself, at the close of our period, aided in this sad work; the Mendicant Friars, at the command of the Pope, came thither, and monasteries of both the great orders, Franciscans and Dominicans, rose in all the cities.

It remains to show how celibacy and investiture, the two great levers of the hierarchy, were introduced into Denmark. From the middle of the 11th cent., the Popes had frequently complained of the evil practices of the Danish Church, and exhorted the kings to send noble youths to Rome to study the canon law. Among these evil practices may have been reckoned the marriage of priests, for the custom was so general that the Archbishop, Eskil, himself was married, or is said to have been. From the 12th cent. onward, the Popes sent legates to Denmark again and again, but with little effect. During the episcopate of *Ascer* (*Ansgar*) the first decree concerning the separation of priests from their wives is said to have been issued (1121); but they gave little heed to it, and public opinion was so divided that a knight in Sealand, who had founded a monastery, rode about (1130), in order to enforce celibacy at the point of the sword, on which occasion a few priests were murdered by the peasants; on the other hand, in the insurrection in Schonen (1180), the peasants demanded the abolition of celibacy. The Bishops and Archbishops, especially Absalon, took up the matter, supported by papal legates and the power of the ban; and though *Innocent III.* had to yield (since he granted the possibility of marriage as a privilege), *Gregory de Crescentio* came (1222) to Denmark to enforce the decree. Several hundred priests then appealed from the Pope to a General Council; but the legate, at a national synod convened in Schleswig, caused the papal decree to be read, and deprived the children of priests of the right of inheritance. Another legate, *Otto of St. Nicolas*,

¹ So all the monasteries in Denmark, endowed with property and lands, were called, in opposition to those of the Mendicants and Hospitallers.

turned (1230) the sword of the Church against the wives, so that they also fell under the ban, whilst the priests were suspended, and at length excommunicated. Thus they succeeded, by severity and kindness (*e. g.*, in 1263 not less than 50 sons of priests were admitted to office in the Church), and by a pledge given to do away by degrees with public concubinage (still recognized by the law of the land as legal marriage); but in spite of all the laws, it continued in secret; for the national Council at Copenhagen, in 1425, found it necessary to renew the prohibition. In the more distant north it was still practised.

The great controversy of the age of Gregory and his successors did not affect the Danish Church. In the 11th cent., since there were no chapters as yet, the king filled the bishoprics. A papal legate appointed the first Archbishop; but during his term of office the idea must have sprung up of the right of choice by canons and the people jointly; for at his decease, 1137, both exercised it in Lund and Roeskilde. King *Eric Emun*, it is true, favored *Eskil*, on whom the people wished to confer the rich inheritance; but after his death, *Eric Lam* acted on a new principle. At the first national Council, held in Lund (1139), he brought about a dispute respecting the right of choice between two clerical corporations in Odence, and had the decision so confirmed by the Pope, that the one alone (without mention of the people) should have authority to fill the vacant seat of the Bishop from their own number, or at pleasure. Even *Waldemar the Great* resigned the right which he claimed, of nominating the Bishop of Roeskilde, when, in 1158, a dispute arose there between the clergy and the people. Thus the choice, without any express law, passed out of the hands of the kings. The chapters, on their part, had no intention of going counter to the royal wish. The result was that *Absalon*, on the recommendation of the King, received all their votes, and most of the Bishops in Ribe at that time came from the court; the parties elect also did not hesitate to do homage to the crown. The people were soon obliged to yield to the papal legate, and only high ecclesiastical authority appeared to threaten the freedom of choice. *Eskil* obtained permission to appoint his successor; *Peter Jacobson* received from the Pope the expectancy of the see of Roeskilde (1198), and a papal legate presented *Gunner* to the Viborg chapter. In the beginning of the 13th cent., also, some examples occurred in which the chapters disregarded the wishes of the king; but for the first time, toward the middle of it, the parties elect refused to do homage; the development of the hierarchy had completed itself.

II. From the 13th cent. intercourse with France gradually ceased, and the connection with Germany became stronger and stronger. The same was the case with Rome, and a door was thus opened for the introduction of many abuses.

The taxes on church-lands first caused the Danish clergy to look to the Pope for aid. It was soon found that the new decretals, taught at Paris, and praised by the mendicant friars, promised a far greater independence of the State than the civil law. The first man of note who

took this ground was the Archbishop, *Jacob Erlandsen* (1254-74). He was a scion of that race from which nearly all the Archbishops and many of the Bishops had sprung. He had become acquainted with the new papal law, probably in France and Italy, was an eyewitness of the contest of the Popes with the house of the Hohenstaufen, had served *Innocent IV.* as chaplain, and, as deputy of the Danish Archbishop, had defended him with skill at the Council of Lyons (1245). The Pope appointed him Bishop of Roeskilde (1249), in the place of *Niels Stigsen*, who had died in exile. He very soon showed himself a most determined hierarch, referred to the Pope in all matters, and followed the new decretals as the voice of heaven; hence he treated with contempt all native laws and all the wishes of the king, in defiance of whom he appointed Bishops, convoked synods, and published decrees; he usurped supreme authority over the ecclesiastical domains, exempted the peasants of the Church from the jurisdiction of the civil courts, and lessened in every way the rights of the State. But when King *Christopher*, his son, *Eric Glipping* (1259-86), and his grandson, *Eric Menved* (1286-1319), attempted to maintain the prerogatives of the crown, a conflict arose, like that of the Hohenstaufen, which lasted for more than half a century. No means were left untried by the ecclesiastical dignitaries to accomplish their end. The throne, it is true, gained the victory; but, as the nobles took advantage of the strife to increase their power, scarcely anything was left but the shadow of royalty. In this contest, the lower clergy wavered between the duty they owed to the King and the fatherland, and the obedience they owed to Rome.

In a totally different way the heads of the Church at length obtained what they had sought through the aid of the Pope; at the death of *Eric Menved* there was no heir to the crown: the choice of a King and the supreme power fell to the lords; the peasants had become in part bondsmen; the formation of a burgher class had been stifled in the germ. When now the spiritual and temporal lords elected the brother of the deceased, *Christopher II.*, who had made common cause with the murderers of his father, and was ready for anything in order to win the sceptre, they laid down to him certain conditions in the first covenant (1320). Thus a charter was formed, under which the Church could secure and extend her rights and privileges, and in which, also, a mediation was obtained between the Church and the State, since a share in the government of the kingdom was granted to the prelates. The clergy were now freed from the payment of taxes, exempted from the jurisdiction of the civil courts, and rendered inviolable in their persons and property, except at the command of the Pope. Another very important article forbade the King to declare war, or enact any law without the consent and advice "of the prelates and the best men of the realm." After a reign of 13 unhappy years, *Christopher* died in 1333, and his decease was followed by an interregnum, during which the Church had to protect herself as she best could.

True to the royal house and the nation, several

Bishops labored to place the last scion of the old race on the throne. Waldemar Atterdag (1340–75) found faithful council and support from the clergy alone, although the severe and not always just rule of the great Restorer in that troublous time demanded great sacrifices on the part of the Church. Taxes were levied; Copenhagen, till then an episcopal city, passed into the hands of the King, and the sacred vessels of the Churches were given up; but the kingdom was saved. He was not, however, a very devoted son of the Church, although he visited the Holy Sepulchre in 1345, and the Pope in Avignon in 1364; it concerned him little, when the Pope placed him under the ban for making that pilgrimage without his permission; yet he did not disdain to use ecclesiastical weapons, for he complained in 1370 of his own subjects to the Pope; but when the latter, moved by their counter-complaints, reproved him for his cruelty, and threatened him with excommunication, he is said to have declared in bitter words the independence of the crown, and Gregory XI. did not venture to put his threat into execution. The national Church in the reign of Waldemar declined not a little in wealth and honor, and needed careful supervision. The great plague, the “black death” (1338–50), unfruitful seasons, the flood of 1362, and other calamities, were regarded as judgments of heaven upon her. At length some nobles and Bishops united in the monastery of Viborg (1375), in order to restore and maintain her rights. A change occurred at the death of the King (1375). His daughter, the wise Margaret, ruled as guardian and regent of Denmark, and then of all the three kingdoms of the north. The pious spirit of this “mother of the clergy” exhibited itself in donations and institutions of every kind, as well as the faithful observance of every religious duty. The charter, which she subscribed in the name of her son, confirmed “the liberties and rights of the Church, to the fullest extent they had ever been enjoyed,” and this remained the rule for all after ages, with one addition: “as they may be granted by the Holy Roman Church and Christian Princes.” The enumeration of the special rights and immunities was gradually completed. But the most important event of the times of Queen Margaret was the formation, through the Calmarian Union and other circumstances, of the State-Council, which, for Denmark in the 15th cent., represented both the people and the crown, now exercising the functions of the one (in the election of the King, taxation, legislation), and then of the other (during his absence, or an interregnum), whilst it took part with the King in all acts of government. In this Council sat all the Bishops of the realm by virtue of their office, along with 2 to 4 prelates from the monasteries or chapters; a like or less number of lords, chosen by the King, formed its secular element. Thus peace between the Church and the State was guaranteed, unless the Council should be at variance with itself, which did not happen until the opening of the Reformation. The freedom of the national Church, also, from the papal see, was in some measure secured; the Archbishops discontinued their visits to Rome; the two-fold position of the Bishops mediated between the

decrees of the Pope and the State; they even aided in framing the article of the charter which forbade the conferring of a benefice on any foreigner. The Pope conceded this point, but, notwithstanding, in 1488 and 1499, claimed the old privilege. The secularization of all the higher clergy was the sad result; many Bishops now employed suffragans or coadjutors, in order to devote themselves wholly to worldly business; the canons did the same thing, and the high councillors of State were regarded as little more than noble feudatories of the Church. Whether the Church was endangered thereby is uncertain; it is said that, towards the close of the 15th cent., the Hussite heresy found its way into Denmark, and that many nobles who marched with King *Hans*, in 1500, against the Ditmarskers, were infected with the new doctrines, and resolved, on their return, to divide the fiefs of the Church amongst themselves; but they all perished, and the story may only have existed in the fancy of the monk who tells it. Canonicates were at length given to boys of noble birth, and in 1519 it was decreed, that no one who was not noble, could become a bishop. Under this title, also, the highest earthly sovereignty could be enjoyed; the Bishop of Roeskilde possessed, beside his tithes, so many estates that he owned a third of all Sealand. The Bishops, moreover, exercised royal prerogatives, such as the coinage of money, the appropriation of stranded vessels and goods, the conferring of patents of nobility, and the like; and since they frequently took part in the administration of justice in their dioceses, we can readily see how the last Bishop of Roeskilde, when the throne was vacant, could assert with truth that “the Bishop was king in his own diocese.” Hence the Reformation had to be also a civil revolution in Denmark.

By this union of the Church and State, the old ecclesiastical tribunals were able to keep their ground. Up to the time of Waldemar IV., they had only dealt with criminals of importance, but after that their sphere was largely extended. The execution of sentences in private cases was linked with great difficulties, owing to the Danish laws; but the clerical court had the ban of the Church as a means of compulsion. The Popes had used it even against Kings; whoever refused to submit was put to great cost and trouble. When now the clergy laid down the necessity of appeal to the Bishop’s court, it became the universal custom. The jury was chosen by the Bishop or his officials from the people or nobility; and the rule by which judgment was given was the Common Law, yet so that the Canon and Roman Law could be used, in case it appeared more just, or in case of defect in the national code. In the 15th cent. this clerical administration of justice increased to such a degree that the civil courts fell into decay; this occasioned great complaint. Christian II. proposed to check the abuse, because “poor people were condemned and deprived of the sacrament on account of debt and other matters, the adjustment of which belongs to the civil courts;” but nothing was done, until Frederick I., at the time of the Reformation, put an end to this lucrative practice. All causes of a spiritual nature were still left to the eccle-

siastical courts, as well as all those in which the clergy were involved; Pope Nicolas V. granted, in 1449, at the request of the King, that all such cases should be first tried in the land itself, by its own judges, and not by the papal nuncio in Germany, or any other, which article was embodied in the royal charter. Christian II. attempted to do away with appeals to the Pope, by erecting a new supreme court for the kingdom, but failed in his scheme.

In spite of all the secularization and abuses the spiritual wants of the people were not badly cared for. In the days of Waldemar II., a papal legate caused the monk, who was a candidate for a bishopric, to preach before him in Latin, only because he did not understand Danish; the Dominican friars preached in the mother-tongue, and one of them in the 13th cent. wrote an exposition of Luke. The order of worship received much attention in the 14th cent.; many new festivals were introduced, and church-singing was greatly improved. King Waldemar IV. loved music; Eric, the Pomeranian, obliged the canons to do their duty, and established singing in several churches. The "black death," which at first diminished the number of the churches, rather inspired terror than penitence: the Flagellants made their appearance, but were put down by the king, even before the Pope interfered. The plague and the consequent famine led to the appointment of an annual day of humiliation. In the Danish churches we find no trace of foolish customs elsewhere in vogue; sacred dramas, then so common in other countries, appear to have been unknown, and with all the excessive decoration of churches and altars, and in spite of the many masses for souls, the gospel was still preached in the mother-tongue. A translation of the Bible existed in the 15th cent., fragments of which yet remain, and although all the missals and breviaries, except one, were in Latin, the whole service was not performed in that language. But, shortly before the Reformation, there must have been great neglect, since many parishes had only one clergyman, and he often living in a distant monastery. In the towns, however, were found pastors, vicars, and mass-priests in large numbers.

When, in the 15th cent., a call for a reformation was made throughout Christendom, the need of it may have been little felt in Denmark. The Papal schism had not disturbed her peace; no heresies existed there; true, indeed, the Pope had appointed, in 1402 (just when Eric the Pomeranian, had won the hand of an English princess), an inquisitor for Denmark, and in 1421 another was appointed by the Bishop of Schleswig for the north; but in both cases it may have been precaution rather than necessity (only a few Waldenses had penetrated into Ditmarsken), and hence the Papal Inquisition makes no figure in Danish history. The government and the higher clergy might have desired a limitation of the Papal power; the people were only anxious for the moral reformation of their spiritual guides, at least the rebellious peasants of Schleswig, in 1439, cherished such hopes from the Synod at Basel. The Danish Church, however, was prepared to profit by

these movements. Of her two representatives at Costnitz, the Bishops of Schleswig and Ribe, the latter, Peter Lykke, greatly distinguished himself: an accomplished theologian, he delivered a speech against Huss, in which he exhorted the Emperor to uproot the heresy; against the Pope he advocated liberal principles, was sent as ambassador to the Spanish Pope, and chosen as one of the procurators of the German nation. At home, in 1425, when Archbishop (1418-36), he convened a national council, which issued 30 decrees in favour of reform. At Basel the deputies were the Bishop of Ribe and the archdeacon, Jens Iversen Lange, *jur. utr. dr.* and afterward Bishop of Aarhusen. The Basel Decrees were accepted in Denmark, but the direct result was only a few statutes enacted by particular Bishops. The only greater reform of the 15th cent. concerned a numerous order of monks; the strict observance of their rule was revived in most of the Franciscan monasteries.

There was one event of special importance. King Eric, the Pomeranian (1412-39), introduced the first Carmelite friars from Germany, and erected for them several convents, in order to profit by their learning. They paved the way for the great Reformation.

In learning there was slow progress after the 13th cent. From the days of Mg. Mogensen, advocate of Eric Menved, who created an epoch in logic, through the whole 14th cent., many Danes went to Paris; but dialectic scholasticism was ill-suited to Denmark and canon-law little needed. In the beginning of the 15th cent., there was some improvement; the Archbishop, Peter Lykke, distinguished himself as a theologian; a monk in Odense, Thomas Gheismer (of Stralsund), attempted to bring down the history of the nation after the chronicles of former ages. King Eric, the Pomeranian, also loved learning, and had a special fondness for history; a chronicle of his age bears his name. As he called the Carmelites to Denmark, so he was the first to broach the idea of a Northern University. But the Pope refused permission to teach theology, and added other conditions, which delayed the work for half a century. The Danish students, instead of Paris, now went mostly to Cologne, Prague, Erfurt, Rostock, Leipsic, and Greifswald. At length Christian I. (1448-81) founded the Danish University. On a visit to Rome, in 1474, he obtained the full consent of the Pope; Copenhagen was chosen as its seat, whilst Sweden placed hers at Upsala. The Church was to furnish the means, and the Bishop of Roeskilde to be chancellor. But the funds were scanty, and the royal deputy, Mg. Peter Albrechtsen, the Vice-chancellor, brought the first teachers (1479) from Cologne, then the abode of a gloomy scholasticism. Hence the new institution bore little fruit, and the King could hardly prevent the students from going abroad. At length two monastic orders united their efforts to found at the University a college, which exerted a most important influence in favor of the Reformation. The Carmelite provincial established it for the young men of his own and of the Cistercian Order, and King Christian II. (1513-23) endowed it. The head of the College, the Carmelite monk, Paul Eliä,

was by a reasonable share of classical culture, and the study of the Church Fathers, raised far above the reigning barbarism and formalism, and was filled beside with a love for the Holy Scriptures, and a great zeal for practical piety. About this time several laymen also brought home some of the first fruits of the revival of letters, and the call of the Saxon Reformer reached the ears of the enlightened sovereign. For the last time (1517-18) were the Danes defrauded by the dealer in indulgences, Arcimboldi (see Art.); Paul Eliä is said to have condemned the traffic in the cloister at Helsingöer before Luther attacked Tetzel. But the Reformation did not spring from this cause in Denmark.

3. *The Reformation.*¹—If the will of a king could have accomplished it, Denmark would have been one of the first countries to receive the Reformation. The clear-sighted, but inconsiderate and cruel Christian II. (1513-23) had long cherished the desire to reduce the ancient rights and privileges of the nobles and clergy. Related to the Saxon princes, and surrounded by a trusty circle of friends and advisers, among whom was Paul Eliä, he followed with sympathy all that was done at Wittenberg. He wished to begin the work at once. Scarcely had Luther issued his Address to the German Nobility, when he asked (1520) for a German teacher to preach as royal chaplain to the people of his capital; a follower of Carlstadt, Martin Reinhard, was sent, but made little impression, although at first supported by Paul Eliä. In 1521 the King made an attempt, by a new envoy, to procure Luther himself, or Carlstadt, or some other. The issue of the Diet of Worms gave him some hope of Luther, who in those days could not have viewed with indifference the offer of a mighty monarch of three kingdoms; but Carlstadt and Mg. Gabler only responded to the call. They found a great change of circumstances. Troubled by the consequences of the Stockholm massacre, exhorted by his brother-in-law, the Emperor, and threatened anew by the Pope for the decapitation of two bishops, the King saw himself obliged to yield; in the Netherlands, where he met Alexander at the Imperial Court, he promised to retrace his steps, although he expressed to Erasmus the conviction, that the Church needed the very strongest medicine. Carlstadt retired before his return, and the light confined itself to the narrower circle of the king and his intimate friends, by whom a beginning was made at the translation of the N. T., after Erasmus. Paul Eliä was no longer in this circle; he had broken with the tyrant, and had already taken offence at the breach of the Reformation with Rome. The King now tried what could be done by laws; a voluminous code was prepared in 1521, in which many changes were made in regard to ecclesiastical affairs; the independence of the national church was aimed at, as well as the limitation of the hierarchy; one of its statutes

even made the marriage of the clergy of every grade a condition in the purchase of property. But when, in the autumn of 1521, the legate, *John de Potentia*, came to Denmark to investigate the part played by the King in the Stockholm massacre, the latter was not only obliged to annul that statute, but to alter much else, before the code was published, in 1522, as a special law for the cities. It was short-lived; for after the deposition of the King it was abrogated and burnt. His yielding to the legate was of no avail. The nobles and prelates renounced their allegiance, and in 1523 placed his uncle, Frederic I., on the throne. The exiled King and his adherents, who followed him abroad, continued, however, to labor for his restoration and the cause of the Reformation at the same time. He caused the first Danish translation of the N. T. to be printed at Leipsic in 1524, and sent it to Denmark, adorned with his likeness and accompanied by an apology, drawn up by his most important co-laborer, Hans Michelsen. Luther also espoused his cause against the Danish magnates. But his religious instability stood greatly in the way of his political interests, and he was so weak, that in 1530, at Augsburg, in order to secure the aid of the Emperor, he again renounced the evangelical faith, and in Norway (1531) promised to uphold the Romish Church. The party, which afterward took up arms for him, raised the banner of Protestantism once more, and in the darkness of a prison (from 1532) he returned to his true convictions, and consoled himself with the Danish Bible († 1559).

The relation of the Reformation to the fugitive King must have done it more harm than good. Frederic I. (1523-33) was bound by treaty to punish to the death all heretics, followers of Luther, and others; the entire Council of State and the nobility pledged themselves to put down heretical preaching and the books of Luther, and the government at least had to forbid books which might open the way for the return of the exiled King. But the considerate Frederic, from conviction as well as policy, was favorable to the Reformation, and did not refuse his protecting hand, when it penetrated from several quarters. And now appear on the stage of action the duchies bordering on Germany. In both the good work was soon begun under German influence. From Holstein it spread rapidly into Schleswig, supported by the Low Dutch translation of the N. T. (1523), and a living intercourse with Wittenberg and Lower Saxony. The Duke and Prince Christian (since the Diet of Worms a faithful adherent of Luther), the nobles and the burghers embraced it. Since 1522, the vicar, Hermann Tilst, one of its ablest champions, had preached at Husum; the burghers protected him, the King appointed him his chaplain. Others made their appearance in other cities; and, in 1524, the King proclaimed toleration, so that no one, whether Papist or Lutheran, could be molested on the score of his religion. Immediately the government, or the citizens, called many evangelical teachers from Germany. The chapter of Schleswig offered a sum of money for the defence of the Catholic faith; but neither the Bishop, Gottschalch v.

¹ *Pontoppidan*, Reformationshist. d. Dänischen K.: Lübeck: 1734, and *his* Ann. Eccl. Dan., 3 vol. *Münter*, Den danske Reformationshist.: Cop., 1802; and *his* Kirchengesch. Dänem. u. Norw., 3 Th.: Leips., 1833. *C. T. Engelstoft*, Paulus Eliä, en biographisk historisk Skildring.: Cop., 1848 (also in *N. Hist. Tidsskr.* 2 Bd.).

Ahlefeldt, nor the other heads of the Church, ventured to oppose the tide; the evangelical party had only to contend with fanatical Anabaptists and adventurers (especially Melchior Hoffmann); but, after a religious conference held in Flensburg (1529), they were banished. Very quietly and gradually the mass-priests were pensioned off; and the mendicant cloisters deserted, or applied to other uses. When the cities had effected these reforms, a visitation of the country was undertaken in 1527; but the churches, in lack of a common law, took various measures, according to the usage and caprice of the patrons and congregations: the Bishop's tithes ceased; the others were much diminished; worship had no fixed rule, and so it continued till 1542, when the new ecclesiastical law was published. So, too, the Romish churches continued along with the new, until at last they were reduced to the chapter and a few cloisters. As late as 1528, the Bishop purified a desecrated village church, and preached the customary indulgence; and when, in 1533, he was invited to the election of the King, he had the boldness to demand that the new sovereign should pledge himself to restore the Romish worship, and that the heir of the duchies should promise to leave the remaining ecclesiastical foundations unchanged, until the two kingdoms to which the duchies belonged, should obtain their final reformation. This occurred in Denmark (1536), but the rest of the Romish churches in Schleswig held their ground much longer; the Bishop died in 1541; an evangelical successor was chosen, and supported by the revenues of the cathedral; but the estates of the bishopric and chapter were entrusted to the hands of evangelical prelates (scholars and princes), until confiscated in 1661. One nunnery was retained as an asylum for women of noble birth, as well as three in Holstein for the same purpose.

The rapid progress of evangelical preaching in the duchy was soon felt in the kingdom, but the issue there was very different; native teachers were needed, and the hierarchy prepared itself for stout resistance. Apparently profound peace reigned during the first years of the new king, till 1526; but the fire glowed under the ashes. Some men had become acquainted with the Gospel abroad; several were even then at the university of Wittenberg; from the school of Morten Borup, in Aarhus, went many future preachers of the truth; in the Carmelite college, at Copenhagen, and other schools, over which Paul Eliä stood as provincial, biblical Christianity was expounded, and the wants of the Church considered. The Danish translation of the N. T. was eagerly read, and awakened no little doubt concerning doctrine, and gave occasion to discussions upon religious topics. Luther's writings also crept in through the booksellers, *e. g.*, his Short Forms for the study of the Ten Commandments, which Paul Eliä translated in 1524, and published in 1526. This man also took an active interest in a translation of the Psalms of David, which his scholar, Frands Wormordsen, of the Carmelite college, had made, after the version of Luther, and published in 1528. But this same Paul Eliä vacillated between the sharp contradictions of the

old and the new, when they came into collision, and hence his name has come down to us dishonored (Paul Vendekaabe, *i. e.* weather-cock). Drawn more and more into controversy, his irritable temper grew hot, and he poured out the roughest abuse upon the leaders of the Reformation. And yet, with all this rude behavior, he always sympathized with them to a certain degree, though he never succeeded in gaining the full confidence which he deserved. Like another Erasmus, he wished a Reformation confined to dogmas, and without a breach with Rome.

The new light began now to spread beyond the circle of the learned. In 1525, the King sanctioned the circulation of the Bible, and in 1526, appeared as an open advocate of the Reformation. Part of the Danish nobility sided with him; the scarcity of money aided the cause. In 1566, it was decreed that no money should go out of the kingdom for the confirmation of the Bishops and other clergy, but that such confirmation must be sought from the canon, thus making the national Church independent of Rome. When now evangelical preachers appeared, the burghers soon acknowledged the truth, and the peasantry kept back their gifts and part of the tithes. The movement began in Jutland: from Schleswig, especially Hadersleben, where many German preachers and teachers were assembled at the court of the prince, the new doctrine spread, in 1526, over the whole peninsula. It found its first strong foothold in Viborg; a man then dwelt there who distinguished himself above all others as the Reformer of Denmark. Hans Tauson, a Johanneite monk, a native of Fyen, had been sent, in 1522, at the expense of the monastery of Antvorskov, to the German universities; but, attracted by the fame and writings of Luther, had exchanged Cologne and Louvain for Wittenberg, where he became thoroughly imbued with the new doctrine. His prior recalled him, threw him into prison, and sent him to a more learned prior at Viborg. But here he preached the Gospel, was shielded by the citizens from the power of the Bishop, and at length (1526) accepted as a chaplain of the King. A school was established by royal consent, and put in charge of another disciple of Luther, Jörgen Sadolin, who was assisted by several monks. And so it was in other cities which the new preachers entered, with letters of safe-conduct from the King. In vain the Bishops warned; in vain they invited the zealots, Eck and Cochlæus, to come and fight the heretics; in vain they reminded the King of his coronation oath. The Council of State even thought the issue of such letters imprudent: but the King defended himself by saying, that he did not protect the Lutheran heresy, but the preaching of God's Word; that the privileges he had sworn to respect were mostly of a secular kind. The movement, however, demanded a legal sanction; in Odense (1527) a diet was held, which laid the foundation for reform. The prelates were obliged to yield many of their claims, in order to preserve the rest. But when the entire Council of State wished to restore the power of the Bishops over the ministry, on condition that they would suffer the Gospel to be

preached, the King insisted on the toleration of Lutheranism, and a thorough reform of the clergy. He succeeded in forming a constitution in which full religious liberty was guaranteed, until the meeting of an Œcumenical Council. By a royal decree, the monks and the clergy were allowed to marry. Thus all spiritual jurisdiction was taken from the Bishops; they did not yield, however, but kept up a long and desperate struggle.

On the basis of the Odense Constitution, the new Church soon rose. The art of printing now did great service; the evangelical teachers, Tausen at their head, sent forth numerous pamphlets and books, devotional, liturgical, and polemical; a new translation of the N. T., after Luther, by Christian Pedersen, appeared; every attack of the Romanists, especially of Paul Eliä, was stoutly repelled. In Viborg (1529), all the churches of the city, save the cathedral, with the Bishop and his chapter, were organized upon evangelical principles. From 1528, Malmöe became a new and very important centre for the Eastern part of the kingdom; hither flocked the teachers who were driven from Copenhagen, mostly from the school of Paul Eliä, and, with the approval of the King, founded, in 1529, a high school, from the old church revenues: in the same year, all that remained of Romanism was expelled from the city. In Copenhagen, the King himself opened the door by calling Hans Tausen to the church of St. Nicolas, in 1529, and within one year, the Reformation had progressed as far as in Viborg. His removal led Tausen to ordain evangelical preachers; this act was followed, especially in Malmöe. Such was the advance of the new Church, as to its *cultus* and ministry; its confession came in 1530. In this year the evangelical cause received a new impulse from a diet held in Copenhagen. The Bishops had desired an investigation; they wished to prove the new teachers to be heretics, and complained of their assumption of the right of ordaining. The King may have cherished the design of compelling them to yield. Both parties, as usual in judicial cases, were summoned before the supreme court, composed of the King and the Council of State, in order (as was said) to bring about a Christian Reformation and concord in the realm. With confidence and lively hope, the evangelical preachers of the whole kingdom obeyed the summons, and on the 9th or 11th of July offered a confession of faith in 43 articles, which, though of independent origin, very closely agrees with that of Augsburg. This confession was explained to the people in all the churches, and the city was won. The prelates had now to look abroad for aid; a Dr. Stagefyr and a Dr. from Bomberg responded to their call. They preferred 27 points of complaint against the doctrine and conduct of the preachers; the latter answered, and preferred 12 of their own. But there was no decision; the prelates postponed their reply to the defence of the heretics, and the preachers strove to procure from the King a decree in favor of the Reformation; but he could do no more than promise to support them in the preaching of the Gospel. Neither party was satisfied; but the evangelicals, who had passed

the ordeal unhurt, gained new strength, and assumed in part what the King had not ventured to grant. In several cities the mass was now abolished as idolatrous; in Copenhagen the cathedral was stormed by the people and closed by the government. The university was dissolved. In Viborg the cathedral was reformed, and in many cities the convents were evacuated, not always without violence, and once, in Schonen, with bloodshed. The King gave the monasteries and churches to the cities, the former even to particular men; he caused the gold and silver found in them to be used for the needs of war, and laid heavy taxes upon the clergy. With the extinction of the service for which they were bestowed, the nobles withheld the gifts of their ancestors. Everything threatened the downfall of Romanism. The enraged prelates held their peace; after a hot battle for the mass, Paul Eliä refrained from publishing his severest controversial work, and it seemed as if some of the Bishops felt the necessity of submission. Knud Gyldenstierne, the diocesan of Fyen, called Jörgen Sadolin as preacher to Odense, caused him to translate the catechism of Luther and the Augsburg Confession and commanded the pastors to employ themselves with such doctrine; he wished it to be tested. Several other circumstances gave brighter hopes to the evangelical party, whilst Tausen urged upon the King the need of reforming the Bishops by the exercise of his royal power. But suddenly relief came to the prelates; Frederick died in April, 1533.

No successor had been chosen, and a new election could not immediately take place, owing to the connection of the kingdom with Norway; there was also a diversity of opinion: the prelates feared Duke *Christian*, and preferred his minor-brother, who might be won over: the election was postponed a whole year. During this interregnum the prelates triumphed, and made an attempt to suppress the Reformation. In spite of a majority of votes, they converted an ambiguous resolution of the council into a law, by which to abolish religious liberty; all teachers were to be subject to the Bishops; who were to have the sole care of instruction and worship; those without call were to be banished, or prosecuted in the civil courts; no convent could be broken up, and it was proposed to restore those that had been, as well as to erect a high school for the education of the clergy. Such a law was the more dangerous, because the Bishop, aided by a few of the councillors, was to administer the government in each diocese, during the vacancy of the throne. But it soon became apparent, that they could not succeed; for as soon as they made a beginning with Hans Tausen, and condemned him to banishment, the indignation of the people rose to such a height, that the Bishop found it prudent to come to terms, and surrender the preacher and the churches to the citizens; yet all the Bishops were not disposed to make the same use of the law. Some of them began a systematic persecution, and, where they had the power, many preachers were driven off and punished, and many churches wrested again from the citizens. The ban of excommunication was freely used. But it came too late to produce any effect upon

public opinion; even Paul Eliä now advocated the cause of the Romish Church only from the standpoint of Erasmus, thinking that harmony should be sought by mutual concession, and the reference of all disputed points to a future council. But he found no hearing; the evangelical party desired nothing less than victory. The power soon vanished from the hands of the Bishops and their allies; after the lapse of one year, the country was reduced by foreign enemies, civil war, and domestic discord to the most wretched condition. The leaders who fought for the imprisoned King Christian had to embrace Protestantism, and aid in uprooting by force of arms the remnant of the old faith. With the bloody insurrection of the peasants the religious strife had very little to do; their attack was directed against the nobility, and the Bishops were only regarded as worldly magnates. The latter soon found themselves compelled to make common cause with the nobles of Jutland and Fyen, and to look even to the Lutheran duke for aid. The choice of *Christian III.* (1534) determined the success of the Reformation. He confirmed, not the privileges of the clergy, but religious liberty to both confessions; the reorganization of the Church he postponed, although he promised the cities who submitted to him an evangelical constitution. His resolution was already taken; the weakness resulting from the protracted internal disorders, had led him to cast his eye upon the wealth of the Bishops, against whom popular hatred was turned, blaming them more than they deserved, as the authors of the public misfortune. As soon as the capital yielded, the King assembled some lay councillors, passing over the Bishops; on Aug. 12 it was secretly determined to deprive the Bishops of their spiritual and secular office, and confiscate their temporalities. All this was promptly done by the King. He then convoked a general diet at Copenhagen, and laid before the estates, among whom the clergy were wanting for the first time, the new constitution of the realm. It was adopted by acclamation. To the King and the Council of State was committed the task of disposing of the confiscated property, in behalf of the crown, of science, and of the new Church, whose organization was also placed in their hands.

Thus the struggle ended. The Gospel was to be taught, and, in fact, was already so freely preached that no one opposed it beyond the cloisters and chapters, where the Romish faith and worship were kept up for a long period, although under limitations. The imprisoned Bishops, with one exception, were released, after renouncing their claims, and otherwise provided for; three of them embraced the Gospel, two of whom married, and one even regained his seat in the Council of State. Paul Eliä vanishes from history; for the tradition that he entered into the service of the new Church is unsupported: he may, like many others, have buried himself in a cloister. Some of the monks emigrated, especially the mendicants, who were forbidden to beg on pain of death.

According to the decision of the diet, the episcopal estates and the so-called lord's cloisters went to the crown, and were (the cloisters, after

the monks had died out) converted into fiefs and castles, and for the most part alienated in the course of time. The convents of the Mendicants and Hospitallers, in so far as not already done, were transferred to the cities, and changed into great public houses for the poor; the Carmelite college of Paul Eliä at length became a dwelling for students. So, also, a third of all tithes in the whole land (the King's tithe) and the chapters fell to the crown; the tithe was devoted in part to the university, the schools, and the wants of the Church, and in part remained as a revenue of the estates of the crown, and went with these, or by purchase, into other hands. The chapters, by the advice of Luther, were retained for the support of scholars; but under the pressure of public necessity, they also were alienated in 1660. The village churches were attached to the crown, in so far as they were managed, when not under a patron, as was seldom then the case, by a royal feudatory, and their revenue was not always applied to religious purposes; afterward they became private property, the owner receiving the third of the tithe (which was everywhere retained) and other revenues of the Church, on condition of keeping the buildings in repair; and such ownership, till 1849, gave noble persons the right of appointment, or, since 1806, of presentation to the pastoral office. The nobility also obtained their share of the rich booty, not only directly, by investiture, but indirectly, by gift and by the right of reclamation, which was confirmed by all subsequent treaties of the crown.

In the new organization of the Church, the Wittenbergers had much to do; for King Christian III. cherished all his life long the highest respect for the great Reformer and his associates. He requested the aid of Bugenhagen and Melancthon, but as their attendance at the Council of Mantua prevented their coming, he called, in the beginning of 1557, a synod at Odense, where a discipline was prepared for the Church. It conforms strictly to those of Germany, especially of Brunswick and Hamburg; yet varies somewhat in its form. It was written in Latin, and sent to Luther for his approval. In the summer Bugenhagen arrived, crowned the King, and completed the discipline by adding a provision concerning the monks; on Sept. 2 it was published, and placed in the hands of the superintendents of the Church. It was then subscribed by two representatives of each chapter, and by the most distinguished evangelical teachers of the kingdom and the Danish duchy; later, it was translated into the vernacular tongue by the now Bishop of Sealand, Peter Paladius; still another translation was made, and this version, with sundry changes, was adopted by the Council of State at Odense, in 1539. It bore, as yet, the name of Church discipline for both kingdoms, and the duchies of Schleswig and Holstein; its application to the latter countries may have been superseded by the new discipline, drawn up by Bugenhagen in Low German, and accepted at Rendsburg in 1542, or it may only have been in force for the Danish congregations existing there; in the following century, Norway framed one of her own, with little change; but Iceland, when it passed

to Denmark, after the overthrow of the Drontheim archbishopric, to which it belonged as a Norwegian colony, was brought under the same law in 1551.

With this discipline, the Danish Church at once received her first superintendents; to each diocese a Bishop and a royal officer (diocesan feudatory) were appointed. The first Bishops were Palladius and five of the chief Reformers, besides one for Ribe. Why Hans Tausen was overlooked then we do not know, since, in 1542, he became Bishop of Ribe. On Sept. 2, they were all ordained by Bugenhagen, for the discipline provided a special form of episcopal ordination. With the diocesan feudatories, they now began their work of visitation. Many churches were suppressed, and three often entrusted to one pastor. In the country, most of the priests who for ten years had embraced the new doctrine, were suffered to remain in office; the city parishes had long been supplied with preachers. These, however, were reduced to great straits, whilst their rural brethren derived a fair livelihood from the glebe lands; hence, in 1542, the King's tithe was devoted to the support of the pastors and churches of the cities. Two great synods were held at Copenhagen in 1540, and at Antvorskov in 1546, for the settlement of doubtful questions. Along with the Church, the university of Copenhagen was reformed; Bugenhagen drew up the plan after the model of Wittenberg; the King furnished the means from the church property; the whole endowment was 50,000 thalers, which now yields about 70,000 p. an. The Bishop of Sealand was to be the professor of divinity. To its theologians was committed the task of producing the first complete translation of the Bible; this was accomplished by the classic pen of Christiern Pedersen, who closely followed that of Luther; it appeared in 1550. Schools of learning were also founded in every city from the revenues of the old Church, and placed under the supervision of the Bishops. But for popular education, very little could yet be done.

It required years to introduce the new system; and only when the Danish Bible appeared (1550), the new parochial appointments were ratified by the King and Council (1555), and the first liturgy (Altarbuch) by Palladius (1555) was published, could the external work of the Reformation be regarded as complete. About this time the men who labored most in the blessed cause ended their lives: Frands Wormorsen died in 1551; the King and Bishop Sadolin in 1559; Peter Palladius, in 1560; and Hans Tausen in 1561.

4. *Since the Reformation.*¹ As regards the

¹ *H. Ushing*, Kirkeforfatningen i de Kongelige danske Stater, 1-4. Del. Sorøe, 1786-9. *J. L. A. Kolderup-Rosenvinge*, Grundrids af den danske Kirkeret, 2 vol. Cop. 1851. *A. F. Bergsøe*, den danske Stats Statistik, 1-4 vol. Cop. 1844-53. (Comp. the hist. works; *Pontoppidan*, Ann. Ecol. 3-4 pt. till 1700. *L. Helweg*, den danske Kirkes Historie efter Reformationen, 1-2 vol. Cop. 1851-55 till 1825. *C. T. Engelstoft*, Liturgiæns Historie, Cop. 1840, and his Om geistligheden som Rigsstand i Danmark, Cop. 1850; also in N. Hist. Tidsskr. 4 vol.) *H. N. J. Jensen*, Versuch einer kirchl. Statistik des Herzogthums Schleswig, Kiel, 1843. *J. Wiggers*, Kirchliche Statistik, 2 vol. p. 375, ss.

order of worship, it remains essentially the same until the present day. In the 17th cent. it was confirmed by the ritual-book of 1685, and the altar-book of 1688. At that time the last vestiges of the Latin service vanished. In 1783, exorcism was abolished. Several attempts have been since made (1785, 1805, 1830) to secure a thorough revision of the ritual, but without success; even that begun in 1839, under the auspices of the government, has proved a failure. A few customs still survive from the age of the Reformation, such as mass-singing, the use of the surplice, the cope, the pallium, and candles on the altar. In 1739, preaching on week days was generally abandoned, and, in 1770, on saints' days also. Here and there in the country, special sermons for fasts, seed-time, and harvest occur. The Danish Rogation day falls on the 3d day after Easter. Into Schleswig many German usages have worked their way. The liturgy of Adler, introduced into both duchies (1797), has done much to destroy uniformity of worship. The ecclesiastical system culminates in the Bishops, who, soon after the Reformation, received the title of superintendents. Their number remained the same as in the Catholic times, only the seats of two were changed. He of Sealand has his residence in Copenhagen; he of Börglum in Aalborg. Afterward, the diocese of Schonen was separated from Denmark, and Fyen divided into two small ones. Instead of two Bishops, Iceland received only one. The diocese of Schleswig perished in the partition of the duchy; after many changes by superintendents and general superintendents, it has now again recovered its Bishop, but without episcopal ordination. The Bishop of Sealand is the primate of the Danish Bishops; he ordains them, anoints the King, and takes the precedence in rank, but has no other privilege beyond the rest. Till 1830 he was professor of theology in Copenhagen. His diocese, in course of time, has been increased by the addition of Greenland, the Farøe Islands, and the Danish colonies outside of Europe, whilst, on the other hand, the island of Rügen has long been separated from it. The King appointed the first evangelical Bishops, after they had been first elected by the city pastors of the diocese, and thus it was until the rise of absolutism, in 1660, gave the right of choice to the crown. The Bishop had, indeed, no parish, but was bound to preach in the whole diocese and the place where he dwelt. With this duty was connected the visitation of the schools and churches. Each bailiwick (Hard), of which, at the time of the Reformation, there were from 13 to 36 in a diocese, according to its extent, had, from 1536 to 1806, a provost, elected by the pastors and the Bishop, and, from 1660, confirmed by the King. In 1806, official provosts were appointed, for the management of the school-system, which were again, in 1822, superseded by district-provosts; these districts embraced 2 or 3 bailiwicks (Hards). Along with the bailiffs they constituted the board of education, and were bound to visit the churches. Formerly these provosts, with the Bishop and the bailiff of the chapter, assembled twice a year, partly to receive the new laws of the King, and the admonitions of the Bishops, and partly

to hold a judicial court. Since the introduction of absolutism, the provost court constituted the lowest tribunal, and is presided over by the provost and the civil judge; the highest is the general court, in which no clergyman can have a seat. The diocesan synods are now held once a year, and the attempt has been made to give them a higher interest by the discussion of subjects connected with dogmatic and pastoral theology.

At first the pastors were elected by seven men of the parish, and by the magistrates in the cities, wherever a noble or the crown did not possess the right of patronage; in 1660, this privilege of the parishes and the magistrates was absorbed by the crown, and, in 1849, that of the nobles also. As regards the discipline of members, there are old statutes requiring it, but they are no longer observed. At the present time, the propriety of appointing a parochial board in each parish is agitated, a measure which could certainly accomplish great good. The pastor is the supervisor of from two to three schools in his parish. The children are here taught until the time of their confirmation, which takes place at the end of their 14th year, unless it be performed earlier by special dispensation. There are in all 110 so-called *personal chaplains*, who are the vicars of aged or sick pastors. In former times, co-pastors or deacons existed in the cities; since 1803 their number has been much diminished. Altogether, there are 1024 pastors and 69 provosts in the 8 bishoprics; in Schleswig 209 pastors and 10 provosts, under one Bishop.

At first the Bishops, with the deputies of the clergy and of the university, as well as those of the chapters, were admitted to the royal diet when financial matters were discussed. From the 17th cent. they acquired the full right of members, took part in the election of the King and other public affairs, and played, as the allies of the people, a very important part in the diet of 1660, where they contributed largely to the change in the form of government. This diet did much to raise the position of the clergy. When, afterward (1834), the popular element was introduced, they were represented by two members, selected by the King until the present constitution was adopted (1849) according to which any citizen can be chosen by the people as their representative.

The external government of the Church was very badly provided for; no trace is found of a consistory, either as a court of morals, or as an executive board. The name was indeed applied to a court which had cognizance of matrimonial causes, from 1542-1797, when it was dissolved. The State undertook the regulation of morals; the Kings issued their decrees, which the civil courts enforced by fines and other similar penalties. All this was abolished in the 18th cent. The special control of the Church was limited to the Bishop and the diocesan feudatory, which latter was obliged to share it, from 1581-1660, with the other feudatories of the district. By these officers the King administered the affairs of the Church; he did, indeed, consult with the Bishops and other learned men, but acted indirectly through his chancellor, and frequently of

his own free will. In the revolution of 1660, a consistory was proposed, but rejected; a court of chancery was established, and to it was entrusted the care of the Church, justice, the poor, and public instruction; for a time it was aided by the counsels of another (General-Kirke-Inspection-Collegiet, 1737-91), which exerted very little influence. In this century the government of the university, and in 1805 that of the high-schools, passed from its control, and it only retained the Church and the common schools, until, in 1848, a special *ministerium* was appointed to take its place (Ministeriet for Kirke-og Underviisningsvesenet). The administration of the Schleswig Church, in so far as it was not included in the dioceses of Fyen and Ribe, was entrusted to a special court of chancery, and is now, with the entire government of the duchy, committed to the *ministerium* for Schleswig.

The ruling principle up to 1848 was, that the King had supreme power over all the affairs of the Church. It was not, it is true, directly conferred upon him, but as he was, in fact, the protector of the new Church, and led her to victory, the charter of 1536 made it his first duty, for the honor of God and the spread of the faith, to promote the divine word and doctrine; and as he became an absolute sovereign in 1660, it was boldly asserted in the law of 1665 that, as the highest judge and ruler on earth, he possessed over all and everything in the Church and religion, as well as the State, unlimited power, only that his religion must be according to the unaltered Augsburg Confession. The result was, that the Kings strove to preserve unity in the Church; they kept out of the realm all that differed from the Lutheran faith as taught in Wittenberg, and a law was inserted in the last royal charter (1648), that he durst permit no other. The Saxon symbols were the rule of doctrine, except the Formula of Concord, which was forbidden in the kingdom, and later (1647), only introduced into the duchies. In 1683, the following were adopted as the symbols of the Church: the Small Catechism of Luther, and the unaltered Augsburg Confession, along with the three oecumenical creeds. No attempt has been made to change these, and the present fundamental law of 1849, which designates the national Church as Evangelical Lutheran, has only assumed its historical name.

And yet the absolute sovereigns have suffered other religious parties, under various restrictions, to enter the kingdom. In some places (Altona, Fredericia), complete religious liberty has been granted; in others, the dissenters have special privileges. Of Jews, first admitted in the 17th cent., and, since 1814, placed in a very favorable position, there are now in the kingdom 4000 (and about as many in the duchies), but their number is decreasing. The same is true of the Reformed, who have 900 in the one (and 700 in the other). The Roman Catholics, who in the beginning attached themselves to the French and Austrian legations, and are subject to the greatest disabilities, although native Catholics, since 1834, are eligible to office, have built at Copenhagen (1843) a handsome church; a short time ago there were only 900 of them in the kingdom (and 1300 in the duchies). If to

these we add a small congregation of Moravians in Copenhagen (there are several in the duchies, especially in Schleswig, where, since 1771, they have had a considerable colony at Christiansfeld), and some Greek Catholics, with a few Anglican Christians, mostly attached to the embassies, we have all the religious parties which, beyond the free cities, are allowed to worship publicly; besides these, there are in the duchies Mennonites (200) and Remonstrants (100). The number of dissenters, compared with the whole population, can scarcely exceed $\frac{1}{4}$ p. c., and in the country, the ratio is only 1 to 4000. All sects, till 1848, were strictly forbidden to make proselytes, and apostasy to Roman Catholicism or Judaism was not at all permitted in a subject. Hence, when the New Baptists, before 1848, began to spread their doctrines, an attempt was made to compel the baptism of the children, and to banish the dissenters to places where religious liberty was allowed; but the government held back, and the new constitution has, by the fundamental law of 1849, changed the position of all dissenters. This law has raised the confessional character of the State, because no one is now prevented from the full enjoyment of his civil rights on the score of religion. Thus full liberty of conscience and worship is granted, in so far as it conflicts not with morality and public order. But the law does not promise any support to dissenters in their worship, and only releases from ecclesiastical taxes those who belong to acknowledged religious denominations; otherwise, they are obliged to pay them into the school-fund. This constitution has already given rise to a law which permits civil marriage only to those who differ in belief, or belong to a denomination not recognized; but other laws are still wanting. Because no form is provided by which such legal recognition can take place, some sects occupy an uncertain position; the Mormons have made use of this circumstance, and have for some years pursued their plans, unchecked by the State.

The national Church has the promise of an establishment by law, but still waits for its fulfilment, in order to carry on her battle with closed ranks, and under freer forms than of old, not so much against variant doctrines, which have spread little, but rather against the vice, the deadness, and the infidelity which are the abiding foes of the Christian Church on earth.

DR. ENGELSTORF, Bishop of Fyen.—Porter.

Dependence, or a feeling of dependence on God. The phrase expresses the immediate relation of human consciousness to God, which lies at the foundation of every religion. Nietzsche justly remarks, in his dissertation on the *Religionsbegriff der Alten* (Stud. u. Krit. Vol. I. p. 541), that even the Greeks have no words to express *piety*, but such as represent it to be a felt dependence on God, or a state of subordination and humility. In many languages, accordingly, the religious feeling is designated as a sense of fear; in Hebrew, e. g., as אֱלֹהִים פֶּחַד; in Greek, εὐσεβεία; in German, Gottesfurcht; in English, *fear of God*. The same idea is indicated by the words used in the N. T.

to describe the nature of religion: φόβος θεοῦ, εὐσεβεία, θρησκεία, λατρεία, δουλεία (Acts 10:2; James 1:27; Rom. 12:1; John 16:2). It is the basis, also, of the well-known derivation of the word *religio*, by Lactantius (Inst. div. IV. 28). It indicates, therefore, an enfeebled conception of religion, to ignore the natural feeling of dependence, and, with Reinhard, Morris, Doederlein, and other so-called supernaturalists, to define it only as a *modus Deum cognoscendi et colendi*.

This enfeebled conception of religion among the Protestants of Germany, during the latter part of the last century, resulted from various causes. Orthodoxy viewed religion as sound doctrine. Pietism was constitutionally averse to scientific theology. And Kant, ignoring the significance of religious feeling altogether, substituted in its stead the knowledge of duty, as prescribed by divine precepts. Protestantism was prepared thus for a powerful reaction, when Schleiermacher, under the modifying influence of the philosophy of Spinoza, Fichte, and Jacobi, promulgated the theory that the essence of religion consists in *the feeling of dependence on God*.

This view of religion was first presented in his *Reden über die Religion* (1st ed. 1799; 4th ed. 1831). Feeling is the peculiar sphere of piety. Piety consists in the single states of feeling which arise from the operation of God in us, conditioned on the influence of the world from without; which implies the dependence of religious feeling on God (Sämtl. Werke, I. p. 196). The origin of this feeling Schleiermacher explains thus: The universe is an uninterrupted activity, continually revealing itself to us. The single thing exists not by itself, but as a part of the whole; one finite object does not contradict and exclude another; but each is the expression of the infinite. To receive and be moved by the influence of the single and finite as the expression of the universal whole, is religion. On p. 200, Schleiermacher expresses this idea also thus: a feeling is an emotion of piety, not when a single thing as such awakens the feeling, but when, in the single, the universal whole, as the revelation of God, affects us, that is, when not the single and the finite, but God enters our life, in whom alone the particular is *one and all*; so that, in turn, there is not some one single power excited in us, but our whole being (as distinct from, yet a part of the world), or the *divine in us*, is called forth through feeling (vid. p. 254).

The fundamental idea of Schleiermacher's *Reden* was developed, twenty-two years later, in his *Glaubenslehre*,¹ but with this definite modification; the nature of religious emotion consists in the feeling, not of dependence only, but of *absolute dependence*. And absolute dependence in feeling means, according to Schleiermacher, *to be conscious of self in relation to God* ("sich seiner in Beziehung mit Gott bewusst sein"). To apprehend this theory properly, we must bear in mind that Schleiermacher conditions the sense of dependence not on the influence of single things, as single, but on the influence of single

¹ Der christliche Glaube nach den Grundsätzen der evang. Kirche im Zusammenhange dargestellt, 2. Aufl. 1830.

things as part of a whole (Anm. 5, Reden ueber die Religion, p. 269, et al.). Single things, as single, occasion but a sensational self-consciousness: "for we have not a sense of dependence on the whole, considered as an aggregate of parts which condition each other mutually, and of which we are one, but only as a union based on a *oneness* which conditions both the *all* and the relation we, as a part, bear to the other parts." The truth involved in the peculiar theory of Schleiermacher, the pantheistic tenor of which is manifest, has been expressed by Deinhardt: "The genesis of religion lies in the consciousness of our limitation and nothingness" (Beit. zur rel. Erkenntnis, 1844, p. 9). Or, as Elwert says: Religious feeling is something original, something wrought in us immediately by God, and religion is a peculiar and independent sphere (Wesen der Religion, Tübing. Zeitschrift, 1835, 3, p. 52).

The more Schleiermacher opposed the prevailing errors and prejudices against religion of his time, the more numerous were the attacks made from all sides upon his doctrine. Rationalism preferred the charge of mysticism. The orthodox alleged that, if religion belongs only to the sphere of self-consciousness, it is exclusively subjective, and can have no connection with the objective authority of the Scriptures (Olshausen, Stud. u. Krit. 1830, 3, p. 362; Steudel, Tüb. Zeitschrift, 1831, 1, p. 1, et seq.) And speculative philosophy declared, in the person of Hegel: If religion rests on the feeling of dependence, the animal has religion too (Vorl. über Phil. der Religion, Werke, Vol. II. p. 100). To which Deinhardt aptly replied: Limitation does not give rise to religion, else the animal would indeed be religious; but the consciousness of limitation involves both the consciousness of the infinite and the destination for the infinite. But the most prominent theologians of the age, those who are laboring most earnestly to reconcile faith and knowledge (De Wette, Nitzsch, Twisten, Ullman, J. Müller, Lücke, Hagenbach, and others), have received the Schleiermacherian theory, though with some modifications, and developed it more fully.

We are by no means, however, of the opinion that the Schleiermacherian theory is exhaustive of the nature of religion. The feeling of dependence on God certainly lies at the basis of, and is manifested in all forms of religion, and leads man to humility before God. But the feeling of dependence, considered simply as such, is not religious; it has no moral element—an element that is not wanting in any form of religion. It is from an *ethical* standpoint, accordingly, that Schleiermacher's doctrine requires modification and emendation. It is only through the functions of the conscience that the feeling of dependence is developed into religion. If, on the one hand, it may be said that there can be no religion in which the feeling of dependence has no place, on the other, it may also be said that there are feelings of (absolute) dependence which do not belong to the sphere of religion.

DR. SCHENKEL. — Gerhart.

Deposition (*depositio*), as distinguished from *suspension* and *degradation* (see *Penalties, eccl.*), consists in permanently depriving an ecclesiastic

of the rights and dignities of his office, whilst he still (according to Rom. Cath. rules) retains the office itself. It requires a formal process against the person accused, and the penalty must, in some countries, be concurred in by the civil authorities. The grounds of deposition may rest partly upon universal rules of public service, partly upon the special obligations of the clerical office, in respect of doctrine, preaching, and conduct.

A. H.*

Deputies. 1. In the *Greek C.*, *δενόταροι*, a lower class of officers, who attended the clergy, upon solemn occasions, with burning tapers; they also cleared the way for priests in their public walks (Du CANGE, *cerosferarius* and *deputatus*; SUICER., *δενόταροι*). They form no distinct order, and hence may marry a second time. 2. In the *Romish C.*, "deputies" occur in some parts, as overseers of the *regiunculae*, or districts divided into larger deaneries. Usually they are under the dean as assistants; but sometimes they receive directions immediately from the Bishop, and then the dean's relation to them is that of *primus inter pares*. — 3. In the *Reformed C. of Basel*, "deputies" for churches and schools, were instituted by a regulation of 1529, to have a supervision over the preachers and schools. The office still exists in a modified form.

HERZOG.*

Derbe, a small city of Lycaonia (strictly, Isauria), S. of Lystra, whither Paul and Barnabas fled, and where they preached (Acts 14: 6, 20). Paul again visited it, after his separation from Barnabas, and associated himself with Timothy, whose native place Derbe probably was (Acts 16: 1). Caius (Acts 20: 4) was also of Derbe. *Steph. Byzant.* (p. 100, ed. *Westermann*) calls it *Δέρβεια* or *Δάβεια*, which, in Lycaonian, means a *juniper tree*. (See STRABO, XII. 569; PROL. V. 1.)

ARNOLD.*

Desire. In a state of wakefulness, a number of conceptions continually arise from within, whether upon some external occasion or not. Some are dark, others vivid. Coming with a higher degree of vividness, one fixes the attention, and makes the impression, more or less distinct, that the object of it is of advantage, or the contrary. If of advantage, we *desire it*, whether the object be already in existence, or yet to become a reality. There is a direction of the will towards the object; a tendency of self to come into possession of it. If strong and abiding, the desire becomes a *longing*, which may be more or less intense.

The original seat of desires, according to the Scriptures, is the heart (Prov. 4: 23); and from the state of the heart they derive their moral character (Luke 6: 45; 12: 34); for desires, as such, are neither good nor evil. As there are natural desires, for the satisfaction of the wants of our sensual life (Luke 15: 16; 16: 21), so there are desires also for the highest and purest good (Ps. 42: 1; Matt. 5: 6). In this sense, desire is attributed to the Old Testament saints, and even to angels (Matt. 13: 17; Heb. 11: 16; 1 Pet. 1: 12). Christ also, who was without sin, had desires both for natural and spiritual things (Luke 12: 49; 22: 15; Matt. 4: 2; John 19: 28). The apostle desired to be with Christ (Phil. 1: 23); and believers are exhorted to de-

sire the sincere milk of the word (1 Pet. 2 : 2; comp. Heb. 6 : 11; 1 Tim. 3 : 1). Indeed, the excitement of desire or aversion through definite conceptions of objects is, in itself, so far from being sinful, that it belongs to the constitution of human nature. Desires become sinful when they originate in the opposition of the flesh to the spirit, when the flesh lusteth against the spirit (Gal. 5 : 17); when a man gives place to this opposition, and desires what is contrary to the law of God, and pollutes his image in the soul. Every desire of this kind is itself an internal sin (Matt. 5 : 28; Mark 4 : 19; Rom. 1 : 24; 7 : 7; 1 Cor. 10 : 6), and begets other sins (James 1 : 14, 15; Matt. 15 : 19; 1 John 2 : 16). Hence it is that *ἐπιθυμία* generally signifies the *prava concupiscentia*, even in places where it is not expressly designated as such (Rom. 6 : 12; Eph. 4 : 22).

In how far now evil desires have their root in our sensual nature; how they are not indeed produced, but excited by the law (Rom. 7 : 7); whether there is an inborn evil tendency; how connected on one side with the fall, and on the other with the work of redemption; in how far its dominion is, not wholly eradicated, but broken in the regenerate—these and other questions are so closely interwoven with the doctrines of sin and justification, and with the differences existing between the Roman Catholic and the Evangelical Protestant Church, that we must refer the reader to the extensive treatises which discuss these subjects. But both Churches agree in this, that the regenerate, who have put off the old man, corrupt according to the *ἐπιθυμίας τῆς σαρκὸς*, endure chastening, are watchful and sober (1 Thess. 5 : 6), deny worldly lusts (Tit. 2 : 12; 1 Pet. 2 : 11), and crucify the flesh with the affections (Gal. 5 : 24); for the life in the Spirit is contrary to the life in the flesh (Gal. 5 : 16; Rom. 6 : 12).

E. SCHWARTZ. — Gerhart.

Desserviens, in the French C., are clergy having charge of chapels of ease, *succursales ecclesiarum*, as distinguished from *parochiales eccl.* (see Du FRESNE, s. v.). They were dependent upon the parish to which their chapel belonged. Older canon law also distinguishes between clergy who officiate independently, and priests who serve at the will of the bishop. Napoleon thought of this arrangement when he attempted to restore the Church, which had been almost overthrown by the Revolution. See *Concord.* of 26, *Messidor* IX. (July 15, 1801), and the *Art. organiques de la convention* of 18, *Germ.* X. (April 8, 1802). In accordance with these articles, the pay of the *curés* was assumed by the State. Hence, their number was kept as small as possible. But as the parishes or cantons thus became too large for the *curé* of the *ecclesia cantonalis*, other clergymen were set over the remaining churches, the *succursales* (*Art. organ.* 31, 60–63). These were now first called *desserviens*. They are instituted or recalled by the bishops. As the chief difference between them and *curés* consisted in their smaller compensation, and as this difference gradually disappeared, it seemed anomalous that they should be more dependent on the bishops than the *curés*. This led to frequent

dissensions concerning the position of the *desserviens*, who form the great majority of the priests in France, Belgium, and along the left bank of the Rhine. (See *Krit. Zeitschr. f. Rechtswissensch. &c.* Heidelb. 1848, Bd. XX. H. III. 47, &c. *Institut. diocesana par Mgr. l'évêque de Digne.* Paris, 1845. *Acta consilii Provinc. Auscitaniae. Auscis*, 1854. *Acta cons. Avenion. Prov. Avenion*, 1850, p. 81, 82. Art. Chaplain). H. F. JACOBSON.*

Determinism. This is the name given to the theories which regard the moral and religious activity of man as absolutely determined by forces, whether operating from without or from within, which are not a part of himself, and thus reduce human freedom to a mere semblance, or deny it altogether. Determinism is, therefore, of various kinds. Dogmatic determinism, e. g. that of Luther, *denies* the freedom of man, and refers the causality of his actions exclusively to God (*de servo arbitrio*), in order to exalt the majesty of the divine government. The philosophical determinism of La Mettrie, on the other hand, transforms man into a machine, or into a plant, in order to deny the existence of God and of spirit in general. Nevertheless, all have this feature in common. They regard the determinative influences which man experiences as an infinite *plus*, before which human personality disappears as an infinite *minus*. This view rests upon the fact that man appears to be infinitely conditioned, and upon the assumption that liberty, in order to be real, must be absolutely arbitrary. In other words, it ignores the fact that God is the highest personality; that he rules and approaches man as such; and that, therefore, the operation of God upon man, which comprehends all true motives, is according to the idea of personal reciprocity, that is, according to the nature of love. Determinism raises, as regards the divine rule, power above love; as regards human experience, external necessity above spontaneous activity, or the limitations of man above the demands of freedom; and, in its judgment of his inner life, the nature and experience which he shares with lower orders of creation, above that which is peculiar to his own personality. The conception of the impersonal beclouds the three fundamental conditions of freedom, namely, a clear idea of divine personality, the truth of human personality, and the certainty of reciprocal correspondence between both. Having lost the knowledge of absolute love, and with it also the knowledge of freedom, determinism is so far forth, therefore, to be regarded as a perpetuation of ante-christian pagan philosophy.

Love unites apparently contradictory elements—necessity and freedom. Without the light of love, both are perverted; the one becoming blind compulsory force, and the other abstract arbitrariness. Each is a caricature, and, reacting, calls forth an opposite error—blind force, an extreme theory of freedom; and arbitrariness, dogmatic determinism. The latter proceeds on the valid assumption that abstract arbitrariness is a figment; for man is always determined either by external circumstances or internal states; and justly maintains that there

can be no middle ground between being determined by motives and self-determination.

But the great error of dogmatic determinism is that it overlooks the peculiarity of man's intellectual and moral nature, in virtue of which he makes the motives influencing him his own motives, or recognizes the complement of his being in that by which he is determined. It makes account of all the factors but the central one—himself as a person. Man is certainly determined not only relatively but absolutely. But just at the point where his state of being determined culminates, he gains his freedom. For when he is determined in his inmost being, he is active under his own true form of self-determination. Hence, a man is a thousand times more free when yielding to the power of divine grace, than when, in seeming playful caprice, he kills a fly on his hand. It is this last form of freedom—arbitrariness—that dogmatic determinism must have in its eye when it shuts up, as in a hard shell, the deep religious feeling of absolute dependence upon God. It should not, therefore, be a matter of surprise that just this dogmatic determinism has developed, with much spirit, the doctrine of freedom which, among the ancients, is peculiar to the Stoics, and, among moderns, to the Calvinists. For the Calvinists are those that have broken through the hard shell of determinism, and unfolded the most glowing doctrine of freedom—the doctrine concerning the bridal relation of the soul to Christ. The case is the same with the dogmatic determinism of *all* the Reformers: it enclosed the consciousness of justification by faith—the religious germ of the highest feeling of freedom.

Those deterministic theories, therefore, which are only incomplete expressions for a sound religious feeling of dependence, in opposition to false abstract doctrines of freedom, are to be distinguished from the fundamental forms of determinism essential and proper.

It is characteristic of determinism that it does not reconcile freedom and necessity, but holds them in such contradiction as to destroy freedom. There is a *fatalistic* determinism. It raises compulsive necessity above the divine being and government; and is exemplified in the doctrine of fate among the Greeks, of the iron rule of Allah among Mahomedans, and of an eternal immutable purpose among supralapsarians. There is a *pantheistic* determinism. Necessity is made to flow from the unchangeable connection of all things. The free acts of men are but the play or manifestations of the universal spirit; illustrated in the philosophy of the Hindus, the ethics of the Stoics, and the system of Spinoza. We get a modification of pantheistic determinism when special stress is laid on the dynamic co-operation of man. There is a *materialistic* determinism. The want of freedom is referred to the connection of the soul with matter as evil; as was done by the Persians, the Gnostics, and especially the Manicheans. Ancient materialistic determinism reappears in the form of modern naturalistic determinism, when human conduct is referred to the force of sensible or sensuo-psychical motives; as is done by French sensationalists.

Phrenological determinism is a higher form of this species. The most refined form is *rationalistic* determinism. Self-determination disappears in the controlling force of conceptions (Priestley), or the conclusiveness of reasons (Leibnitz). But just as fatalistic determinism is infinitely near the *feeling* of the profoundest doctrine of freedom without reaching it, so is rationalistic determinism related to the *understanding*. Some writers have also made a distinction between *mechanical*, *rational*, and *metaphysical* determinism.

Compare *Lehre von der Freiheit des menschlichen Willens*, Göttingen, 1836, by Herbart; on the Schleiermacherian determinism, *Die Christliche Lehre von der Sünde*, by Julius Mueller; on the development of Schl. determinism, the work of J. P. Romang; on Free-will and Determinism, the treatise by L. Ph. Fischer; on the speculative conception of freedom, on Free-will, &c. the *Zeitschrift für Philosophie und spekulative Theologie* (vol. III. p. 101 et seq.). See also *Philosophische Dogmatik*, by Lange.

LANGE. — Gerhart.

Deusdedit (= *Deo datus* and *Adeo datus*), sometimes called *Adeodatus* I., b. in Rome, according to one account the son of a sub-deacon, was elected Pope in 615, as successor of Bonif. IV. He died in 618, and accomplished but little. Tradition adorns his life with many wonders, and his reign with spurious decretals. He was canonized; his anniversary is Nov. 9.

HERZOG.*

Devolution, the right of, is, properly, the prerogative of conferring a benefice, the presentation to which belonged to another person, but was forfeited for the time. It originated in the decree of the *Lateran. Conc.* 1179 (c. 2, X. *de conc. praeb.* 3, 8), that all inferior (c. 12, X. *eod.*) benefices and offices should be filled within six months after becoming vacant. In case the Bishop neglected this duty, the chapter should act; if it devolved upon the chapter, and this showed remissness, the Bishop should fill the vacancy. If both failed, the Metropolitan should appoint an incumbent. At the *Later. Conc.* of 1215, Innoc. III. decreed that, if the election to an episcopal vacancy, or prelacy, of a regular church, was unnecessarily delayed beyond three months, the constituents should forfeit their right of choice for that occasion, and it should devolve upon the nearest dignitaries (c. 41, X. *de elect.* 1, 6. See further regulations in the *TT. de supplenda neglig. praelatorum*, in the Decretals of *Greg. IX.* [1, 10] and *Clem. V.* [1, 5]). The present law is, that if the right of presentation, nomination, &c. is not exercised within the legal limit, through culpable neglect, or is not exercised canonically, it at once devolves upon the nearest superior dignitary, who must discharge the duty as the original patron was bound to do (*devolutio fit cum qualitatibus et personis, quae in prima erant collatione*). The neglect of Bishops to appoint, devolves the right upon the Archb., on whom, also, the appointment to a bishopric rests, *jure devolutionis*. But in case of an uncanonical choice, the right of appointment to the see devolves upon the Pope; if he delays it three months, it reverts again to the original

constituents. In a wider sense, the right of devolution is the prerogative of superior ecclesiastical dignitaries to take extraordinary measures whenever necessary jurisdiction is not exercised by the first proper authorities. This is one of the essential rights of the papal primacy.

SCHURL.*

Devotion, devotional exercises. Devotion is the religious collection and lifting up of the thoughts, the turning of the soul to God, in its transition from meditation to prayer. It is the blossom of the former and the bud of the latter, or, rather, that pious frame in which meditation and prayer combine. Devotion, therefore, includes two distinct elements; that of a self-determining act, by which the individual collects his thoughts from worldly things, and sets them upon spiritual things; and that of a happy spontaneous act of the mind, in which he finds himself in communion with the witnessing Spirit of God. — In *devotional exercises*, the former element is more prominent. They are acts by which man strives to pass over from the thought of finite things, in which, as a sinner, he has become more or less absorbed, to the realization of eternal things. Foremost among these is public worship; then family worship, silent meditation, reading the Bible and other edifying books, prayer, and retirement. — The more a person occupies an external religious position, the greater will be his danger of mistaking these exercises for devotion itself; and even when he does his best, these acts will constitute formally fixed points in his religious life. But the more inward, deep, and free his piety, the more varied and rich will be his devotions; and thus they will point to a time when his whole life will become an uninterrupted act of devotion. This result, however, cannot be attained by omitting all self-discipline in the case, under the impression that devotion must, from the start, be the spontaneous offspring of a free and happy soul. For as in other things legal discipline is the road to moral liberty, so in the case of devotion. None who neglect the practice of devotion will ever taste its blessedness.

LANGE.*

Dexter, Flavius Lucius, a son of B. Pacien, of Barcellona, was entrusted with various offices by Theodosius and Arcadius, and intimately associated with Jerome, whom he induced to write the *de viris illustr.*, which J. dedicated to him. Jerome, in his work, says Dexter had written a general history, which he had not yet read. The work was lost; but the Jesuit, Romanus de la Higuera, pretended, about the beginning of the 17th cent., to have found it in a codex of the Cloister Fulda. But the codex could never be found there by others.

HERZOG.*

Diaconicum designates, in the Greek C., a liturgical manual, used by deacons, or, oftener, a small separate space in a church. Philostorgius, 7, 3, mentions it as a structure occupying a prominent place, *συννότης*, in a church in Constantinople, into which a statue of Christ was taken, — perhaps a semicircular projection from the bema (see *Architecture*). These *diaconica* were used as closets for articles used by deacons; also for the private meetings of the

ecclesiastics of the church; sometimes delinquent ecclesiastics were imprisoned in them (in the 5th cent. *δειακονία*, probably from *δειακός*, was used). In the 8th cent., *diaconicum* occurs in this sense (see Du Cange, *Constant. Christ.* III., 82, p. 48; and his *Gloss.*) HENKE.*

Diaspora, dispersion, the. Thus the Jews living beyond Judea are styled (John 7 : 35, &c.; see *Jews*). — In modern times, the term has been applied to similar cases. The Moravians (see Art.) have their *diaspora*. For a more special use of the term see *Rendtorff*, d. ev. Diasp. d. preuss. Monarchie, &c., Berlin, 1855.

HERZOG.*

Didymus the blind, b. in Alexandria, 308, though deprived of sight in his 5th y. (*Jerome*; *Palladius* says in his 4th y.), acquired extensive erudition, treasuring the lectures he heard in a well-disciplined memory. Thus he became one of the most learned men of his times, in all the branches of knowledge then cultivated. He also diligently studied the Bible. He became one of the teachers and leaders of the Alexandrian school (see Art.), and died in 395. Jerome, Palladius, Ambrose of Alex., Evagrius, Isidore of Pel., &c., were moulded over his writings. Although he opposed the Arians (*Socrates*, IV. 23), he was charged with Origen's heresy, whose *περι αρχων*, Jerome says (*adv. Ruf.* l. 1), he vindicated. Hence his condemnation by the 2d Council of Nice. Most of his writings (chiefly commentaries upon the SS.) have been lost (see a list in *Jerome's viris illustr.*, and in *Fabricius*, *bibl. græc.* V. VIII.). Still extant are: 1, his work upon the Spirit, in the Latin of Jerome, publ. Cologne, 1531, Helmstädt, 1614. It is one of the best ancient works on the subject, though Jerome's version may not be unaltered (see *Basnage*, *animadv. in Did.*, &c., in *Canisii lection. ant.* I.). 2. A brief exposition of the canon, or cath. epp., at Cassiodore's request, *inst. div. scr.* c. 8, transl. into Latin by *Epiph. Scholast.*; found in the *Max. bibl. Patr.* Lugd. 1677, IV., 319, &c. This shows his adherence to Origen. 3. Fragments of a Greek work against the Manichæans (see *Basnage*, l. c.). 4. Three books upon the Trinity, discovered by Aloysius Mingarelli, publ. by his brother, Ferdinand, the Camaldulensian (Rome 1764), who tries to show that this is the book to which *Socrates* (IV. 25) refers. — (See *Schröckh*, K.-G. VII. 70, &c.; *Guericke*, de Schola Alex. I. 79, 83, &c., 333, &c.).

HERZOG.*

Didymus, Gabriel, b. 1487, a Bohemian, was one of those violent characters who caused Luther so much anxiety, and constantly endangered his great work by their fanatical preaching and measures. He embraced the Reformation from its start, and forthwith commenced preaching upon grace, predestination, against the adoration of the host, private masses, &c. In connection with Carlstadt, he also vehemently denounced schools and universities, and invited the people to take matters into their own hands, in correcting abuses, if the proper authorities would not move with sufficient energy. In 1549, Moritz of Saxony deposed him for his connection to the Leipsic interim. He died an individual in 1558. (See *SECKENDORF* *Lutheranismo*, II. 181, &c.; *GIESELE*

97; BRETSCHNEIDER, *corpus ref.* I. 548; TERNE, Versuch einer suff. Nachricht von d. G. Did. &c., Lpz., 1737.) HERZOG.*

Dies iræ, the celebrated sequence for All Soul's Day, used in the Rom. Cath. C. not only on that day, but in all masses for the dead and funeral solemnities, dates from the 13th cent. Whilst some regard L. M. Frangipani, a Dominican, as the author, Barth. Albizzi, of Pisa, in his "*Liber conformitatum*, 1385," has testified that the Franciscan, Thomas of Celano, a village in Albruzzo Ulteriore, according to the view of many of his contemporaries, is entitled to the honor. About 1221, T. was custodian of the Franciscan convents in Mayence, Worms, and Cologne; in 1230 he returned to Italy, and in 1249 wrote the biography of his friend, St. Francis († 1226), under the title of "*Legenda antiqua*;" and at that time the poem is supposed to have appeared. The Franciscan, Waddingus, in his "*Scriptores ordinis Minorum*, 1650," gives strong reasons to support this view. At all events, the "*Dies iræ*," as found in the Missale Romanum, with 19 three-line stanzas, was in use in the Church in the second half of the 14th cent., and is spoken of by Albizzi as well known. It occurs, with a crucifix, on a marble slab in the Franciscan Church at Mantua, introduced by 4 stanzas, the first of which runs thus: *cogita anima fidelis—ad quod respondere velis—Christo venturo de cælis*," whilst, among many other minor variations, the last three stanzas of the received text are replaced by this: "*consors ut beatitatis—viva cum justificatis—in ævum æternitatis*." These additions and alterations were made, it seems, by a monk of this convent, and hence the sequence, in old books, often bears the title: "*meditatio vetusta et venusta de novissimo judicio*."

The passage in Zeph. 1: 14–18, especially v. 15, as translated in the Vulgate, no doubt suggested the poem. Use has also been made of Ps. 102: 27, and 2 Pet. 3: 10, and in order to show that the destruction of the world is a universal idea, and not merely Christian, the poet refers to the prophecy of the Sibyl, which begins: "*væ quas illa dies deprendit*" (ed. of the Sibylline Oracles by Castalio, Helmstädt, 1673, p. 13). Although it is scarcely possible to transfer this sublime and stirring hymn, so full of harmony and rich in thought, into another language, no less than 80 versions have been published in Germany. The earliest is that of Freder, in 1550; the present cent. alone counts 55. We may mention those of G. Herder, Schlegel, F. von Meyer, A. L. Follen, von Wessenberg, Döring, Claus Harms, Bunsen, A. Knapp, and Dr. H. A. Daniel. The last preserves the peculiar metre of the original (Tholuck's liter. Anzeiger, 1839; Nos. 67, 68). Many attempts have also been made to translate it into English, but without any great success. We give the names of Drummond of Hawthornden, Crashaw, the Earl of Roscommon, Evelyn, Sir Walter Scott (a free paraphrase of a few stanzas occurs in his Lay of the Last Minstrel), Isaac Williams, and R. C. Trench. In all, the double rhymes of the Latin are sacrificed (see Sacred Poets of England and America, p. 546, R. W. Griswold; N. Y. 1849).

At the same time, this sequence has given rise to the most magnificent musical compositions by the best masters, such as Palestrina, Durante, Pergolese, Joseph and Michael Haydn, Abbot Vogler, Winter, Cherubini, Gottfr. Weber, Neukomm. But the finest of them all is the Requiem of Mozart (1791), during the preparation of which he passed into eternity. The most comprehensive works upon the "*Dies iræ*" are by Dr. Lisco, preacher in Berlin, and Dr. Daniel, in Halle; the former in his monograph, "*Dies iræ. Hymn. auf d. Weltgericht*; Berl. 1840;" the latter in his *Thes. Hymnolog.* II. 103–131; Hal. 1844.¹

C. E. Koch. — Porter.

Dietrich v. Apolda (or *Thüringen*), b. about 1229, a Dominican of Erfurt, is the author of two works, still prized: 1) *Vita S. Dominici*, publ. by Surius and the Bollandists in the 1st vol. for August; 2) *Vita S. Elisabethæ*, Countess of Thüringen (in CANISIUS lect. IV. See FABRICIUS, *bibl. lat.* VI. 630).

Dietrich of Neheim, after being deprived of a benefice in Bonn, became *scriptor apost.* of Gregory XI. at Avignon. In 1377, he accompanied Gregory to Rome, where he served until 1410 as papal abbreviator. At the schism, D. took sides with Urban VI. Boniface XI. appointed him (1395) Bishop of Warden; but he had to yield this to the anti-Bishop, and even failed to secure the see of Cambray, offered as a substitute. He therefore remained in Rome. Afterwards he attended John XXIII. to Constance, where he died in 1417. He was rather a fertile writer, and though he long dwelt at the papal court, was a zealous adherent of the general Councils. His position convinced him how greatly a *reformatio in capite* was needed. His chief work is upon the Schism (1378–1410), in three books, publ. in Nuremb. 1532, Basel, 1560, and a fourth entitled *nexus unionis*; an important source. For its frankness it was put in the index. The four books were often publ. together. The tract, *de necess. ref. eccl. in capite et membris* was inserted by von der Hardt (*Acta Conc. Const.*, I.) as the work of Peter d'Ailly; but he afterwards corrected the error. It was undoubtedly written by Dietrich. — (See FABRICIUS, *bibl. lat.* V.; MEIBOM, *narratio de Theod. Niem.* in his *script. rer. Germ.*) HERZOG.*

Dietrich, Veit (*Vitus Theodorus*), b. 1506, in Nuremberg, after preparatory training, went to the university of Wittenberg, and soon attracted the notice of Luther and Melanchthon. In 1527, he became Luther's amanuensis and table-fellow; he also accompanied him to the conference at Marburg, and (1529) to Coburg, where he remained with L. during the diet of Augsburg. He rejoiced in this edifying fellowship (see the dedication to his ed. of the *ennar. L. in proph. Micham*, and his letter to Melanchthon of July 30, 1530). After remaining 14 y. in Wittenberg, and being made magister and adjunct of the

¹ A valuable notice of this hymn may be found in "Miscellanies by W. R. Williams, New York, 1851," pp. 78–90. Dr. Williams furnishes the original text (with the various readings, &c.), and two of the best English versions, that of R. C. Trench, and one by an anonymous American author. The latter is one of the most successful English imitations of the metre of the original.

philos. faculty, he left, against Melanchthon's wish, probably on account of some disagreement with Luther. He returned to Nuremberg (1535), not certain as to his future course. As he was about to leave N. for Tübingen, it was resolved to retain him. Feeling under obligations for assistance received during his academical studies, he was the more willing to comply. Melanchthon approved of the plan in a letter to Baumgärtner, a councillor of N., and patron of Dietrich (written Wednesday after Martinmas, 1535). He likewise encouraged D. to accept the proffered post, and assured him of Luther's love and regard, adding: *novi ejus naturam minime tenacem esse simulatum. Erit et tuæ humanitatis meminisse illud Hesiodum; ἢ τις αὐδὲς ἦγγε' εἰ παύσεται, δεξιοδάα*, and requesting him occasionally to write to L., and not to spurn (*aspernari*) his friendship (Mel. to D., Feb. 6, 1536). — The post offered was that of preacher at St. Sebald's, which he assumed early in 1536, and retained until his death. He now devoted his energies to the Church of his fatherland, and maintained correspondence with the leaders of the Reformation, especially with Mel., whose many letters prove the confidence he bestowed on D. He signed the Smalcald Art. in behalf of Nuremberg, and, 1546, attended the Regensburg colloquium (SECKENDORF, comm. III., 153, 623). It was he who informed Luther of the unhappy end of Dr. Eck (1543); this brought down upon him the invectives of the Romanists, and the reproach of a contentious theologian. In the discharge of his office in N. he was drawn into various contests; amidst these, Mel. often advised him to follow Baumgärtner's counsel. But Dietrich advisedly did not often consult B. He opposed the attempt of his colleague, Osiander, to abolish general absolution. The result was that private absolution was dropped; it was first restored again by the Augsburg interim. By order of the magistracy, D. introduced (1542) the Reformation into some Palatinate districts, which Nuremberg had obtained by purchase. This proves that he had not lost the confidence of the magistracy by the sermon which he had shortly before preached against them. In 1543 he had a dispute with Osiander regarding the laying of hands on candidates for ordination, a custom rejected by D. as popish. Luther, whom he asked for counsel, did not wish to reject the custom (Mel. to D., Oct. 1543), whilst Mel. fully approved of it. D. prevented it, and it was not adopted until 1583. He more justly opposed the rite of elevation, which had not yet been abolished; and, on his own responsibility, omitted it on St. Thomas's day, 1543. Osiander resisted, and even Melanchthon thought he acted rashly, and exposed himself to the suspicion of Zwinglianism (cf. Mel. to D., Feb. 13 and March 22, 1538). But his agenda shows no trace of an approach to the Reformed doctrine (comp., also, *Kinderpredig von fürnembeste Festen*, a. 1546; and Mel. to D., Sept. 6, 1543. See *Cruciger*). He, indeed, acknowledged a synecdoche in the words of institution, and did not go so far as to affirm a hypostatical union of the body and blood of Christ with the elements, but assumed a real connection, as of fire with the glowing iron, or of the wine with the chalice containing it, and

thus differed from Mel., who held to a real presence in a sacramental form, *h. e. ut signis positis adsit vere Christus efficax* (Mel. to D., April 23, 1538; comp. May 24, 1528.) It is remarkable that D. urged *separatim tradi corpus et sanguinem* (Mel., *ibid.*; Cruciger to D., April 18, 1538), and that neither M. nor C. would concede this separation. M. even affirmed that it was unknown to papists, as though D.'s views went beyond theirs.

This leads us to speak of Dietrich's chief labor in liturgical matters. The magistracy of N. directed him to prepare an agenda for the city and its districts. The first issue of 1543, and succeeding ones till 1639, are entitled: *AGEND-BÜCHLEIN FÜR D. PFARRHERREN AUFF D. LAND*. But it must also have been used in the city. The last ed. is that of 1755; from the close of the cent., another liturgy took its place. D.'s, however, was used in preparing the new Bavarian Lutheran agenda. Mel. approved of D.'s work, but misses the form for excommunication (Oct. 25, 1543).

Dietrich's last years were beclouded, partly with sickness, but chiefly by the unhappy state of Church affairs. On account of the number of strangers drawn to N. by the Emperor's visit (1547), the council advised the preachers to abstain from preaching upon disputed points, D., in a sermon on Ps. 37: 3, disregarded the request, and was silenced for a time. — But the attempt of the Emperor (1548) to force the Augsburg interim upon all the ev. States, caused him still greater pain. In the Opinion which he drew up (see *Strobel*, *Nachricht v. d. Leben D., &c.*, 1772) in the name of the clergy, and presented to the council, he acknowledged that obedience in all proper things was due to the Emperor; but that to demand it in matters affecting the soul's salvation, would cause the shedding of innocent blood. This opinion was accompanied by the submissive answer of the council to the interim. It was of no avail. Nuremberg (1549) accepted the interim, all but a few points. Among other things, the *elevation* of the elements was restored. D. thought of leaving N., but Melanchthon dissuaded him. His death (on March 24, 1549) was doubtless hastened by grief. — As an author, D. held a subordinate place, and yet rendered good service by editing many edifying works, especially Luther's Comm., part of which he transl. into German (see Mel. to D. Nov. 16, 1544) and some smaller works of Melanchthon. His own productions were chiefly sermons, and many of these for the young. During his sickness, in 1548, he published an instructive exposition of Isaiah. His intention to prepare similar expositions of the other prophets was frustrated by death. The *ep. theologorum Norimb. ad D. Rupertum*, 1539, though also signed by Dietrich, was written by Osiander. D. composed some hymns, and founded several Christian institutions in Nuremberg. — (See *Corp. ref.* for his corresp. with Mel. and Cruciger, 1537–49; many of D.'s letters have been lost. *Strobel*, l. c.)

HERZOG.*

Dieu, de, Louis, b. 1590, in Flushing, where his father was an ev. preacher. His grandfather, also called Louis, was in the service of Charles V., and accompanied him to Algiers, and on his

expeditions to Germany. It is said that, having shown some leaning to the Reformation, Charles V, warned him that it would not be in his power to rescue him from the Inquisition, if he fell into its hands. This may be so or not; but the report that he was won over to the Reformation by Calvin, during a voyage to England, is certainly false. Louis, after completing his studies, was invited by prince Maurice, of Orange, to succeed Uyttenbogard as court-preacher at the Hague; but he preferred living away from the court. In 1619 he became prof. of theol. in the Walloon college of Leyden, and happily filled this post until his death, in 1642. He occupies an important place among the exegetes of the Reformed C. He wrote *Animadv. seu comment. in quatuor Evang. Lugd. Bat.* 1631. *Animadv. in Acta Apost.* 1634. *Animadv. in D. Pauli apost. ep. ad Rom.*—*Accessit spicilegium in reliqua ejusdem apost. ut et cathol. ep.* 1646. *Animadv. in V. T. Libros omnes*, 1648. All collected, Amstelod. 1693, fol. He also wrote grammatical (see *Aramaic Language*), and other smaller works (see *Bayle*). His principle of N. T. interpretation is laid down in the words of his preface to the Oriental grammar: *facilius Europæis foret Platonis Aristotelisque elegantiam imitari, quam Platoni Aristotelive N. T. nobis interpretari.*—(See MEYER, *Gesch. d. Schrifterkl.* III. 415–16; R. SIMON, *hist. crit. d. comment. du N. T.*, c. 35; BAYLE, s. v.) HERZOG.*

Dignity, or *prelacy*, is the distinction connected with a secular or ecclesiastical office, or post of honor. An eccl. dignity may attach to every incumbent of an office with which any pre-eminence is associated (see *Benefice*). But the term is also used in a narrower sense, in which a *dignitas* requires an eccl. office attached to a *jurisdictio propria*, whether *ordinaria* or *extraord.* and *delegata* (see *Jurisdiction*). Among those possessing a dignity, therefore, are: 1) *dignitates pontificales, prælaturæ sensu proprio*, who originally enjoyed this pre-eminence, all Bishops having a see of their own; hence the Pope, Primates, and Archb., but not merely suffragan or titular Bishops; 2) *dign. majores, præl. secundariæ*, on whom it has been subsequently bestowed by special act, as Cardinals, Legates, Nuncios, former Archdeacons and Arch-presbyters, the heads of chapters, cloisters, orders of knights, who have been released from and invested with episcopal jurisdiction; 3) *dign., præl. honorariæ, personatus*, who have no jurisdiction, but whom custom merely regards as prelates, as Provosts and Deans in chapters. The rights of dignitaries are, apart from their particular official position, various eccl. honors, as precedence of rank upon solemn occasions, a distinctive dress, incensation, &c., together with various civil prerogatives, special titles of honor (Right rev., &c.). II. F. JACOBSON.*

Dimissory letters (*literæ dimissoriales, dimissoriae, ἀπολυτικά*) are, in modern usage, papers certifying that the bearer has been duly dismissed from the eccl. jurisdiction to which he belonged, in order to take charge of a congregation, &c., in another. Even according to ancient canon law, no clergy could leave his diocese for another without such letters (*Gratian. dist.* LXXIII.; *Conc. Trullan. a.* 692, c. 17, in c. 1,

can. XXI. qu. II.; comp. Du FRESNE, s. v. *formata*, &c.). Subsequently, to prevent abuses, it was insisted upon that strange clergy should not be allowed to perform religious services, as preaching, &c., without having certificates of dismissal and recommendation; new parishioners were also required to present similar papers.—Besides these *literæ dimiss. perpetuæ*, there were *temporales* given to those ordained by a strange eccl. superior. In the ancient C., clergy were ordained for a particular post. Each Bishop in his own diocese designated the post, and ordained to it. To allow a member of his diocese to be ordained by the B. of another, he gave the person a *litera dim. perpetua*. But, subsequently, absolute ordination was also allowed, by granting a transient dismissal for the purpose of ordination. The person to be ordained then received from his B., whom sickness, &c., might prevent from acting, a *lit. dim. or formata (sigillata)*. One of the earliest specimens of these, dating from the 10th cent., may be found in GALLANDI, *de vetustis canonum collect.* P. I. p. 385. Others besides Bishops obtained the right of granting such letters (see c. 3, *de temp. ordinat.* in VI. [I. 9]; Bonif. VIII. *Conc. Trid. s. VII. de ref.* c. 10, s. XXIII. *de ref.* c. 3, 10).—As the Pope is ordinarius of the whole C., he has unlimited power to grant dismissals. Cardinals can grant them to such as have lived three years in their houses (FERRARIS, *bibl. canon. s. v. Ordo*, art. III. nr. 37). The episcopal Vicar-general can grant them in the Bishop's absence, or by his special permission. The Vicar-capitulary can do it only after the see has been vacant a year (FERRARIS, l. c. nr. 40, &c.). Abbots are limited in granting *dim.* to the monks subject to them; and exempt prelates, even though holding an episcopal jurisdiction, require a special papal privilege.—The *dimissory letter* (called *referenda* by the Council of Trent) is either directed to a particular B. for the imparting of the tonsure, or of a single order, or it is general, as *facultas de promovendo a quocunque*. H. F. JACOBSON.*

Dimorites, the title given, first by Epiphanius, *hær.* 77, 23, to the followers of Apollinaris the younger (see Art.), because they held that there were but two human parts in Christ, the *λογος* and the body, and that the *Logos* in him took the place of the reason. Sozomen. (H. E. VI. 25) calls them *Vitalians*, from Vitalis; Facundus of Hermiane (*pro def. trium capit.* Par. 1679) *Synusiasts*, because they held that Christ's flesh was of one substance with his divinity. But this name applies only to one of the two Apollinarian parties, the *Polemians*, whose leader, Polemo, taught (see PLOTIUS, *bibl. cod.* CCXXX.) that the doctrine of the two natures in Christ was an invention of Athanasius, the two Gregorys, Basil M., and the Italian Bishops. Opposed to these were the *Valentinians*, whose leader, Valentinus, seems to have swerved the least from the doctrines of Apoll. (*Theodoret, hær. fab.* IV. c. 8, 9). According to this, Augustine's division of these sects (in his *de dono persever.* c. 69) is incorrect. He names three parties: 1, those who said Christ had no soul; 2, those who said he had no rational soul; 3, those who taught that the *Word* was converted into flesh.

HERZOG.*

Diocletian, C. Aurelius Valerius, son of a Dalmatian slave, seized the reins of the Roman government when it was on the verge of ruin. His talents and exploits soon elevated him from the rank of a common soldier to an equality with the first generals. Looking upon his election as Emperor, which took place Sept. 17, 284, as the fulfilment of a prophecy delivered by a Druidess, he acknowledged no power but his own, and held himself responsible to no man. To perpetuate Imperialism, he associated with himself Maximianus, under the title of Augustus (April 1, 286), and two subordinate Emperors, Galerius and Constantius Chlorus, as Cæsars, who were allied to the Augusti by adoption and marriage. These latter, it was intended, should, in the course of time, take the place of himself and Max., and be succeeded by others whom they had chosen as Augusti. There was always to be a chief Emperor, Diocletian's special successor, clothed with absolute authority. Twenty years he assigned as a limit to every reign. Thus, while establishing a school for the education and trial of rulers, he rescued the empire from the rivalries of ambitious aspirants. Finding even in his name (*Diocles*, the *Zeus-famed*) a divine vocation to universal dominion, he assumed the title Jovius, whilst Max. took that of Ilerculus. He caused himself to be addressed *Dominus*, and to be prayed to as a god. Thus did he make use of religion to fortify his Imperialism, and to extend his sway. — During the reign of D. took place the last conflict between Paganism and Christianity. The Græco-Roman heathenism having failed to satisfy the wants of the soul, some sought consolation in the mystic rites of the Orient and the worship of Hecate, of Isis and of Mithras; whilst others manufactured a sort of theism which, resolving the manifold ideas of a supreme power then prevalent into one abstract divinity, worshipped it under the form of the sun and the lights of heaven. Christianity, which was tolerated during the reign of Gallienus, and the conflicts of the forty tyrants, had quietly penetrated the social system, and numbered more adherents than any specific form of heathenism. As it sought not only to save the souls of individuals, but to gain possession of entire nationalities and empires, it necessarily came into collision with Oriental paganism and the Theism above-mentioned. Had Diocletian, who adhered to the former system, fully and clearly understood the relation it sustained to Christianity, instead of allowing the number of Christians in the army and in his court to increase, and intrusting them with important offices, he would, from the very start, have unsheathed the sword of persecution. But the priests, who, according to D.'s plan of government, were to consecrate the rulers to their high position, as the vicegerents of the father of gods and men, recognized in Christ the destroyer of their authority, and became the deadly enemies of the Church. Besides, it is quite probable that Galerius, who was in the hands of the priests, may have obtained a knowledge of the object of the Christians, who aimed at the possession of the empire through the instrumentality of Constantius Chlorus and his family. The reign of D. was drawing to a close. Gale-

rius, the priests, the pagan courtiers and generals, demanded the extirpation of Christianity. A bloody persecution ensued. The heathen State religion received a mortal wound. The Theism above-mentioned succumbed, and Christianity ascended the throne of the Cæsars.

Galerius having ordered (298) all the soldiers to take part in the offerings to the gods, many abandoned the army, whilst those who remained were exposed to the charge of treason. On the birthday of the Emperor, the centurion Marcellus, at Tingis, in Africa, having been summoned to sacrifice, indignantly threw away his sword, and refused obedience. Death was the reward of his fidelity. A fierce persecution was now visited upon the Christians, 303. On Feb. 23, the festival of the *permiralia*, the cathedral in Nicomedia was plundered and destroyed, and on the 24th an imperial edict put up, which forbade the assembling of Christians, and ordered the delivery and burning of MSS. Bibles, and the demolition of church buildings. Christians in office were bound to sacrifice, on penalty of losing their situations and their rights as citizens, whilst Christian slaves were never to be set free. Revolts breaking out in Armenia and Syria, a second edict was published, ordering the imprisonment of the officers of congregations who were falsely accused of having originated them. A third soon followed, which decreed that, if the Christians voluntarily offered sacrifices, they should be set at liberty; if not, they should be forced into compliance; and a fourth, which ordered that all, without distinction, should be compelled to sacrifice. A terrible panic ensued. Whilst many delivered up the Sacred Writings, which were burnt, many others concealed the Bible, and gave up in its stead other books, or acknowledged the having it, but refused to hand it over. The number of those who suffered death was very great, and the steadfastness of the Christians, some of whom even courted martyrdom, grew with the increasing furor of their enemies. The persecution having lasted two years in every part of the Roman empire, the Western excepted, where Constantius Chlorus was satisfied with the tearing down of churches, Diocletian, together with Maximian, retired into private life, May 7, 305. Galerius and Constantius now became *Augusti*, and Maximinus and Severus *Cæsars*. His father having suddenly died, Constantine was nominated by the army Augustus, in July, 306. As Constantine favored the Christians, he came into collision with all the other Augusti and Cæsars, who now continued the persecution begun by Diocletian. Galerius, whom his Cæsar, Max., alone equalled in bloodthirstiness, ordered (308) that the ruined temples should be rebuilt, that the Christians should offer sacrifices and eat of the meat, and that all market provisions should be sprinkled with the sacrificial wine. Many fell martyrs to his cruelty; amongst them the tribune Mauritius, with his 70 soldiers. On the approach of death, Galerius put a stop to the persecution. In an edict of 311, he acknowledged the failure of his design—the extirpation of Christians—granted them the free exercise of their religion, and called upon them to pray to their God for his welfare and that of the em-

pire. After his death, Maximinus renewed the persecution in the Orient, and Maxentius in Italy. In the latter country, the victory of Constantine put an end to it, 312; in the former, Licinius continued it until compelled to a peace by Constant., 314. Diocletian, having lived long enough to see all his designs frustrated, poisoned himself, 313. — (Sources: EUSEB. H. E. VIII.; the treatise ascribed to LACTANTIUS, *de mortibus persecutorum*, c. 7, &c.; BURCKHARDT, d. Zeit. Constant. Gr.; GFRÖRER's allg. K.-G. I. 557-570.

A. VOGEL. — *Ermentrout*.

Diodorus, of noble descent, was a Presbyter in Antioch; from 378, Bishop of Tarsus; died about 394; one of the chief masters of the Antiochian school, and, in dogmatics, its founder. Having finished his classical course at Athens, he prepared himself for usefulness in the Christian Church under the distinguished Eusebius of Emesa (HIERONYM. *vir. illustr.* c. 119). As Chrysostom, who pronounced his eulogy, says nothing about his having presided as abbot over a monastery in Antioch, the report to that effect must be regarded as fallacious (SOCRAT. h. e. 6, 3; SOZOM. 8, 2; *orat. in Diodor.* c. 4; *Opp. ed. Montfaucon*, T. III. p. 749). Julian describes him a walking skeleton, with pale face, sunken cheeks, wrinkled body; and Chrysostom as the shadow of a human being (FACUND. *defens.* 4, 2). — Diod. spent the greater part of his life in combatting the enemies of the Church. In Antioch, Julian had restored the temple of the Daphnian Apollo; the sects had their conventicles, Arianism opposed the Nicene Confession; and Valens, whilst persecuting the Christians, countenanced their adversaries. His writings, chiefly polemical, were directed against heathen, Jews, and heretics. From Porphyry (*περί ζώων και θνσίων*) and the errors of Hellenism (*περί θεού και ιλης ελληνικης πεπλασμένης*), he turned against Plato and Aristotle. His dogmatic works are more positive in their character, e. g., *περί του εις θεός εν τριάδι—περί οικονομίας—περί νεκρών αναστάσεως*. Heretical notions about the soul are refuted in *περί ψυχής*. Whilst Arians and pagans visited him with bitter hatred, Chrysostom prized him as a martyr. — Diod. was a vigorous defender of the *Nicene Creed*, and introduced responses into the service of the Church. During the exiles of Meletius, who became Bishop of Antioch, 360, he, together with his friend, Flavian, undertook the care of the bereaved congregations (CHRYC. *orat. in Diodor.* c. 4), and, when expelled from them, he assembled the faithful on the neighboring mountains, on the shore of the Orontes, and other concealed places. In the year 372, he was compelled to fly from the city, together with Meletius, to Armenia, where he became acquainted with Basil. On the return of M., his fidelity was rewarded with the bishopric of Tarsus, 378. He took part in the Œcumenical Council of Constantinople (381), which made him Metropolitan over Cilicia (SOCRAT. h. e. 5, 8). An imperial edict (381) nominated him the fourth among the Bishops (*cod. Theodos.* 1, XVI. tit. 1, 7, 3).

In his conflict with Apollinarianism touching the *relation of the two natures in Christ*, Diod. advanced a theory which contained the germs of later Nestorianism. The two principal treatises

on this subject are: *προς τους συνουσιαστας*, and *περί του αγίου πνεύματος* (Phot. bibl. cod. 102). From extracts of the former by *Marius Mercator* (*ed. Baluze*, p. 349, sqq.) and *Leontius Byzantinus* (c. Nestor. et Eutych. 1, 3, in *Canis. lectiones antiquæ ed. Basnage*, I. p. 591, sq.), it seems that D. distinguished a double son of God, the divine Logos and the son of David, the latter by nature, the former by grace. Mary did not beget the Logos, but the man, through the Holy Ghost. As the divine Logos is essentially and absolutely perfect, what Scripture (Luke 2:52) says concerning the growth of the Redeemer can only be applied to his humanity. The mystery of the incarnation consists in the assumption by the Logos of a perfect human nature. The relation of the two natures is the indwelling of the Logos in the man Jesus. In virtue of this connection, though not in the strict sense, the son of David may be called the Son of God, and worship may be directed, in the same way, to the humanity of Christ, provided the two natures be not intermingled or confused. Whilst the Spirit abode momentarily in the prophets, he dwells in Christ permanently, and in all his fulness. As the Scriptures teach that sin was the reason for the incarnation, the coming of the Son in our flesh was not necessitated by a law of the divine Being, but resulted from the free determination of God.

This view of Diod., whilst it did not dissolve the divine-human person of Christ, yet tended to destroy the substantial, organic unity of the two natures, failed to satisfy the demands of a more advanced state of dogmatic theology. In the course of time, when Nestorianism came to be regarded as a heresy, Diod. was looked upon as its forerunner. With the year 432, *Cyrill of Alexandria* called for the condemnation of Diod. and Theodore of Mopsucsta. The Church of Syria, however, adhered to its great teacher, and an imperial edict terminated the controversy. Cyrill stirred up an odious disputation, but was rebutted by Theodore. Instigated by the Monophysites, Bishop Flavian, of Antioch, pronounced an anathema against the writings of Diod. and Theodore, 499. From this time forward, the Greek Church regarded the christology of D. as heretical.

In exegesis, Diod. rejected, on the one hand, the allegorical theory, which puts into the text the fancies of an interpreter, and, on the other, the literal theory, which merely dissected words, without grasping their inner spirit. Following the laws of language, and of a true historical exposition, and regarding the Bible as a system of organic truth, he endeavored, whilst making the Messianic element the centre of his views, to do justice to the historical, as well as to the ideal meaning of Scripture. From this standpoint it was, that he wrote the *εις διαφορά θεωρίας και αλληγορίας* against the Alexandrians. His principle was susceptible of various applications, and, whilst his commentaries, as a whole, are characterized by a learned exposition of the text and by clearness of statement, they do not do justice to the supernatural, typical element of Scripture.

The cool, ratiocinative bent of his mind led him to lay great stress on the *cosmological argu-*

ment for the existence of God. In his lost treatise, *περὶ εἰσαγωγῆς*, l. 8—of which Photius has preserved some extracts (*bibl. cod.*, 223)—he proves that, as all things are undergoing a continual change, and as an eternal changing is a contradiction *per se*, God must have created the world. And as eternal punishment impugns the divine predestination of man to a happy immortality, in his *περὶ αἰωνοῦς* (*Asseman. biblioth. orient.* III., l. p. 324) he asserts the finiteness of the pains of hell. "As the worth of good works is as far short of their reward as the struggles of this life are short of the duration of eternity, so also will punishment be overcome by the greatness of the Divine clemency."

For a complete catalogue of his works, see *Suidas* (*Διόδωρος* ed. Bernhardt, T. I., p. 1379, sq.), the Nestorian *Ebed Jesu* (*Asseman. bibl. orient.*, III., l. p. 28, &c.) and *Fabricius* (*bibl. græc.* ed. Harles., T. IX., p. 277, sqq.). Diod. was worthy of the honor with which his age crowned him. Though not a productive genius, and not unfrequently deficient in depth and thoroughness, he combined with a comprehensive erudition a sharply-defined individuality. His life was blameless. Even his participation in the breaking of a promise by Flavian (*Socrat.* h. e. 5, 5, 9, 15; *Sozom.*, h. e. 7, 3, 11) was based upon a good intention (*Theodoret.*, h. e. 5, 23). Some of his pupils were numbered amongst the most distinguished teachers of the Church; of them the two great fathers of the Greek communion, *Theodorus*, of Mopsueste, and *John Chrysostom*. Comp. NEANDER, *St. John Chrysostom*, 3 ed., I., p. 27.—ERNESTI, *opusc. theol.*, p. 498, sqq. SEMISCH.—*Ermentrout*.

Diognet. *Epistle to*, a valuable relic of Christian antiquity, of the post-apostolic age, is a reply to certain inquiries on the part of him to whom it is addressed. Struck with the contempt of death exhibited by the martyrs, he desires information concerning the nature of Christianity, its difference from heathenism and Judaism, and the reason of its late appearance. This request the epistle meets by a concise sketch of Christian morals and doctrine. It opens by declaring heathenism to be nothing but the worship of lifeless images of wood and stone, and Judaism, with its equally sensual worship of the one God and Creator, as though the All-sufficient had need of bloody offerings, rather folly than piety, and its minute ceremonial law more worthy of ridicule than serious refutation. On the highest position God has placed the Christians. Indifferent to the divisions of national and social life, but worthy of admiration on account of their strict morality going beyond all law and their fervent charity, they are to the world what the soul is to the body, homeless on earth, in spirit and conversation citizens of heaven. The divinity of the Christian religion has its warrant, objectively in its establishment by the Son of God, the world-creating Logos; subjectively, in the joyful dying of the martyrs, the sign of God's presence. All true knowledge of God depends on revelation. The eye of faith is the spiritual organ, which sees God revealed. From the beginning the Father had communicated to the divine Son the counsel of redemption. His long-suffering per-

mitted the generations before Christ to give free rein to their desires and lusts, not because it was pleasing to him, but because he wished to make it plain that no power of their own and no merit of works could win the crown of life. After the measure of their sins was full, God revealed himself in the incarnation of his Son, who, without sin himself, became the ransom of the lost. From the assurance of justification wrought by his righteousness arises trust in the paternal goodness of God; from both, love, which, essentially god-like and fearless of the terrors of death, in its elevation above the world and its spirit of self-sacrifice, gives even here a foretaste of the mysteries and blessedness of heaven.

These are the fundamental ideas of the epistle, whose origin, from internal evidence, must date about the middle of the 2d cent., when the Church, already sharply sundered from the Jews and prepared by many a baptism of blood, was waking to a consciousness of the part she had to take in the history of the world. Its reigning simplicity, along with its references to novelty of Christianity and persecutions, has led many to give it a higher age. Hence it is placed in the reign of Trajan (*Möhler, Hefele*), or in that of Hadrian, either before (*Herbig*) or after (*Otto*) the outbreak of the Jewish war. *Dorner* offers another conjecture. He finds the first traces of an alliance of Christianity with Hellenic philosophy, in the free, universal standpoint of the epistle, in its ethical doctrines, especially its eudæmonism, and in the author's styling himself a scholar of the Apostles, the characteristic marks of the person of Quadratus. From a palpable misapprehension of what it says in regard to the continuance of Jewish sacrifices and customs it has even been assigned to the age of the Apostles (*Tillemont*). But there is really no strong ground to support any of these views. With *Dorner* (*die Person Christi*, I. p. 178) we may perhaps say: "Since the work proceeds from what is eternal in Christianity, it bears so few certain marks of any particular age, that any period might claim it as its own. From his title *ἀπὸ τῶν ἀποστόλων*, which cannot be given here as a mere compliment, we learn that the receiver of the Ep., *Diognet*, was a man of rank and culture. But the supposition, that he and the Stoic philosopher, who taught Marcus Aurelius, were identical, has scarcely more to support it than the fact that they lived about the same time. In the MSS. the Ep. bears the name of *Justin Martyr*, but the majority of the ablest modern critics do not consider him as the author. For the arguments against its genuineness, see *Semisich*, *Monogr. üb. Just. Mart.*, I. p. 172, ss.; on the other side, *Otto*, *Epist. ad. Diog. Just. nomen prae se ferens*, 1845, ed. 2, 1852. The difficulties are, 1. *The language and style*, which are manifestly not those of Justin, and 2. *The views expressed*. And here the most important points of difference are, a) *The conception of heathenism* as a worship of dead images made by human hands, whilst Justin regarded them only as the symbols, forms of manifestation and temporary abodes of demons identical with the gods; b) *The disparaging opinion of Judaism*, without the least intimation of its divine origin,

whilst Justin advocated the unity of God's revelations in the O. and N. T.; c) *The complete silence respecting the activity of the Logos before the incarnation*, which forms with Justin the fundamental idea, to connect the otherwise sundered worlds before and after Christ in one great whole. With him the universal character of Christianity rests specially on this. It is his answer to the charge of novelty made against it by the heathen (Apol., I, 46). Hence this epistle could not possibly be the work of Justin, standing in such flat contradiction as it does, with his view of the world before Christ. It never alludes to the idea of the λόγος σπευματικός, for it recognizes neither the prophecies nor Christophanies of the O. T. Suddenly, unexpectedly, Christianity bursts into a world under the power of sin. Not the necessity of a gradual unfolding of the plan of salvation, as Justin teaches, but the design of God, first to bring mankind to a consciousness of the need of saving grace, was the reason, according to the Ep., why the work of redemption was postponed.—It contains no particular marks of *Gnosticism*, although it seems to lean somewhat in that direction.—Independent of the general question as to its genuineness, the *last two chapters* (11, 12), undoubtedly belong to a later period. Even in the MSS. they are noted as suspicious. The language, the contents, the spirit, all look the same way. Their aim was to reduce the too free expressions of the Ep. to the standard of a stricter orthodoxy. The probable time of their origin was the 3d cent. According to *Bunsen* (Hippolytus u. s. Zeit., I. p. 138), they form the conclusion of the recently discovered heretical work of Hippolytus, and the body of the Ep., the beginning of one composed by the Gnostic Marcion in his earliest period. Both hypotheses are groundless. The oldest edition of the Ep. is that of *H. Stephanus*, 1592; *Otto's*, corrected after MSS., (Opp. Just., ed. 2, 1849, II., p. 156, sqq.); then *Hefele* (patr. apost. opp., ed. 3, p. 300, sqq.). Of the older critical works upon it we may mention: Böhl (opusc. patr. select. I. 109, sqq.), Möhler (gesam. Schrift. I. p. 19, sqq., Patrologie I. p. 164, sqq.), and von Grossheim (de Ep. ad Diog., 1828). The latest critical revision by *Hollenberg* (der Brief an Diog., 1853) strengthens the argument against referring it to Justin. SEMISCH.—Porter.

Dionysius, of Alexandria, surnamed the Great, a disciple of Origen, succeeded Heraclas both in the Catechetical school (232), and in the Bishopric of Alexandria (247). In 250 he was involved in the Decian persecution. Like Cyprian, he was called upon to justify his flight, with which, however, the accusation of too great rigor against the *lapsi* could not, in his case, be connected. Having been seized notwithstanding his flight, he escaped further consequences by an unexpected deliverance. After this he was engaged in the religious struggles of his age, generally as mediator, as in the schism of Novatian. His views in favor of a milder discipline he urged both in numerous letters, as also, according to Euseb. Ch. Hist., VI., 46, by his works, *περὶ μετανοίας* (to Conon), and *περὶ μαρτυρίας πρὸς τὸν Ὀριγένην*. His course in the contest concerning the baptism of heretics,

was similar to this; since, though in principle on the Roman side, he wished to honor the views of his opponents, and maintain union with them. See his letters in Euseb. Ch. Hist., VII. During the persecution of Valerian, 257, he had to endure a grievous banishment first at Cephro in Lybia, and afterwards at Colluthion, in Beroetis, which, however, did not prevent all intercourse with Alexandria, and also saved him to the time of Gallienus, by whose edict, 260, he was once more set free. Even sadder than his past experiences were those which were forced upon him by the seditions, murders, pestilence and famine, which were afflicting Alexandria. We find him once more engaged in two doctrinal struggles of his times; the first of which reminds us of a declining age, the other of the aim of theological development, which was just now assuming a more definite form. Of the spirit of the Alex. school he has given a testimony in his triumphant refutation of Chiliasm, the expiring light of which was once more flaming up under the auspices of Nepos (see Art. Chiliasm). In the doctrine of the Trinity, however, he strove in vain to make the views of Origen prevalent. In his opposition to Sabellianism he was carried too far into the opposite extreme, so that Dionysius, of Rome, charged him with dividing the Deity, and reducing Christ to a mere creature with a beginning in time (see Athanas. de decr. Synod. Nic., 26). In reply to this he wrote his *συγγραμματα*, by which he rescued his orthodoxy. Shortly before his death (264) he wrote a letter against Paul, of Samosata, age and sickness having prevented his attendance at the Synod of Antioch.—D. is the most important of the disciples of Origen, and a worthy scion of the older Alex. school. He did not, however, possess that resolute independence, which in doctrine could effectually combat the tendencies of the age. He is, nevertheless, an important leader of the Church in his times, of a noble and conciliatory disposition, though the greater freedom of his views assigned him often the ungrateful task of a mediator. In his brief comparison of the Gospel and Apocalypse of John, undertaken to prove a diversity in their authors, in the treatment of which question he has not yet been excelled, he shows himself a commentator of superior education, and sprung from the school of Origen: see MÜNSTER, de Dion. Al. circa Apoc. sentent., &c.: Copenh., 1826; and LÜCKE, Einl. in d. Offenb. Joh.—His narratives and pictures from life are fresh and richly colored, and yet terse and vigorous. The few authentic remnants of scriptural explanations which have reached us, show him to have equalled the first preachers of his age, and to have held truly evangelical views of the method of salvation.—Of his numerous polemic, ascetic, exegetic, and apologetic works, only scanty fragments have reached us. Most of these are found in Eusebius. They have been gathered by GALLANDI, bibl. vet. patr., etc., III. p. 481, seq.; de MAGISTRIS, Rome, 1796, fol.; ROUTH, rel. sacr. II. et IV. WEIZSÄCKER.—Reinecke.

Dionysius, the Areopagite, works ascribed to him. According to Acts 17, 34, Dion. A. was converted to Christianity by Paul. Dion., of Corinth, tells us (Euseb., III., 9 et IV., 23) that

he was the first Bishop of Athens, where also, according to a tradition resting upon Aristides the apologist, he suffered martyrdom.—The following works are extant under his name: 1. *περὶ τῆς οὐρανίας ἱεραρχίας*; 2. *περὶ τῆς ἐκκλησιαστικῆς ἱεραρχίας*; 3. *περὶ δεινῶν ὀνομάτων*; 4. *περὶ ἁγίας θεολογίας*; 5. ten epistles; an eleventh, *Ἀπολλοφάνης*, is a later addition by a different author. These works are first met with about A. D. 532, hence, shortly after the Neoplatonic school at Athens had been closed (529) by command of Justinian, and a portion of its adherents had emigrated to Persia. During a colloquy of the monophysite Severians with the Catholics, held by command of Justinian at Constantinople, under the presidency of Hypatius, they were quoted by the Severians, whilst H. denied their authenticity, since they were unknown to the fathers, such as Athanasius, and Cyril, of Alexandria. Notwithstanding their disputed authenticity (Photius, cod. 2) they soon acquired high favor in the Greek Church, where they are furnished with scholiæ and paraphrases by various authors, and pass as the type of mystical theology. In the West, where mention is first made of them, though in a hesitating, doubting way, by Gregory the Gr., they became better known after the Emp. Michael had presented (827) a copy of them to Louis the Pious, and were the more highly honored, when, in consequence of the discoveries of Hilduin, Ab. of St. Denys, their reputed author was identified with the great patron saint of France. After this they pass as a fountain of theological wisdom; the mystics find in them the source of their doctrine, and the scholastics write comments on them: thus, John Scotus Erigena, Hugo of St. Victor, Albert M., Thomas Aquinas, Dionysius Carthusianus, &c. — In the age of the Reformation their authenticity and the identity of the two saints were again called in question by Laurentius Valla and Erasmus (Comment. to Acts 17), and the fact was pointed out that they were unknown in the first five centuries, and presupposed dogmatic forms and Church institutions, which were undoubtedly of later origin. Catholic theologians also, as Sirmond, Launoï, Morinus, do not deny the facts; and the apologies of the Jesuits, Halloix and Delrio, are thoroughly refuted by Dallæus (*de script. quæ sub Dion. A. et Ignat. Antioch. nom. circumferent.*: Gen., 1666); the arguments of the latter once more weighed and confirmed by the Catholic LE NOURRY (*Adparat. ad Biblioth. Max. Patr.*: Par., 1703). Their unauthentic character remained after this undisputed, and the attempt of Kestner in his *Agape*, Jena, 1819, to reassert their authenticity, is a complete failure.—After having thus been shown to be unauthentic, their origin and design were investigated. Earlier theologians, as *le Nourry*, supposed from dogmatico-polemical allusions that they had been composed in the interest of the Cath. doctrine on occasion of the Nestorian and Eutychian controversies. Others (*le Quien*, *Venema*), regarded their author as a Eutychian or Monophysite. But, though in these writings, a reference to these doctrinal controversies cannot be denied, it is nevertheless far too general, too cautiously orthodox and incidental, to be regarded as the

peculiar motive of the fiction. A closer acquaintance with the development of the Neo-Platonic philosophy and mysticism afforded the conviction, that the true explanation of these works and of their design, must be found in it. Suidas already had noticed their accordance with Neo-Platonism, and had concluded that the Platonists, especially Proclus, had made use of the philosophy of the apostolical father, suppressing, however, his name. Appolinaris, the elder, on account of his philosophical views and other literary labors, was regarded by others as their author. (Thus *Cave*, script. eccl. I., 177. *Paulus*, in his review of Engelhardt's *Dion. Ar.* in the *Heidelb. Jahrb.*, 1825, XI.). This is contradicted by the churchly-dogmatic, and especially the philosophical basis of the work. With more plausibility their origin was ascribed to *Synesius*, after 410, Bishop of Ptolemaus, who, indeed, was more Platonist than Christian theologian. (Thus *la Croze*, *Beschreib. d. christl. Relig. in Æthiop.*, a. d. Franz. Danzig. 1740, p. 17, etc.). But with all similarity these writings nevertheless differ from *Synesius*, both in style and particular views. In more recent times *Baumgarten-Crusius* has supposed (*de Dion. Areop. Progr.*, Jen., 1823; reprint. in his *Opusc. theol.*, Jen., 1836), that these writings design a complete transfer of the Greek mysteries into Christianity, as also to oppose Gnosticism with a mystical system of religion, whence their author must be an Alexandrian from the beginning of the 3d century. Though the former supposition seems plausible, yet the latter is an anachronism, since the gnosis combatted by the author is not the older gnosticism. Engelhardt (*die angebl. Schrift. des Ar. Dion. übers. u. m. Abhandl. begl.*, Sulzbach, 1823) has without doubt pointed out the true historical place of these writings; they belong to the later Neo-Platonic school, whose most important representative was *Proclus* (see *Baur*, *Gesch. d. Lehre v. d. Dreieinigk.*; *Ritter*, *Gesch. d. christl. Phil.*). — The ideas of God and the process of religious life (of the supersensuous monas, from whom by an emanation the universe, the *νοῦς* with the *κόσμος νοητός* and the *ψυχὴ* with the *κόσμος αἰσθητός*, originates; and to return to whom, by being purified of the material and by illumination, is the highest aim of religious life), as they had been developed by *Plotinos* (see *Vogt*, *Neu-Platon. u. Christenth.*, Berl., 1836), the later adherents of this doctrine, *Porphyry*, *Jamblichus*, had sought to render practical, by endeavoring to infuse by means of them an ideal character into the heathen belief of the gods, and connecting with it theurgy and mystic rites as means of induction into the monas. *Proclus*, the last Coryphæus of this school at Athens, had striven to carry forward this tendency, but also to give it, by means of logical formulas, a strictly scientific appearance. He classified the higher and lower existences (gods, etc.), emanating from the monas, into three triads (see *Ritter*, *Gesch. d. Phil.*, IV., p. 679), making the latter to proceed from the former, in which also they are contained, and to have part in the higher, and be led back again into the highest, only by their connection with the order next preceding them: e. g. men through the dæmons,

eto. (RITTER, *ut supr.*, p. 665). The heathen theurgy of these hierophants, being no longer tolerated in the Christian state, had to retire into obscurity; their philosophy, however, maintained its influence even among the confessors of Christianity. — The ideas of this school the Pseudo-Dion. seeks to portray as the true and original sense of the Christian doctrine and institutions, as the deeper, recondite, divine science, which, in the manner of St. Hierotheus, is made accessible to youths by himself and other teachers. That only can be taught concerning God, which he himself has revealed in the Scriptures and a kindred occult tradition teaches; which, being in a certain measure nearer to the celestial than the other, passes in a spiritual way from spirit to spirit (*Div. Nom.*, I., 2, 4; III., 2, 3; *Hier. Eccl.*, I., 4). The leading thoughts, occurring in endless repetitions, are: God, the monas, superior to all existence, thought, limitation, and attribute; the good, is the ultimate foundation, substance, and life of all things through the goodness with which he — like the sun which, not by reflection or design, but from its very existence pours out its beams — brings everything into existence, and maintains in its place all that has cause to exist. Through this irradiation exist all purely spiritual beings, rational and irrational souls, and even lifeless substances (*Div. Nom.*, I., 3, 5; IV., 1, 2). The relation of the ray to the centre, of the numbers to the monad, the qualities to the subject, are used to illustrate how the *one* can be the cause of all and in all, and yet above all, and no part of all (*Div. Nom.*, V., 6, 7; XIII., 2). But everything also strives to reach the *one*, as the ground and end of its being. — Theology, in order to reach this existence which is supersensuous, incapable of being reduced to forms of thought and incomprehensible, must proceed *per thesin* and *per aphæresin*, must be cataphatic and apophatic; i. e., must affirm of it, as the cause of all, all which is found in that which is: but again, since what is, is limited and hence a mere negation — deny it all and regard the absolute as above both affirmation and negation (*Theol. Myst.*, I., 2). Thus God, from his emanations, and from that which is in them, the spiritual, psychical, corporal and lifeless sphere of existence, has received his *names*, such as goodness, life, beauty, salvation, redemption, etc., in the interpretation of which, however, the ethical always vanishes to make room for the physical. In all these names only the power, effect, etc., which we receive from God, is expressed: as he is in himself, he cannot in this manner be understood; for the cause, though it impresses its image upon the effect, is yet above the effect. Properly, therefore, God must be reached cataphatically, i. e., we must deny of him all the limitations found in positive existence; and, setting aside sense, must ascend not only to the light of intellectual vision, but setting aside this also, must plunge into the mystical contemplation of him, who has made darkness his habitation (*Theologia mystica*). This movement of the soul to the One, is regarded as being in a circle, in which the soul, being freed from the outward, collects its own harmonious powers, and being thus inwardly reconciled, ascends to

him who is above all existence (*Div. Nom.*, IV., 9). — This mystical inward reunion is, of course, not attainable by all. Those who attain to it are called to be mystagogues, and to elevate others. This elevation cannot be reached in the subjective way of a free exercise of reason, but by means of a hierarchic process, the order of which is given already in the doctrine of emanation, as given by Proclus. A *hierarchy* is the holy order, science, and energy assimilating to God, by which those who are parts of it are, each in his manner, *purified, illumined, and perfected* (*Hier. celest.*, c. 3). The *Hierarchia celestis* describes the order of the angels, or supermundane spiritual beings, who have received illumination unmixed with matter; *every revelation* of God is through their agency; the legal hierarchy of Moses, as well as the incarnation of Christ (*H. C.*, IV., 3, 4; V., 2). The order of angels divides into three triads: 1, thrones, cherubim, and seraphim: 2, rulers, principalities, powers: 3, angels, archangels, dominions. — In accordance with our own nature, the *hierarchia ecclesiastica* is replete with sensuous symbols; for through such we are lifted up to spiritual contemplation (*H. E.*, I., 2). Here, also, three triads are given (*H. E.*, V. 1–3). In every hierarchic office are to be distinguished: 1, the holy consecration; 2, those who consecrate, the *mystoi*; 3, those to be consecrated. The consecrations are: *a*, baptism (*ῥανσμός*); *b*, communion (*συνάξις*); *c*, unction: the *mystoi* are: *a*, the hierarch (bishop); *b*, the priest; *c*, the liturgue (deacon): the deacon purifies, the priest illuminates, the bishop perfects: among the consecrated are: *a*, those to be purified (catechumens, energumens, etc.); *b*, those to be illumined (the baptized, who take part in the mysteries); *c*, the higher monks. The descriptions of church customs are generally true to the actual state of the case. The substance of these mysteries, if it is separated from a mass of luxurious verbiage, is simply a *symbolical representation* of the manner in which we advance in the divine life — through a *moral asceticism*. — From the above it is evident that the doctrines of sin, God, redemption, in their true sense, do not belong to these writings. The author enters upon no thorough discussion of them, and excuses his omission by referring to his theological hypotyposes (*Theol. myst.*, 3, etc.), which undoubtedly never existed. Though striving to keep up in general an appearance of orthodoxy, he does not in particulars adopt the entire orthodox terminology. *Evil*, to which he devotes most space (*D. N.*, IV., 18, sqq.), has no real existence, but is a mere limitation, want, which belongs to all not absolutely good. God knows the evil as good; for all spirits, souls, bodies, etc., the evil consists in a departure from the good which properly belongs to them. Thus human nature, though created *καθαρὸν*, has nevertheless voluntarily departed from the divine life which would have elevated it to immortality, and has chosen mortality instead (*H. E.*, 3, 11). — In the doctrine of the *Trinity*, that which is one must not be divided; e. g., the names which belong to the whole Deity, be applied to one of its persons: nor must that which is different be confounded. But inherent dif-

ferences cannot exist in the absolute. According to the Scriptures the father is the fonsal deity; son and spirit are branches of the theogonic deity. How this is, can be neither understood nor expressed. All such Trinitarian terms are mere expressions of the cataphatic theology, which must be set aside by the truer negations of the apophatic (Theol. M., 3, 5).—In the want of a proper theological basis, and in the prevailing principle of a hierarchic mediation by angels, no room is left for an orthodox *christology*. The ontological basis for the being of God in Christ is perhaps the same as that for the being of God in man in general; only the real, actual appearance of it in Christ, is a new one. The divinity of Jesus, which is the cause of all things (especially of every hierarchy, II. E., I., 1), fills all things, and in all things holds the parts in union with the whole, has taken upon himself perfect and unchanged human nature (D. N., 2, 10, 3). The incorporeal Jesus has become corporeal, without giving up his incorporeity (Theol. M., 3, ep. 4). The divinity of Jesus is nothing else than the incorporeal one, which, regarded as causality, produces in the world the effects which are called salvation, redemption, etc. His human appearance is the actual manifestation of the original relation of the incorporeal absolute and humanity, which was destroyed by the aberration of man.—The object of this effort to blend Neo-Platonism with Christianity was, to conciliate both the heathen philosophers of the Athenian school, and the orthodox Christians; to do which the more effectually, the name of Dion. Ar. was used. The philosophers charged the Christians with having stolen the Neo-Platonic ideas to the detriment of the Greeks: the author wished to show that N.-P. had appropriated many Christian ideas. On the other hand he wished to introduce into the Church a mode of thinking, which, he was convinced, would lead to a deeper apprehension of Christian truth. He succeeded in introducing into the Church a mystical philosophy clothed in a Christian garb, at the very time when its heathen representatives had been silenced by the State. The best edition of the works of Dion. Ar. is that of *Balth. Corderius, e soc. Jesu: Par.*, 1615; Antwerp, 1636, in 2 vols., fol. It is accompanied with the explanations of *Maximus, Pachymeres*, and other learned apparatus. It was reprinted in the *Opera D. A., ed. rec. Corderii: Brizix*, 1854. K. Voort.—*Reinecke*.

Dionysius, of Corinth, became, an. 170, Bishop of that city (*Eus. in Chron.*), and distinguished both for the conscientious discharge of his duties in his own diocese, and for his counsels and instructions to others. Eight epistles, called Catholic, were known of him in the ancient Church; they were addressed to the Church in Lacedæmon, Athens, Nicomedia, Gortyna in Crete, Amastris in Pontus, Gnossus, Rome, and one to a Christian sister called Chrysophora. They are lost, except their general contents and a few fragments in Eusebius, *Eocl. Hist.*, IV., 23, which are valuable for their information concerning the churches to which they were addressed. Jerome, in *Catal. C.*, 37, metes considerable praise to Dion. for these letters. *HERZOG.—Reinecke.*

Dionysius, B. of Rome, 259–269, successor of Sixtus II. When yet R. presbyter, he took sides in the controversy concerning the baptism of heretics with Stephan; and, in connection with a colleague, Philemon, wrote a letter concerning it to Dionysius of Alex., who had declared against Stephan. Dion. A. replied by a vindication of his views. As Bishop he is known particularly by the part which he took in the Trinitarian controversies, and which was of no inconsiderable influence. Several Ægypt. Bishops had declared the letter of Dion. A. to Ammonius and Euphranor against the Sabellians heterodox, and accused him before the R. Dionysius. The latter brought the matter before a Synod, in the name of which he also wrote to the Al. Dion., requesting him to explain himself more fully concerning the accusation, and giving the general opinion of the Synod on the point in dispute (*Athan. de synod.*, c. 43, compared with his *de sentent. Dion.*, c. 13). Dion. A. replied with his *ελεγχος* and *απολογία*, giving in his adherence to the Roman view. Hereupon Dion. R. wrote an *encyclica* to the Ægypt. bishops, combatting both the Sabellians and the opposite error. Of this writing Athanasius makes mention in his *de sent. D.*, c. 13, and gives a lengthy quotation from it in his *de decret. Syn. N.*, c. 45. This fragment is all that remains of him. He rejects in it three errors: the Sabellian; that of those who sunder the divine unity into three hypostases or deities; and that of those who make the Son a creature (*ποιημα*) of the father. He is not remarkable for speculative acumen. "The Logos is united with the Father, the Holy Spirit dwells in him. The Son is not created, but conceived. He is the word, wisdom, and power of God: hence, unless there was a time when God was without these, he is uncreated." A third letter of D. was addressed to Cæsarea, in Cappadocia, in order to comfort the Christians in their afflictions. The bearers of this letter were also charged to buy up the captive Christians of this Church. As late as Basil M. the letter was preserved by this Church.—*Bas. M.*, ep. 70. *MÜHLER, Patrologie*, I., 640. *DORNER, Entwick.-Gesch.*, etc., I., 746, 764.

HERZOG.—Reinecke.

Dionysius, Exiguus, one of the prominent and influential Latins of the 6th century, was by birth a Scythian, and acquired at Rome, where he also became abbot, a considerable education. He died in 556. He is known more particularly as the author, by his Easter-cycle, of the common Christian æra, and by his collection of Canons (see Canons and Decret.). He translated also several Greek works: 1, the *epistola paschalis* of Roterius; 2, the life of St. Pachomius, to which he furnished a preface; 3, the Epistle of Proclus, Patr. of Constantinople, to the Armenian clergy (in 435); 4, the *laudationem in sanctiss. Theodoros*, delivered, 429, in Constantinople against Nestorius, by the same Proclus, when yet B. of Cysicus; 5, the *de conditione hominis* of Greg. of Nyssa; 6, the *hist. invent. cap. S. Joan. Bapt.*, by the archimandrite Marcellus, of Emesa; 7, the Synodical epistle of Cyril, of Alex., and of the Alex. Synod against Nestorius, besides twelve Anathematisms.—See *FABRICII, bibl. lat., lib. IV.* *HERZOG.—Reinecke.*

Dionysius, the Carthusian, called also *D. Rickel, D. Leuwis* or *Leeuwis*, born 1403, of the noble family v. Leuwis at Rickel, a hamlet near Looz, in the diocese of Liege, desired in his 18th year already to be received into the Carthusian order; being refused, because the rules of the order required an age of 20 years in order to admittance, he went to Cologne, where he studied theology and philosophy, and published his first work, *de ente et essentia*. In his 21st year he entered the Carth. monastery at Roermonde, and remained there until his death in 1471, a model of monastic rigor verging on cynicism, a model of an iron diligence, which produced countless works. From the special divine revelations to which he laid claim, he was called *doctor ecstaticus*. He stood high in honor and influence, his counsel being sought by the highest dignitaries of Church and State. In 1451 he accompanied Cardinal Nic. v. Cusa on his missionary journeys through Germany and the Netherlands, on occasion of which he wrote his *de mun. et regim. legati*, and zealously assisted the Cardinal in his reformatory labors. He wrote a mass of works in support of what the papal court called a reformation of the Church; prevented a civil war between Arnold, Duke of Guelders, and his son Adolphus; and, after the fall of Constantinople, urged, in his *ep. ad. princ. Cath.*, a new crusade against the Turks.—His works, above a hundred, are enumerated by *Rzovius*, ad a. 1471, N., XXI., and in *THEODORUS PETREJUS, bibl. Carthus.*, p. 50–84. His chief work is, *enarrationes* or *commentarii* to the O. and N. T., 7 vols.: Col., 1530–36. For criticism and philology they are worthless, but they abound in patristic quotations, and in mystic-allegorical conceits. *Schröckh*, XXXIV., 117, etc.—Nor was D. orthodox Catholic on all points. A translation of his *de quatuor novissimis* was placed in the *index*, as it taught that souls in purgatory were not sure of their eternal salvation. He also wrote comments on *Dion. Ar.*: Col., 1536; *Peter Lomb.*: Col., 1535; *Thomas Aq.*, and others, besides a refutation of the Alcoran. His life, by the Carth. *THEOD. LOER*, Col., 1532, is reprinted in the *Acta SS.*, March 12, Tom. II., fol. 245. His revelations are given also in the *Chron. Cart. of Dorlandus*, Col. 1608. See *FABRICII, bibl. lat. lib.*, IV. *WETZER AND WELTE. HERZOG.—Reinecke.*

Dippel, John Conrad ("Christianus Democritus") b. Aug. 10, 1673, at Frankenstein castle, displayed as a child a strange inclination to religious quibbling; in his 9th year he fell out with his catechism. In his 16th year he entered the university of Giessen, where he was spoiled by the unseasonable praise of his teachers. He became a violent partizan with the orthodox against the pietists, and demonstrated his zeal by indulging in open revelries. In Strassburg, whither he had gone to oppose the influence of *Spener*, he lectured upon astrology and chiromancy, also preached, but scandalized his calling by his irregularities, so that he had soon to leave the city. After various adventures, he published, in 1697, *Orthodoxia orthodoxorum*, and, in 1698, a defence of orthodoxy, entitled, *Papismus Protestantium vapulans*, oder das gestäupte Pabstthum d. Protestirenden. In both

he rejects the inspiration of the SS. the efficacy of the sacraments, and justification by faith. Subsequently, he went to Berlin, and, despite the squandering of his estate in previous failures, prosecuted experiments in alchemy. In Berlin, he was imprisoned for an attack upon court-preacher Meyer, and his son-in-law, the Swedish minister; but, after being cautioned, he was released, and secretly went to Frankfort on the M., and thence to Amsterdam. Leyden bestowed the M. D. upon him. His pamphlet, *Alea belli Muselmannici*, 1711, caused his expulsion from Amsterdam. He went to Altona, where imprudent expressions led to his being again imprisoned. He was sent in chains to Copenhagen, and thence taken to the island of Bornholm. After seven years' imprisonment, the Queen of Denmark procured his release. He next went to Christianstadt, and, in 1727, to Stockholm, where the court honorably received him; but for his heterodoxy, he might have become Bishop of Upsala. Again compelled to flee, he found at length an asylum in that common refuge of all persecuted fanatics, the Witgenstein castle, Berleburg. He prophesied that he would live till 1809, but died suddenly, April 25, 1734. In 1733, he published "Hauptsumme d. theol. Grundlehren d. Democriti." *Ackermann*, his panegyrist, compares him to Luther, but censures his imperiousness, and his violence against opponents. Altogether, Dippel presents a peculiar mixture of mysticism and rationalism, of pietism and frivolity.—(See *ACKERMANN, Leben D., &c.*; *HOFFMANN, H. V. do. Darmst. 1783*; *Adelung, Gesch. d. menschl. Narrheit*, I. 314, &c.; *STRICKER, hess. Gelehrten- u. Schriftstellergesch.*; *WALCH, Rel.-Streitigk. &c.* I. 764–5; II. 721–55; *HAGENBACH, K.-gesch. d. 18. u. 19. Jahrh.* I. 164, &c.). *HAGENBACH.**

Diptychs, in the ancient C. were registers of the names of persons, living or deceased, whom the priests had to mention in the prayer preceding the consecration of the sacramental elements. These were, ordinarily, persons who had brought with them the bread and wine needed for the sacrament. But, besides these, such as had rendered themselves deserving in other ways were entered upon the register. Thus the people, to show their reverence for the first four Œcum. Councils and Pope Leo, desired, "Quatuor synodos diptychis, Leonem episcopum Rom. diptychis!" and, until the 12th cent., the diptychs of the different churches contained, on the leaf for the dead, the names of all the Bishops whose memory was specially revered; on the leaf for the living, the names of the king, princes, and others who had rendered service to the Church. And as it was a proof of orthodoxy to be enrolled upon the diptych, so it was equivalent to excommunication to be erased from it. The Greek and Armenian Churches retain the custom of reciting the diptychs; in the Western C., the following formula in the old missal of Pamelius, *Memento, Domine, famulorum famularumque tuarum, et eorum, quorum nomina ad memorandum conscripsimus ac super sanctum altare tuum scripta adesse videntur*, implies that it was thought sufficient to place the diptychs upon the altar, and refer to them only in a general way. The *Missale Rom.*

merely directs the priest to pause a moment at this point, and silently think of those for whom he desires to pray. II. A.*

Diseases of the Israelites in Palestine. The Israelites in Palestine were subject to none of those endemic diseases which prevailed in Egypt. Even epidemics sent to punish them raged but a short time. And during their sojourn in Goshen, they seem to have mostly escaped the plagues of those districts flooded by the Nile. Even leprosy was not endemic in Palestine, or among the Israelites. Its occurrence there and in Syria was of a sporadic and milder character (2 K. 5 : 1, 27, &c. &c.). Tacitus still testifies to the salubrity of the country (*Hist.* V. 6). Among milder epidemics, there occur: during the summer, dysentery; in the spring and fall, fevers (*Lüdecke*, *Beschr. d. türk. Reichs*, p. 60). In summer they prevail more in mountainous districts, in winter, throughout the plains and cities. Intermittent fevers (tertian typhus is very common in Arabia and Syria) are confined to marshy districts. March and October are the most sickly months. Acute and rapid diseases chiefly prevail. Among chronic diseases, the climate is especially productive of hypochondria and hysteria (*Jost*, *Gesch. d. Isr.* I. 12). Gout and rheumatism are common in Syria and the surrounding districts; but there, as in other countries, the cure is, providentially, near at hand, in the warm and sulphur springs of Tiberias, &c. (comp. John 5 : 2).—*Individual cases of disease* will chiefly claim our attention; although, on account of the various, and, at times, contradictory views of physicians who have written upon Biblical nosology, we cannot with certainty classify the single cases mentioned in the SS. Among these, we find named in the Pentateuch, *Consumption* (Levit. 26 : 16; comp. Deut. 28 : 22), including all forms of hectic fever, which, with its fellow, typhoid fever (in the various forms of petechial typhus, yellow fever, and pestilential bubo) carries off the largest portion of our race. It is called שִׁחָהּ from

an Arab. root, meaning thin, lean, سَكَا, *phthisis*, שִׁחָהּ and רָזַן from רָזָה, to be lean (Is. 10 : 16). The emaciation results from a diseased condition of the organs of assimilation and secretion, and of the nervous system. (Upon the frequency of tubercular C. among oriental, especially Egyptian, Jews, see *Pruner*, *Krankh. d. Orients*, 337, &c.). A case of local decay (*atrophia*) without fever is mentioned Matt. 12 : 10; such cases probably result from a paralysis of the nerves, deficient or interrupted innervation of the muscular tissue, &c. In Deut. 28 : 22 (comp. 32 : 24; Levit. 26 : 16; Hab. 3 : 5), three terms are used to designate fevers or inflammations. Whether they express different forms of fevers (inflammatory, gastric and gastric-nervous intermittents, &c.), or designate distinct diseases, it is difficult to decide (see monogr. *REUSSELIUS*, *de pestil.*, Deut. 28 : 22; *Jena*, 1681); so of the cases stated Matt. 8 : 14, &c.; Luke 4 : 39; and John 4 : 46–52; but in both, the fever seems to have been of an acute character. The fever of the father of Publius, Acts 28 : 8, was the mere accompaniment of the

II. — 8.

chief disease, the dysentery, with which old people are apt to be afflicted, on account of the weakness of the lower bowels. Among other acute diseases of the vascular system, mention is made of sun-stroke (Ps. 121 : 6, and, doubtless, 2 K. 4 : 19; Judith 8 : 3; Jonah, 4 : 8). It is said to occur often in Jericho (ROBINSON, I. 553, &c.; BUEHLER, *Calendar*, p. 40). If, besides affecting the face and hands (*erythema*), the brain is reached, hyperæmia and inflammation of the membrane of the brain ensue, and death follows in from 3–7 days (PRUNER, l. c. 118, 297, &c.). Even those who recover suffer long with pain and weakness in the head, or become insane.—Among chronic diseases of the vascular system, diseased sexual issues are named (Levit. 15 : 2, 25; Numb. 5 : 2; 2 Sam. 3 : 29; see *Purifications*). These were not hemorrhoidal issues, for they certainly proceeded from the sexual organ (רִשְׁתָּהּ; comp. PHILO, I. 88; Jos. B. J. 5, 5, 6; 6, 9, 3; *Mischna tr. sabim*, II. 2). MAIMON. *ad tr. Sab.* II. 2, supposes *gonorrh. benigna* is meant (comp. RICHTER, *spez. Therap.* IV. II. 551). But then stopping it would be a cure, and not a *stat. impurit.* (Levit. 15 : 3). MICHAELIS (*or. bibl.* XXII. 1, &c.; Mos Recht, IV. 282) and others think *gonorrh. virulenta* is meant; but this hardly occurred prior to the origin of the *lues venerea* (in the 15th cent.). Some, indeed, find the first traces of syphilis in Numb. 25 : 1, &c. (comp. Josh. 22 : 17) and think that the measures adopted were intended to prevent contagion. But those measures were certainly a theocratic penalty inflicted, and of the nature of the plague, which was supernatural, nothing is said. Perhaps it was the plague as in Numb. 16 : 41, &c. WINER (*Lex.*) supposes it was *blennorrhœa urethræ*, not *gonorrhœa* (the term for this does not occur in the passages), but a flow of mucus from the urethra, which is contagious, and may be produced by intercourse with unclean, menstruous, and leucorrhœous women, and by other causes, and which, if stopped, has evil consequences.—A diseased, irregular issue of blood is mentioned in Levit. 15 : 25, &c.; its long continuance may prove fatal (see SPRENGEL, *Pathol.* I. 706, &c.; PRUNER, l. c. 276). The Jews at the time of Christ could not cure it (Matt. 9 : 20, &c.), and even modern physicians find it difficult to manage. Rationalistic physicians and theologians (SCHKEGER, *medic.-hermen. Unters.* 361, &c.; PAULUS, *exeg. Handb.* I. 524), ascribe the cure in Matt. 9 : 20, to magnetic or to psychical influences! The nature of the diseased affection mentioned in Gen. 20 : 17, 18 (from which Abimelech as well as his wives suffered) cannot be determined. KURTZ, *Gesch. d. alt. B.* I. 142, supposes *impotentia copulæ*.—Among individual cases of chronic-vascular diseases, we find that of Jehoram, 2 Chron. 21 : 18. Some have thought it was fistula, others a falling of the rectum, others a suppuration of the liver, &c. It seems most natural to suppose it was a chronic diarrhœa, which ultimately carried off the mucous membrane of the intestines (PRUNER, 212, &c.); or it might be a loss of the lymph, which is often accompanied with singular after-formations, not parts of the intestines, but lumps of membranous matter.—

Whether the *disease in the feet* of Asa (2 Chron. 16: 12), inflicted for putting Hanani in the stocks, was dropsy, elephantiasis, or podagra (see Asa), is uncertain.—In regard to Job's disease (2: 7; Deut. 28: 27, 35), opinions vary, some supposing it was elephantiasis, others a tubercular leprosy, others the black leprosy, *λεῖψη ὀγκρῖος*, *ψωρα κνησμος*, called *morb. S. Marci* in the middle ages, with the symptoms of which many of those in Job correspond (2: 8; 7: 5; 16: 16; 17: 7; 19: 17, 20; 23: 17; 30: 10, 17, 30). Only one case of *dropsy* occurs (Luke 14: 2, &c.). A *canker* or gangrenous ulcer is mentioned in a striking comparison, employed 2 Tim. 2: 17. Finally, *worms* destroyed human life (2 Macc. 9: 5, 9; comp. Targ. Jon, Numb. 14: 33; Sota, f. 35, l.). Herod Agrippa was devoured by them (Acts 12: 23). According to Jos. Ant. 17, 6, 5; B. J. 1, 33, 5, Herod M. also died of this disease. In this case they were probably *ulcera verminosa* (see Ecclesiasticus 19: 3). *Galerius Max.* also perished thus (LACTANT. *de mort. persec.* 33); not by *φθούριαις*, not by the dragon-worm (*dracunculus*), the symptoms of which are wholly different (see WEISCH, *exerc. de vena medin. Aug. Vind.* 1674, p. 316; PRUNER, 250, &c.).—The precise nature of the seven *cutaneous, eruptive diseases* mentioned in Levit. 13, four of them as distinct from leprosy, and yet resembling it, cannot be certainly ascertained, as neither the names given to the different forms, nor their symptoms, furnish a basis for definite conclusions, and as diseases change their character, or wholly disappear in the course of ages.

Among the *diseases of the nervous system*, *apoplexies* are named. They frequently occur in warm countries, especially at the beginning of summer, and during the prevalence of the simoom winds (PRUNER, 294, &c.). Nabal's death was caused by apoplexy (*ap. sanguinea, sthenica*, 1 Sam. 25: 37). The words, "his heart died within him," are not to be taken in a strict pathological sense. The similar case of Alcimus (1 Macc. 9: 55, 56) is more minutely described. In the cases of Uzza (2 Sam. 6: 7), and Ananias and Sapphira, the Lord may have used this disease as a means of punishment.—*Syncope*, as described in the Bible, differs from apoplexy, in there being no paralysis, but merely a suspension of the pulse and of breathing (1 Kings 17: 17; Dan. 8: 18; 10: 9; Ps. 76: 7).

תַּרְדֵּמָה designate an obstruction of self-consciousness, or a deep sleep (Gen. 2: 21, &c.), or a diseased tendency to drowsiness and sleep (*cataphora, lethargus*, Is. 29: 10; Prov. 19: 15). Its acme is *asphyxia*, in some *livida, plethorica*, in others *pallida*.—Partial apoplectic paralyzes also occurred. *Paralytics* and lame persons were often brought to Christ and the apostles (Matt. 4: 24; 9: 2; 11: 5; Acts 3: 2; 8: 7, &c. &c.). These lamenesses result either suddenly, as from apoplexy, or gradually from spinal diseases (*paral. medullaris*) or from palsies, depriving the muscles and nerves of their mobility and sensibility (or diminishing these), without stopping the circulation of the blood, secretion, &c. Sometimes atrophy supervenes (Matt. 12: 10; John 5: 3). As these lamenesses are mostly without pain, or accom-

panied with but a pricking, creeping sensation, the case in Matt. 8: 5; Luke 7: 2, was doubtless attended with *tetanus*; indeed, anciently *παράλυσις* was used in a wider sense, and two forms were distinguished: *immobilitas musculi flaccidi ab extensione* and *rigidi a contractione* (*contractura articulorum*), the latter being very painful. In torrid climes, tetanus is apt to be produced by the inflammation of wounds (caused by the chilly nights); such cases are often attended with fever (John 4: 52). Painful cramps and convulsions also appear as symptoms of other diseases (eruptive fevers, &c.). The woman in Luke 13: 11, &c., was rather afflicted with *arthritis* than *tetanus emprosthotonus*; for the latter does not continue for 18 years. Among women arthritis in the hips, and in consequence of long-continued paralysis, is still common in those regions. The withering of Jeroboam's hand, 1 Kings 13: 4, was either a sudden local paralysis, or a local tetanus, although the drying seems rather to refer to a paralysis combined with atrophy (comp. Zech. 11: 17).—In Matt. 4: 24; 17: 15 (comp. Mark 9: 17–27; Luke 9: 38–43) the symptoms pretty clearly indicate *epilepsy*. Epilepsy may be cerebral, medullary, gangliary, or abdominal. Abdominal ep. (Mark 9: 18) occurs mostly in boys, from their 9th year to manhood (in Syria especially it is caused by intestinal worms. PRUNER, 244), chiefly in daytime, and during the increase of the moon, hence *lunatici*. (See MEDICUS, *Gesch. period. Krankh.*, I., 1, § 3; ROSENMÜLLER on Pa. 121; KRAZENSTEIN, *Einfluss d. Mondes*, &c.: Halle, 1747; KRETZSCHMAR, *de astrorum in corp. hum. imperio*: Jena, 1820). Muteness is not a characteristic symptom of epilepsy, but has its cause in the *πνεῦμα* (see *Demoniacs*). Epilepsy as connected with an obscuration of the intellect, forms the transition to *psychical diseases*.—At present *psychical diseases* rarely occur in the East (PRUNER, 305). Two highly interesting cases (Saul and Nebuchadnezzar) of melancholy and insanity, the two chief forms of psychical disease, are mentioned in the Bible. If it can in a general way be assumed that such diseases have their physical basis in a disorder of the nervous system, *melancholy* results from a diseased affection of the ganglionic system. It rises, where psychical excitements are co-operating causes, periodically from a passive, brooding sadness, to a raging mania (Prov. 26: 18; 1 Sam. 16: 14, 23; 18: 10, &c.). *Insanity* (chiefly combined with a disease of the brain) is an erratic state of the spirit, showing itself either as a foolish craziness (1 Sam. 21: 14) or a monomania, in an asthenic or hypersthenic form. Both are appropriately designated (Deut. 28: 28; 2 Kings 9: 20; Zech. 12: 4) by **וַיִּשְׁרָשַׁע** from **שָׂרַשׁ**, to rave like a maniac (1 Sam. 21: 15, &c.; Hos. 9: 7). The case of Nebuchadnezzar presents a remarkable example of total insanity (*insania metamorphosis, zoanthropica*), and hence was formerly a favorite theme of academic lectures (KEPNER, *de metam. N. Viteb.*, 1654; PFEIFFER, *exerc. acad. de N.*, &c., *Regiom.*, 1674; REUTEL, *de mira et stupenda N. metam. Marp.*, 1675; SCHWEIZER, *de fur. N. Al.*, 1699; HENTSCHEL, *de metam. N. Viteb.*, 1703

RECKENBERGER, *de N. ab hom. Expulso*: Jen., 1733; MÜLLER, *de N. metam.*: Lips., 1747). His insanity was a natural consequence, and a righteous punishment of his self-deifying pride. Various similar cases are reported (APOLL. II., 2; VIRG., *Ecl.* VI., 48; see SPRENGEL'S *Beitr. zur Gesch. d. Medicin* I., 2. ARNOLD, *Obs. on the nature, &c. &c., of insanity*. Leicester, 1782, I., 3). WIER (*de præstig. demon.*, IV., 23) tells of a farmer who imagined himself a wolf, with the hairy side of the skin turned inward. ANDRAL (*spec. path.*, III., 162) relates the case of a lycanthropic boy of 14 years, who clothed himself in a wolf-skin and roamed the woods, tearing children to pieces; WEINRICH (*comm. de monstr. Vratisl.*, 1595) of a girl, who, to dispel epilepsy, drank cat's blood, and then was seized with the idea that she was a cat, &c. (For similar cases see CABANIS, *rapp. du physique et du moral de l'homme.*: Par., 1824, I., 57, &c. CASPAR, *Vierteljahrsschr. für ger. Med.* 1855, p. 163. BLECH, *diss. de mutat. unguium morboris*: Berol., 1826, p. 19). — Of idiocy no cases occur in the Bible.—The cases of Timothy and Paul (1 Tim. 5:23; 2 Cor. 12:7; Gal. 4:14) may have been nervous affections, gastric debility resulting from a diseased affection of the ganglionic nerves.

Literature:—For the later periods of Judaism, COHN, *de medic. Talm. Vratisl.*, 1846. A thorough work upon this entire subject is still needed. PROF. GRUNER, of Jena, is said to have left behind a valuable *Nosologia bibl.* Earlier monographs upon Biblical diseases are mostly defective, as that of THOM. BARTHOLIN, *de morbis bibl., miscell. med. ed.* III., a *Francof.*, 1692, which, among the rest, contains chaps., *de somno Adami, an ecstasis vel lethargus; uxor Lothi in salem conversa; facies Moysis immutata; de pisce, in quo sepultus Jonas; de puerperio St. Mariæ; de annulis narium; de hypoch. Judæ proditoris morbo, &c.* Two essays by Prof. WEDEL, of Jena: *exercit. med. phil. sacræ et profanæ*, 1686. and 1704. WARLITZ, *diatr. de morb. bibl., &c.*: Vit., 1714. J. J. SCHMIDT, *bibl. Medicus*, Züllichau, 1743; this is one of the best and most comprehensive works. Chr. T. E. REINHARD, *B.-krankheiten, &c.*: Frankf. and Lpz., 1767. ACKERMANN, *Erläuter. d. N. T. Krankh. in Weise's Mater. für Gottesgel.* II.–IV., 1784, &c. C. B. MICHAELIS, *philologemata medica.*: Halæ, 1758. MEAD, *med. sacræ.*: Amst., 1749. ESCHENBACH, *scripta medico-bibl.* Rost., 1779. TH. SHAPTER, *Medica sacræ*, or a short expos. of the more important diseases in the S. S., Lond., 1834. GOLDMANN, *diss. de rel. med. vet. Test. Vratisl.*, 1845. TRUBEN, *Darstellung, &c.*, Posen, 1843, is unsatisfactory. DR. F. PRUNER, already cited. DELITZSCH., *Syst. d. bibl. Psychol.*: Lpz., 1855. LEYRER.*

Dispensation, in general, is exemption in special cases from established rules, allowed by the proper authority. The necessity of such occasional exemptions arises from the peculiarity of human relations, in which abstract rules cannot always be enforced without perverting their real design. In such cases the executive officers must fully ascertain the applicability of the rule, before enforcing it. If it is found inapplicable, the fact is determined by interpreta-

tion, and the matter is dropped, unless there be special directions for doubtful cases. But if the case is found really to come under the rule, and yet that its enforcement would cause unforeseen injuries to persons or institutions, the law-giver must proceed to order an exemption from the rule. The granting of this exemption is a dispensation. It is *disp. in a proper sense*, when it refers to the future; it is *absolution* (*indulgentia, remissio, relaxatio*) when it refers to the past. *Absolution proper* is the remission of a *pœna fori interni*, whilst *pardon* (*adgratiatio*) is the remission of a *pœna fori externi*. — Church-regulations have rested from the first upon custom and law. The latter was derived from the O. T., evangelically modified, from the rules prescribed by Christ and his Apostles, from synodical canons, &c. Offenders against these laws, could only be reconciled to the Church by showing proper repentance. The penalties incurred were then remitted, through fraternal clemency (*συγγνώμη, συμπαθεία, φιλανθρωπία, οίκονομία, remissio, venia, clementia, &c.* See SUICER, *thes. eccl. s. v. οίκονομία*). Hence arose the *disp. post factum*, granted in early times by Bishops (JNO. JUNG, *facta disp. episcop. hist., &c., Mogunt.*, 1787, 4to.), or by Provincial Synods (c. 2, sq., *Conc. Ancyran. a. 358, in c. 32, dist. L.; c. 12 Conc. Nic. a. 325, in c. 9, Can. XXVI., qu. VI.*). But no antecedent privilege to violate a rule could be granted (c. 41, *Can. I., qu. I.; c. 7, 14, Can. I., qu. VII., Innoc. I., a. 411, &c.*). But after canon law came to include, in the manner of the O. T., many and severe regulations, the necessity of interpretations and relaxations arose. For these appeal was made to Rome, and thus originated the Papal right of dispensation. Thus *Innoc. III.: Nos sec. plenitud. potestatis de jure possumus supra jus dispensare* (c. 4, X., de concess. præbendæ [III., 8]). This assumption led some Bishops and Synods to claim the right for themselves (THOMASSIN, *vet. ac nova eccl. disciplina*, P. I., l. III., c. 24–29); but its moral aspect was scarcely noticed. The practice gained ground. — Luther took earnest hold of the matter (WALCH, X., 361), and the complaints of Germany against Romish abuses of this assumed right, forced a change of practice, which the Papal court could the less avoid, as a commission of Cardinals appointed by Paul III., 1538, denounced the evil.¹ This led to greater care, but the principle itself was left untouched.²

¹ Their language is: "*Alius abusus magnus et minime tolerandus, quo universus populus Christianus scandalizatur, est ex impedimentis quæ inferuntur episcopis in gubernatione suarum ovium, maxime in puniendis sceleratis et corrigendis. Nam primo multis viis eximunt se mali homines, præsertim clerici, a jurisdictione sui ordinarii: deinde, si non sunt exempti, confugiunt statim ad penitentiarium, vel ad datariam, ubi confestim inveniunt viam impunitati et, quod pejus est, ob pecuniam præstitam; hoc scandalum, beatissime pater, tantopere conturbat Christianum populum, ut non queat verbis explicari.*" (LE PLAT, *monumenta ad hist. conc. Trid. amplissima*, T. II. p. 601).

² See SARPI, *hist. Cmo. Trid.* (ed. Amstelod. 1622, 4to.) lib. VIII. p. 788, 789, 872; *Trid. Conc. s. XXV. c. 18, de ref.; s. XXII. c. 5, de ref.; s. XXIV. c. 4, 5, de ref. matr.; s. VII. c. 11, 12, de ref.; s. VI. c. 2, de ref.; s. XXII. c. 1, de ref.* But, despite these restrictions, some of the evils still continued.

The right of granting dispensations belongs to the Pope in all cases not fixed by the *jus divinum*, in which he can only interpret (FERRARIS, *bibl. canon. s. v. disp.*, Nro. 19, 30). In the gloss upon c. 2, Can. XV. qu. VI., it is even said: "*Dico, quod contra jus naturale Papa potest dispensare, dum tamen non contra Evang., vel c. artic. fidei, tamen c. Apostolum dispensat.*" Romish dispensations are granted by the *Dataria* for public, by the *Poenitentiaria* for private cases, and those in *foro conscientiae*. Bishops may dispense in cases expressly designated by the canons (FERRARIS, l. c., 25), including dispensations from their own injunctions (BENED., XIV., *de syn. dioces.*, lib. XIII., c. 5, § 7 seq. FERRAR., l. c., 91), and in cases referred to them by the papal quinquennial-faculties (see Art.), and *casus papales superveniente impedimento adeundi Papam fiunt episcopales*; also in extreme cases, when peril threatens, in which custom gives such right to them, and when it may be questionable whether a dispensation is required (FERRAR., 27-29). The episcopal *Vicar-general* must obtain special authority to dispense (c. 4, *de procurat. in VI.* [l., 19] *Conc. Trid. s.*, XXIV., c. 6, *de ref.*) Chapters, or the *Vicar-capitulary* may dispense, *sede vacante*, only in cases absolutely belonging to the Bishop.—The operation of the disp. is determined by circumstances and the terms of the license or absolution granted (FERRAR., 31, &c.). — The disp. are based either upon legal forms (*disp. legis*), or upon the judgment of the dispenser (*disp. hominis*), or upon the fact that the law allows it to be granted by a duly authorized person (*disp. mixta*). A disp. may be *disp. justitiæ* or *gratiæ* (*in forma gratiosa*); but even in the latter case, the Bishop must guard against subreption.—(See also KLÜBER's contin. of PÜTTER's *Literat. d. Staatsr. B.*, IV., 557, &c.) — The *Evang. Church* from the first attached a more strict and limited sense to the idea of dispensation. As freedom of legal requirements was greatly extended, there was but little room left to apply dispensations. Still it was retained in some form, since it was impossible to frame the government in so normal a way, as to render disp. wholly unnecessary. But the Reformers did not fail to distinguish between divine and human ordinances, and to declare disp. inadmissible in regard to the former. When granted, they recommended it to be done by the clergy and civil rulers conjointly. (See LUTHER, l. c., X., 361; MELANCHTHON, *de conjugio*; J. H. BÖHMER, *jus eccl. Prot. lib.*, IV., tit. XIV., § XLIV., seq.). In Prussia most disp. are now granted by the consistories, with the consent of the civil rulers. They have reference chiefly to laws concerning marriage, and minor religious customs (EICHORN, *K.-recht*; G. L. BÖHMER, *principia jur. canon.* Upon the entire subject: J. H. Böhmer, *diss. de sublimi principum ac statuum evang. dispensandi jure*, &c., Halæ, 1722, 4to.; also found in his *Exercit. ad Pandectas*, I., Exerc. XIII., p. 481, &c. See also: *Anglican C.* and BURN'S *Eccl. Law*, II., 158-165). H. F. JACOBSON.*

Dissenters, from *dissentire*, a term of English origin, and applied to those who have separated from the Anglican C. See *England*, and special articles upon the various religious dis-

senting bodies. In Scotland Episcopalians are considered dissenters, the State-church being Presbyterian. HERZOG.*

Długossus, the oldest Polish historian, born 1415, at Coczyn (others say, Brzenica). After completing his studies, B. Sbigneo de Olessnica consecrated him a priest, and promoted him to various eccl. benefices. He was skillful in business matters. B. Sbigneo appointed him executor of his will,—he improved the opportunity by restoring many neglected revenues, and is said to have distributed about 12 millions Polish guilders among various benevolent and religious institutions. Ladislaus II. called him to a canonry in Cracow, where he distinguished himself by the improvement of poor-houses, and assisting indigent students.—A charge of simony and of corrupting records, preferred against him by the Vice-chancellor of the kingdom, was retracted with tears. Subsequently the king had him imprisoned for three years in the castle of Mesztyn, because he preferred a Bishop appointed by the Pope to one whom the King appointed. To make amends for this, the King afterwards sent him to Vienna, to solicit the hand of the daughter of Albrecht II. Cassimir IV. appointed him tutor of the royal children. He twice visited Rome; first to obtain the Cardinal's hat for B. Sbigneo; again during the jubilee. From Rome he went to Palestine, whence he returned sick. At last he was chosen B. of Reusch-Lemberg, but died, 1480, before his consecration. His chief work: *Hist. Poloniae usque ad a.*, 1480, was published in 13 books, Leipsic, 1711-1712. He also wrote the lives of many Polish Bishops; also published. Other writings (a hist. of St. Cunigunda; a Geogr. of Poland, &c.) exist in MSS. (See ISSELIN, *hist. L.*; *Ersch and Gruber*). HERZOG.*

Doctrinarians, a product of the new life and zeal awakened in Romish churches by the Reformation. There are two classes, differing from each other in immaterial points. 1. In FRANCE, *doctrinaires, pères de la doctrine Chrétienne*, founded, 1592, by CÉSAR DE BUS, of Cavaillon, a distinguished pastor and preacher. He became impressed with the importance of founding a society for instructing the people in the Romish Catechism. He arranged the contents of the Catechism into three parts, beginning with the simplest doctrines; and, having gathered around him a number of young priests, he prepared them to give instruction in the first part, and sent them out to catechise everybody they might meet. He himself taught the second and third parts in churches and private houses. More assistants having offered themselves, he collected them all in l'Isle, in the county of Venaissin, 1592. It was resolved to use the same measures there, especially in Avignon, and to solicit the approval of Clem. VIII.; this being readily obtained, the society was duly constituted in 1597. The Doctrinarians met with general favor, and spread over France, though not without some internal discords. The union formed, 1616, with the Somaski, ceased in 1651, after many collisions, at which time Innoc. X. annulled a bull of 1651, which, he said, had been fraudulently extorted from him.—2. In ITALY, *Padri della dottrina Christiana*, founded

by a Milan nobleman, *Marcus de Sadis Cusani*, in Rome, 1562, also to instruct the people and children in the catechism. The society, actively supported by Cæsar Baronius, the historian, rapidly spread, especially after Pius V. had recommended it. That these fathers did not carry the matter of religious education too far, is evident from the regulation in HELYOT, IV. 251, directing that, if the laity could not read the breviary, it would suffice for them to pray the rosary. Most Doctrinarians are found in Rome; a few in other Italian towns.—(See HELYOT, IV. 232–252.) HERZOG.*

Doctrines, History of. — *The character, nature, and method of the science. Its literature.* — Doctrine-History, as a separate theological discipline, is scarcely a hundred years old. The earliest contributions to it (by *Walch*, 1756, *Semler*, 1762, and *Rössler*) made during a period of the most wakeful scientific reflection, were preceded by a careful consideration of its form and contents, and yet may be regarded as merely initiatory steps towards the science. Even *Lange's* (1796) arrangement of the systems of the fathers to Irenæus, is very imperfect. He was followed in quick succession by *Münscher*, *Augusti*, and *Münter*, who apprehended and treated the object of the science more definitely, and these by the more recent and important works of *Baumgarten-Crusius*, *Hagenbach*, *Meier* and *Baur*. And yet the necessity and propriety of making the history of doctrines a distinct department of theological science, have been questioned, even by such men as *Schleiermacher* and *Hase*. It has seemed objectionable thus to dismember the connected branches of Church History, and unnecessarily to multiply the departments of theological science; especially as so much of the material not incorporated in Church History (as in *Neander's*), would be properly embraced in introductions (prolegomena) to Dogmatics, in the historical illustrations of Dogmatics proper, in the history of Christian Philosophy, or in Symbolism. Where, then, the necessity for a Doctrine-History? — But are these seemingly plausible objections valid? The simplicity, and therefore the truth and beauty of the organism of theological science, do not depend merely upon its including the smallest possible number of departments, but rather upon excluding all foreign material from each, and upon presenting each in a distinct, perspicuous form. Thus, if *Church History* does not limit itself (as in *Niedner's*) to the mere fundamental outlines of theology and its essential contents, so far as its progress is associated with the other sides of Church life; if, on the contrary, it attempts to take up all the theological material at hand, it becomes too massive, and loses its proper summary character. But if all this doctrinal material were embraced in *Dogmatics*, this department would forfeit its systematic character, and more would be lost than gained by the method. As for *symbolism*, the narrow limit of its design prevents its embracing a doctrine-history; whilst the *History of Christian Philosophy* could not do this, unless it were extended in a manner contradictory to its true conception, or the idea of Doctrine-History were unduly contracted.

But what is the correct idea of Doctrine-History? A proper conception of its *nature* must furnish the best vindication of its claims to be an independent department of theological science. We may assume that a Christian *dogma* (see *Dogmatics*) or *doctrine*, is that form of religious truth which has been definitely apprehended and adopted as such by the great communion of Catholic Christians, either by a formal public decision, or through personal influence, and informal common consent, and as opposed to conflicting, sectarian opinions. A *definite apprehension* of each truth thus adopted, as the result of a scientific process of inquiry and discussion, is requisite to its becoming a *dogma*, even in the case of those truths which seem to preclude all such scientific inquiry (as, Jesus is the Christ, the Trinity, &c.). The doctrinal results, therefore, reached by means of the progressive dialectic activity and collision of various minds, form the substance of the *History of Doctrines*; their proper presentation is the office of this particular science.

From this gradual development and scientific apprehension of Christian doctrines we must distinguish the *original testimony* of Revelation, the *apostolic and prophetic Word*, which is the basis of those doctrines, and which is presupposed by them. That testimony also has its history, its progressive complementary development; but it involves no scientific process of apprehension, as in the case of dogmas. Its history constitutes the sphere of *Biblical Theology*. It may, however, be altogether proper to preface a history of doctrines with a concise review of the general results of Bibl. Theol., by way of transition from the one to the other, and in order to make the formation-process of the former more intelligible by a lively representation of the germ out of which dogmas have been developed. — The *History of Dogmatics* differs from that of *Doctrines*, in that the former is concerned with the gradual formation of doctrines into a systematic whole — proposes to show the various steps by which, in the course of scientific efforts, Dogmatics has acquired its present form. There are, indeed, points of contact between them, so far as both have to characterize certain tendencies of thought, theological and philosophical theories, and their influence upon the subject in hand: but this influence will vary accordingly as in the one case it affects particular dogmas, in the other the system of dogmas. And even if, in the *History of Doctrines*, the sum of the doctrines of influential men is presented, this is done, not to show the formative process of their system, but to shed light upon the formation of certain doctrines, and to ascertain the influence of those men upon them. Nor is the distinction between these two branches of history abolished by the fact that Doctrine-History portrays the progressive recognition of the organic unity of doctrines; for this is only incidental to its general object, and is treated accordingly; whereas it is the proper business of the *History of Dogmatics* to set forth the growth of doctrines into a united systematic exposition. — The *History of Doctrines* is distinguished from *Symbolism*, because the latter, though including a considerable

amount of material belonging to Doctrine-History, does so only so far as it is requisite to a right apprehension of the confessions of Christianity in general, and its various branches, and not for the purpose of portraying the progressive apprehension of the doctrines involved in those confessions.—Between the *History of Christian Philosophy* (as in *Ritter's* and *Branniss'*) and that of Doctrines, there are also important points of contact. But the more sharply we define the true character of both, the less will the former be found to absorb the latter. The Hist. of Chr. Phil. introduces Doctrine-History only as it serves to exhibit the plastic influence of Christian thought, in its freedom and independence of eccl. decisions, or other settlements of doctrine, upon the highest problems of the human spirit; whereas, reversely, the Hist. of Doctr. refers to the movements and results of Christian thought, as the form of eccl. doctrines is thereby determined. Of course the matter will wear another aspect, if we consider theological dogmas as but an imperfect grade of philosophical speculation, in which case the Hist. of Doctr. would become a sort of *phenomenology*. But this pantheistic or panlogistic view of the subject may be considered as exploded and dying out.

In thus defining the character of our science, we have also gained a view of the grounds of its nature. Upon this point, therefore, we shall only add such remarks as will aid our consideration of the *method* of the science.—As already stated it is the office of the Hist. of Doctr. to present the dialectic process of Christian doctrines, or of the articles of the Chr. faith (as distinguished from the principles of ethics), their development to a definite apprehension. But Chr. truth comprehends the divine gospel in Christ; the theological, anthropological, and christological doctrines form its basis; the doctrines of the objective means and proffer of salvation its centre; and those of the subjective appropriation, of the communion and consummation of grace, its end. Its dialectic process, however, is the onward movement of the idea of the dogma, through antithesis and conflict, to scientific definiteness—to an apprehension of its points, in their unity, by which, along with the progressive determination of all the parts, a distinct perception of their organic union is gained. The idea of the dogma, however, is nothing else than the actualization by individual self-consciousness of the fact of salvation, which, as such, is the unity of the word and the fact—the word moulded into a fact, the fact which receives its designation and significance from the word. This fact, brought to man by oral and written announcements and representations, and apprehended by inward contemplation, takes possession, primarily, of the mind, of the immediate life of the soul in its unity and indivisibility; and, being embraced by the will as the bearer of salvation, its saving power renews the inmost personal life of man, so that he now becomes conscious of his condition as determined by the energy of this fact of salvation, and can say: Christ is my Saviour. From the immediate intuition of this objective fact, as it has penetrated the mind of the subject results

the idea which forms the substance of immediate religious knowledge. But this personal knowledge of the truly enlightened and living Christian, must according to the ordinary laws of the human spirit, pass through a *process* in which the various points included in *this idea* are brought out, perceived and defined in their diversity and relative antithesis, as well as in the unity in which all these diversities hold together. Nor is it a matter of personal choice to pass through this process or not; its necessity follows from the nature of the human spirit, as well as from the design of Christianity, which, as a renewal of man's entire being, of his nature in all its activities, of his self-consciousness in all its functions, also seeks to gain the ascendancy in the sphere of science, to pervade it, to incorporate the idea of itself with science, and thus to sanctify it.—But the dialectic process moves, as already intimated, in the three acts of *thesis*, *antithesis*, and *synthesis*. Starting then from the assumption that the Christian principle is the unity of the Divine and the human, and that this principle pervades all dogmas, its development, as doctrine also, and therefore the entire process of constructing dogmas, would consist in the thesis, antithesis, and synthesis, of the divine and human; and thus we would obtain a very simple construction and division of the Hist. of Doctr.: the period of the thesis, or of the immediate settlement of those points, the period of antithesis, and that of the synthesis of both, of the reconciliation of contradictions (*Dörtenbach*). But plausible as this method may at first seem, it is refuted by the fact that the different points of the various dogmas cannot be traced back to such an antithesis of the Divine and human. This is obvious in regard to the doctrine of the Trinity; but it will be found to be the case also with others.—If, however, we proceed from the fundamental conception of the salvation of sinful man in Christ, the historical personal God-man, three circles of dogmas will be obtained, by which, together with the formal side of development, and its national sphere, the *chief periods* of Doctrine-History will be determined. For we hold that the concurrence of these three points:—1) the *material*, those circles of dogmas in which, principally, the contents of the development are formed; 2) the *formal*, or the way and manner of that development; 3) the *national*, or the sphere in which it becomes prominent—and that, a concurrence in which a harmony of these points can be perceived—will lead to a correct division of the periods of our science, which is a chief problem of its method.—These spheres of doctrine may be briefly designated as the sphere of the commencement, that of the centre, and that of the completion. The *first* is that of the *principal* or *fundamental* dogmas, in which the antecedents and causes of redemption are scientifically set forth. These are the dogmas 1) of *God*, 2) of *man*, ideal and fallen, 3) of the *God-man*. Other doctrines will, of course, come up with these, but in a secondary way, partly as involved in or resulting from these, partly as belonging to the substantiation of these, and partly in such form that the transition to the second period will appear, which,

if the development is an organic one, must have its preparatory existence in the first. Thus the doctrines of grace and election, of redemption, and of the Church and sacraments, of the conditions of salvation, and of the final negative and positive completion of redemption, in the individual and the race, will be considered. This circle will include the *patristic* period, in which the foundation of dogmatics was laid, in which the dogmas, one after another, were *analytically* expounded out of the fundamental dogmas, and in such manner that these appear as the primary ones. But the field on which this was done, comprehended the most intimately connected ancient nationalities, the Oriental-Hellenic-Roman Christianized world, which theoretically released itself, in this production of dogmas, from its past Jewish-heathen bonds, made itself thoroughly familiar, step by step with Christian truth, by substituting the Christian mode of contemplating all religious doctrines, for the Jewish and heathen mode. Thus, in the general dogma of God, the theistic Christian idea was established over against deistic, pantheistic, dualistic, polytheistic views; in the doctrine of the Trinity, the divine Trinity against abstract monotheism and the notion of subordinate national sub-gods; in anthropology, the biblical idea of man over against heathen and Gnostic fables and conceits concerning his origin and nature; in the dogma of the God-man, the personal unity of the Divine and human natures in Christ, either against the Gentile or Jewish denial of the real humanity or real divinity — against Ebionism and Nestorianism, or Gnosticism and Monophysitism. — The *middle* circle includes those dogmas which set forth the objective mediation and proffering of salvation: those of election and the sacraments, of the Church and the atonement. The dogma of the Church was, indeed, not specially discussed; but on the one hand the C. with her tradition is the antecedent and basis of the entire dogmatic life of this period, and is definitely recognised as the holder of the truth, through her orthodox fathers, general councils, and legal head; and on the other she stands forth, with her sacraments, as the exclusive bearer and profferer of salvation, and as dispensing reconciliation, sanctification, and redemption, as, through her priesthood, opening or shutting the door of the kingdom. Thus *election*, *objective redemption*, and the *sacrament* of the Lord's Supper form the dogmas of this middle circle, and which form the chief matter of the dogmatic development of the mediæval Church; to which must be added the dogma of the *Holy Ghost*, viz., his procession, whether from the Father alone, or from the Father and the Son. That at the same time *other dogmas* were more or less developed, followed from the *formal* character of this period, which, answering to the material character, occupied the centre between the old period in which the basis was laid and doctrines were produced, and the new in which they came to be subjectively appropriated. This mediæval form and mode of treatment is the *scholastic*, characterized as *fides querens intellectum*, by which the faith of the Church, as explained by the fathers, is dialectically elaborated; the *sentences* of the

fathers, whose collection was the work of the commencement of the middle ages, were brought together and subjected to acute philosophical investigation. Thus the single dogmas were more sharply defined and more clearly apprehended. — The national field of this work was also a middle sphere between the ancient and modern, the *Romanic-German*, in which piety was combined with great energy of the understanding, and exerted itself as *fides querens intellectum*. — But these two still connected elements could not always endure each other. In the Roman nationality appeared the tendency to oppression of the individuality, to despotic rule; in the German, on the contrary, a struggle after independence, personal self-determination. This was invigorated by scholastic exercises, so that within the scholastic period tradition was shaken, especially as to the proof of its necessity and reasonableness, the external authority of the Church alone remained. But when, at length, arbitrariness came to prevail, at the pleasure of the predominant power, as the only basis, this externality easily swung over to its opposite, the abolition and negation of tradition, and the ascendancy of subjectivity. Such arbitrariness obtained in one part of mediæval scholasticism, whilst a positive independence was establishing itself in the deepest life of the mind and its immediate intuitions, a *mystical* independence and freedom, which, even when not hostile to tradition, used it in a free way, fixed its import and assimilated its mode of contemplating things. Along with this there was a falling back upon the primitive revelation, the Holy Scriptures, as the true source and norm of faith and practice. — In this way, and by means of revived humanistic cultivation, a *third period* was inaugurated, that of the *subjective conditioning* of the dogma, especially of those doctrines which concern the *subjective appropriation of redemption*, and in those in which this attains to its full realization. The chief field of the development of doctrines is the *German* in its attempts to rid itself of Romish influence and freely construct its own system. The first and obvious principle of these attempts is *conscience as bound by the Word of God*. This affirms freedom of hierarchical assumptions and arbitrary laws and ordinances, and the rights of self-consciousness, yet as ethically restrained (by conscience); these rights not in the form of a Pelagian denial of the bondage of the natural man (in his reason and volition) to error and sin, nor of pantheistical identification of the Spirit of God and man; but in a union with the acknowledgment of the authority of the written Word of God over the conscience, which excludes the fanatical errors of a false mysticism. Thus the *mystical and Bible principles* are combined; and at the same time a *critical* principle is fixed, which finds its limits in actual religious experience, and which, with all its perils in consequence of a defective partial surrender of self to God in Christ, finds its corrective in the common experience of all Christians, of all ages, as in a truly catholic tradition and in a candid impartial historical investigation of the truth. This great principle of the Reformation is both *formal and material*, the former in a consciousness of justification before God, through

Christ, the latter in a consciousness of a corresponding holy obligation to a progressive harmony of the human mind with the mind of God; both being conditioned by *faith*, as involving an unqualified confidence in and surrender to God in Christ.—But this principle must work its way through *various points* which may readily degenerate into negation and conflict. Especially does an antithesis of *word* and *spirit* show itself. a) The *spirit* seeks to predominate at the expense of the word. The *word* is set aside as a mere letter, and the spirit asserts its dominant authority to decide upon the sense of the letter; hence a revival of the mystic, sectarian tendencies of the earlier periods. b) In opposition to this the *word* asserts its supremacy over the spirit, and thus there arises a dominion of the latter, either of the literal mechanically inspired Word of God, or of eccl. confessions. Both, in a sense, are *right*. The *spirit*, as a truly evangelical one, pervaded by a living experience of salvation, really possesses the essence of the Word, and thus has the key to its proper sense and the rule of its interpretation; but these living contents of the spirit are extended, enriched, and purified by a growing acquaintance with the SS., and by participation with the knowledge and experience of contemporaneous and antecedent generations of Christians, whilst isolation leads to fanaticism and sectarianism. So, on the other hand, the SS. form the *Word* of the Holy Spirit, as revealed and established by divine illumination and guidance; but if their mere letter, upon the assumption of entire literal inspiration, is made the unconditional norm, and exclusive source of the knowledge of the truth, no clear perception of the seeming diversities and antitheses which occur will be gained, and many untrue or half-true attempts at reconciliation will intrude themselves, and thus detriment be done to the honor of the SS. But if the letter of *confessions of faith* predominates, there must ensue a temporary check to free development, even though it constitute an epoch in the general process. This will produce and justify reaction in the form of *criticism*. This began, though not historically or scientifically, but as proceeding somewhat arbitrarily from the instinct of a religious self-consciousness, with Luther, and showed itself in a separation of the primary and secondary, the proto and deutero-canonical books, the apostolical and non-apostolical. Its ground-thought is a *canon in the canon*, expressing itself in giving prominence to the principal books of the SS., according to their seemingly more evangelical character. But the more fully this *critical* principle was surrendered, and everything found in the SS. was put on an equality, in order to gain a firmer footing against the Romish doctrine of tradition, and the more confessions came to be respected, under the pressure of internal controversies, the more violent became the contradiction. The *spirit*, ultimately, determined everything, and gradually more in the form of the natural *human reason*, so that nothing was to be thought true but as it harmonized with it, or was deduced from its principles. And as the formal authority of the SS. was thus overthrown, the *contents* of the

confessions were gradually negated, and an anthropology and doctrine of justification, approximating Romish-Pelagianism, prevailed. It was the period of the tyranny of subjectivism in matters of truth and salvation.—The school of *Schleiermacher* (see Art.) corrected this divergence, by leading self-consciousness to yield itself to the *common consciousness*, and its source, the personal Christ, the substance of the SS. Here again we meet with oscillations, and with conflicts between negative and positive, destructive and conservative criticism. But all leads to the freedom of the spirit through the word, and the vivifying of the word through the spirit; there will be no longer a dead letter, and no longer a spirit cut loose from the facts of Revelation. This is the struggle of our age. In reference to this, however, we can only distinguish four stadia: 1) Spirit and word in lively immediate union with particular vacillations of opinion; 2) a predominance of the word with a one-sided ruling of the letter; 3) a predominance of the spirit with a one-sided sway of subjectivity; 4) the tendency to a reconciliation of the antithesis, to a living union of the several points involved.

The entire movement of this period proceeds from the *soteriological class of dogmas*; the doctrines of the subjective appropriation of salvation, and of the method of grace; of justification and sanctification, &c. The fundamental or central idea is: *the free personal certainty of salvation*, as independent of hierarchical guardianship, or objective eccl. mediation, and as resting in the relation of the inmost personality of the believer to God in Christ; a relation rooted in God's grace and its operation, by means of the Word and sacraments, upon the heart of sinful man; or, if it be regarded as man's own act, still as an act originated and made effectual through that grace. Everything done aims at the free and firm certainty of salvation on the part of the subject of grace. Partly foreign matters of dispute and contradictions (as in the doctrine of the Lord's Supper), partly the free investigation of the SS.; partly the resuscitation of older views; and partly the rise of rationalism, also led to dogmas acknowledged as transmitted by earlier periods (the Trinity, the Person and works of Christ). But the doctrines peculiar to this period had to maintain their ground amid great struggles, especially those concerning the difference or unity of justification or sanctification, the value of good works, the unconditional or conditional character of predestination, the irresistibility or resistibility of grace, the relation of the Word and sacraments, of the Word and Spirit, and of faith and the sacraments. One-sided extremes, in reference to each of these points, were gradually overcome and corrected, and the way of truly reconciling contradictions was more and more fully opened.

The Reformation overthrew the existing Church authority, so that communion and unity seemed to be sacrificed to individual freedom, or, at least, that a mere ideal unity was substituted for a real one, and that the dogma of the *Church* was substantially surrendered. But it was now, in fact, to be first fairly developed. Instead of an

empirical, secularized conception, there arose the true idea of the Church; instead of a mere objective apprehension of it, one which included both the objective and subjective apprehensions. The Church no longer stood forth as a queen or a mistress, nor merely as the mother of the faithful and the mediatrix of salvation, but as the communion of saints, the comprehension of those who had appropriated salvation. And this is the Church, *κατ' ἑσθιν*, Christ in redeemed and believing humanity, called the *invisible C.*, because its unity rests upon a fact of the inner life not patent to the senses, and is not bound to this or that empirical Church-society. But this also includes all who have come under the operation of the Spirit of Christ, all the baptized and regenerate (1 Cor. 7 : 14) or the *visible C.*, which, in its present state of imperfection, liability to sin and error in other things, has also fallen under the influence of schisms and divisions. The *visible* and *invisible C.* are, however, not parallel or separate, but essentially in each other; for even believers are not yet wholly pervaded by the Spirit, but still entangled with the flesh and the world; and many of those who have not yet attained salvation, give evidence of being wrought upon by the grace of God, and under the operations of his Spirit. It is in the establishment of this doctrine of the Church, that our period is engaged. Its completion will be presented in the settlement of the *eschatological* dogmas, which have been recently receiving earnest attention. — Moving within the spheres of these three periods, the History of Doctrines must endeavor fairly to exhibit all that pertains to the gradual development of the several chief dogmas.

In noticing, finally, the *literature* of this science, we must pass by all monographic contributions, which will be the subjects of separate articles, and confine our remarks to *methodological* labors, and to works embracing them all, or superadded to them. — The former began with WALCH: *Gedanken v. d. Gesch. d. Glaubenslehre*, &c., 1756, which he defines as the history of the changes of Christian dogmas. In this the Hist. of Doctr. and of Dogmatics is combined. — SEMLER (*Baumgarten's* Unters. theol. Streit. herausg. v. Semler) exhibits a consideration of the method; he aims at selecting from the great mass of material. — He was followed by ZIEGLER (*Ideen über d. Begriff u. d. Behandlungsart d. Dogm. Gesch. in Gabler's* *Neuestem Journal*, Bd. 2) and AUGUSTI (*über d. Methode d. D.-Gesch. in d. Neuen theol. Blättern*, II. 2). Of more account is the critical-anthropological exposition of DE WETTE, in his "Religion u. Theol." (pp. 196–222). DAUB contemplated the form of Christian Doctrine and Church History from a *speculative* standpoint (in Br. Bauer's *Ztschr. für Speculat. Theol.* I. 1, pp. 1–61; 2, pp. 63–133; II. 1, pp. 88–161). He adopts five periods, corresponding to the different principles predominant in each: the primitive Christian, the apostolic Christian, the eccl.-patristic, the papal, and the eccl.-reformatory. The principle on which the form of the last rests can only be fairly discovered at the end of the period. If we regard the first two as the periods of biblical theology which form

the basis of Doctrine-History, we have our own division. — This division of DAUB was adopted, among his disciples, by ROSENKRANZ (*Encyclopädie*), whose construction is defective, BR. BAUER, and SCHNITZER (see *Recens. d. dogm.-gesch. Werke v. Neudecker u. Engelhardt*). This methodology, in which theology is resolved into speculation, finds its completion in DR. BAUR (*Vorr. zur chr. Lehre v. d. Versöhnung*, &c. (V.–VII.), and *Einl.* p. 8, &c., 12, &c.) who exhibits all changes as the essential points through which the idea moves, in order to comprehend itself ultimately, in its inmost being. The periods are determined by the preponderance of objectivity or subjectivity, or the comprehension of both in the higher unity of the idea. The first reaches to the Reformation; the second to Kant; the third to the most recent times; all are consummated in the self-consciousness of the absolute spirit, in which the Hegelian religion-philosophy moves and exists. — As the theological standpoint is thus surrendered, this system cannot, with all its assumed formal perfection, solve the problem of a methodology of Doctrine-History. — Let us then turn to the school of SCHLEIERMACHER. Here we first meet with the work of HAGENBACH (see *Abh. in the Theol. Stud. u. Krit.* I. 4, and the *Theol. Encycl.*). The basis of his division is the doctrinal spirit predominating, not the epochs of Ch. History. Hence, he makes 5 periods; the apologetic, to Origen; the polemic, to John of Damascus; the systematic, to the Reformation; the symbolic, to the 18th cent.; the philosophico-critical. This division, otherwise untenable, evidently embarrasses the author in his work. — A valuable article upon the subject, proceeding from essentially the same standpoint, may be found in *Rheinwald's Repert. Recension d. Lentz'schen Dogmengesch.* (by DR. ELWERT?). The writer lays chief stress upon the *spiritual principle*, which, indeed, involves the law of the various developments; then upon the *influences* under which it has developed itself. The material is grouped into three principal periods: I., the ancient period, to 730, the first production of the doctrines of faith in a reflective form, subdivided into three parts; II., the middle ages, the systematizing of those doctrines, two subdivisions; III., the modern period, that of the protestation of the new life of faith against all human ordinances, and of the struggle to confirm and comprehend the contents of faith by internal proof; two subdivisions, the second from the middle of the 18th cent., the commencement of the victory of the formal over the material principle of Protestantism. This otherwise correct division errs in assigning undue influence to the formal side. — The material side, however, receives full justice in the able work of KLIEFOTH, *Einl. in d. D.-gesch.* 1839, who, 1) makes the dogma originate in the onward co-operation of the Christian faith and life — the genetic idea of the dogma; 2) deduces the development of doctrines and its laws, from the nature of the dogma; 3) shows thence the proper method of doctrine-history. He adopts three classes of dogmas: theology, anthropology, soteriology, which develop themselves in three corresponding periods: the theological through

Greek nationality; the anthropological through the Roman Occident; the soteriological through German Protestantism. And each has its scientific form: the analytic, the synthetic, and the systematic. Each, also, runs out into three *stadia*, the productive, the symbolical-constructive, and the consummative; that of the completion and solution of the dogma. — The last methodological treatise, that of DÖRTENBACH, has been already noticed.

We conclude with mentioning some of the principal works upon the History of Doctrines. — MÜNSCHER'S *Handb.*, 4 vols., 1797–1809, (not completed) and *Lehrb.*, 1812. It is characterized by external pragmatism. — AUGUSTI, *Lehrb.*, 1805 (4th ed., 1835). This surpasses the work of Münscher by its juster appreciation of the eccl. development of doctrines, and by keeping the dogmas of Religion, Revelation, and Christianity, as such, distinct from each other—also by keeping *general* separate from *special doctrine-history*. — Similar, in this respect, is the *Lehrb.* of BAUMGARTEN-CRUSIUS, 1832, 2 vols., and his *Compendium*, 1840–46; but otherwise it far excels the work of Augusti. He adopts the following periods: 1) that of the *formation* of eccl. dogmas, *a*) by private thought and opinions, *b*) by the Church; 2) that of their confirmation, *a*) by the hierarchy, *b*) by eccl. philosophy; 3) that of their purification, *a*) by parties, *b*) by science. But with all its excellencies, this work fails in carrying out strictly the distinction between what is general and special, and in showing clearly the inward connection of the various points of development. — The same holds of the otherwise excellent work of HAGENBACH, (transl. in *Clark's series*, Edinburgh, &c.) distinguished alike for its lucid style, moderation, and selection of sources. — The division adopted by Dr. F. K. MEIER (1849) is that of the compendium of Baumgarten-Crusius, although he, like Hagenbach, does not follow B.'s separation of the general from the special. — In Dr. ENGELHARDT'S *Dogmengesch.* (2 Th., 1839–40) we have the work of a man who had already acquired reputation by his researches in historical theology. It is thorough, but deficient in scientific development and artistic execution. It occupies a sound, Protestant, biblical, churchly, standpoint; the dialectic speculative yields to the exegetical historical element. He adopts three periods: 1) to Duns Scotus Er.; 2) to the Reformation; 3) to 1680. The first two periods are most ably treated. The most important work is, undoubtedly, that of Dr. F. CHR. BAUR, of Tübingen (Stuttgart, 1847). It is based upon a succession of independent monographic investigations. His standpoint is that of a critical-speculative procedure from what is external and incidental in the phenomena, to the idea of things themselves, and an exhibition of the historical progress of the dogma, as this is grounded in the nature of man's spirit. This progress covers two periods: the exhibition of consciousness as appropriating the dogma, 1) in its unity with the dogma, 2) in its rupture and reconciliation with it; this latter from the Reformation onward. But as the absolute significance of the Reformation is also merely relative, and as scholasticism, although standing upon the same

ground of faith, possesses an essentially different character from patristicism, we get three great periods: 1) that in which the dogma produced itself, or in which Christian consciousness became objective in and realizingly one with the dogma (the ancient Church to the close of the 6th cent.); 2) that in which this consciousness receded from the objectivity of the dogma into its own subjectivity, and combining with rational reflexion opposed itself to the dogma (the middle ages, Scholasticism); 3) that in which absolute consciousness renounced and set itself above the dogma. This masterly construction depends so entirely upon the peculiar theological position of the author, that they stand or fall together; although in any event it must exert a lasting influence upon the further development of the science. — Among manuals and text-books upon this subject, which are however of but secondary importance, we name that of LENTZ, 2 vols., 1834, which is moderately rationalistic, and averse to dogmatic definitions; that of BECK, 1848, on the plan of Baumgarten-Crusius; and that of NOACK. — In the Romish C. but little attention has been given to this science. — (See *Stud. u. Krit.*, 1840, 4; 1841, 3; 1843, 1; 1852, 4). KLING.*

Dodanim, a son of Javan (Gen. 10:4), from whom a Greek race sprang. Older expositors, from the resemblance of the name to that of *Dodona*, have supposed the Oracle of Jupiter in Epirus, was alluded to (CLERICUS, *Comm.*; MICHAEL, *Spicil. Geogr.*, ext. I., 120; *Suppl. ad Lex. hebr.*, II., 414; ROSENMÜLLER, *Bibl. Alterth.*, I., 1, p. 225; III., 375, n. 7). — But this conflicts with the fact that all the other Japhite names are taken not from single cities, but from tribes or districts of country. Gesenius, and then Knobel, following older Jewish interpreters, refer the name to the entire Illyrian or North Greek race, called Trojans or Dardani, after the best known tribe. But instead of the common

reading דָּוָנִים the *Cod. Sam.* has דָּוָנִים, which is the true reading in 1 Chron. 1:7 (though some MSS. and edit. have changed it to suit Gen. 10:4). According to this reading BOCHART (*Phaleg.*, III., 6) assumes an allusion to those living along the Rhone (Rhodanus). But it seems more natural to suppose the island Rhodes to be meant (see Art.). And yet, if *Kittim* refers not to the Cyprians only, but to the entire Karian race, the Rhodians are too small a branch to be designated by Dodanim. (See KNOBEL, *Völkertafel*, &c., and *Com. zu Gen.*). ARNOLD.*

Doddridge, Philip, D. D., born in London, June 26, 1702, was the son of Daniel Doddridge, an oilman, and grandson of John Doddridge, rector of Shepperton, in Middlesex (ejected in 1662, by the Act of Uniformity); his mother was the only daughter of Rev. John Bauman, of Prague, who suffered from the Romish persecutions which followed the expulsion of the Elector Palatine Frederic, left his native country in consequence of them, and after spending some time at Saxe-Gotha, and in other parts of Germany, went to England, where he became master of a free school at Kingston. Philip was the last of twenty children, all of whom,

excepting one sister, had died before his birth. At his own birth he gave so little evidence of life, that he was actually about to be laid aside for dead, and was resuscitated only with great difficulty. His physical debility clung to him through life. He was reared by parents whose piety had been chastened in the school of affliction; but he was deprived of their care by the death of both in his 13th year. After attending a private school in London until his 10th year, he was placed at that in Kingston over which his mother's father had presided. In 1715, after his father's death, he was removed to the school at St. Alban's, then under the care of Nathaniel Wood, where he became acquainted with Dr. Samuel Clarke, then minister of the Dissenting congregation at St. Alban's, by whom he was received into full communion with the Church. He remained at St. Alban's school about three years, when he went to reside with his sister, then the wife of John Nettleton, a Dissenting minister. Here he resolved to devote himself to the ministry, but was embarrassed for want of means. The kind offer of assistance made by the Duchess of Bedford, to whose notice he had been brought through the influence of his uncle, Philip Doddridge, steward to the Duke of Bedford, he was compelled to decline, because he could not conscientiously subscribe the Thirty-Nine Articles of the Established Church. He then applied to Dr. Calamy for counsel, who advised him to adopt some other profession. In the midst of his perplexity he received a letter from Dr. Clarke, who offered to take him under his care, and assisted him in preparing for the profession he had adopted. He accepted the offer and was placed in a Dissenting school at Kibworth, Leicestershire, then under the Rev. John Jennings. In 1722 Doddridge removed, with this small theological school to Hinckley, where he was admitted to the ministry on July 22, of the same year. In June, 1723, he accepted a call to Kibworth, and another to Coventry; he modestly accepted the former, on account of his youth, and to have more leisure to pursue his studies. In 1725 he removed to Market-Harborough, still retaining the charge of the small congregation at Kibworth; in 1729 he was chosen assistant of the Rev. Mr. Some, of Harborough. In the summer of 1729, by the advice of many friends, and with the sanction of a number of Dissenting ministers, D. founded a theol. seminary at Harborough, that at Kibworth having been suspended at the death of Mr. Jennings (1723). In December, 1729, he was invited to take charge of the congregation at Castle Hill, Northampton, and removed thither, with his school. He continued here for twenty years. In 1730 he married Miss Mercy Maris, of Worcester; the fruit of this happy union was nine children, the first-born of which, and the last four, died in infancy. As principal of the new seminary, he greatly improved upon the system of Jennings, by insisting upon a more general course of study. Morning and evening prayers were strictly observed; at the former the O. T., at the latter the N. T., were read in the original languages. To the more advanced classes he delivered lectures upon didactic and practical theology, the history of Non-confor-

mity, and mythology. Exercises in speaking and preaching were also had. — He had hardly founded his seminary, when he was arraigned before the ecol. court; but through the King's intervention the indictment was quashed. The seminary now rapidly acquired importance, and became the chief school of the Independents. It usually had from 20 to 30 students. — Doddridge was untiring in his labors, notwithstanding his bodily infirmities. Besides attending to the duties of his school and pastoral office, he was a fertile writer, especially of practical religious works. The chief of these, which have been often republished, and still enjoy great popularity in England and America, are: "The Rise and Progress of Religion in the Soul," first published 1745, and suggested to him by Dr. Watts; "A Course of Lectures on the Principal subjects of Pneumatology, Ethics, and Divinity, with references to the most considerable authors," 1763; "The Family Expositor," Vol. I., 1739; Vol. II., 1740; Vol. III. and IV., 1748; Vol. V. and VI., ed. by Job Orton, 1756. — Correspondence from 1729–31, ed. by J. D. Humphreys, Esq. In 1748 he revised and ed. the works of Archb. Leighton, publ. in Edinburgh, 2 vols. Some of the above works were early translated into the Dutch, and afterwards into the German languages. Doddridge was a man of great amiability of character, and of sincere and consistent piety. Though not distinguished for depth of thought, and too much under the influence of Independency to attach proper value to the Church and its grace-bearing ordinances, his practical writings, especially, must long minister, as they have hitherto done to many, spiritual edification to all earnest and devout Christians. — Doddridge also exhibited fine talents for religious poetry, and contributed some of the best compositions found in English hymnology. — His arduous labors, however, soon proved too severe for his feeble constitution. His health having quite failed, he made a journey to Bristol, then to Lisbon, to recruit it; but he died soon after reaching the latter city, Oct. 26, 1751. — (See Biogr. by ORTON; BOGUE and BENNET, Hist. of the Dissenters; Memoir by Prof. FISKE, in the ed. of the Fam. Exp.: *Amherst*, U. S., 1836; Memoir in the *Comprehens. Comm.* Vol. VI.).

Dodwell, Henry, born at Dublin, 1641, being early left a destitute orphan, was supported by Sir Henry Slingsby, his mother's brother, and thus enabled to acquire an education. He entered Trinity College, Dublin, in 1656, and remained there for 10 years; during part of which time he held a fellowship. He obtained various academical honors, and published some smaller works, but declined, from scruples of conscience, entering the ministry. At the same time he proved a zealous friend and champion of the Establishment. In 1674 went to England, and visited Holland; then he published several works in defence of the Anglican Church, which raised his reputation as a scholar. Hereupon he was chosen Professor of History of Literature at Oxford, but, declining the oath of allegiance to William III., lost the post again in 1691. Dodwell wrote several times in defence of the non-juring Bishops, declared those schismatics who submit-

ted, and quit the Anglican communion. But his zeal for Episcopacy soon overcame his other objections, so that he changed his views and recognised the authority of those whom he had branded as schismatics, but did not return to the Anglican Church. Meanwhile he had gone to Cookham, between London and Oxford, and from thence returned to Shotterbrooke. He married in his 52d year, and begat ten children. In this retired village he composed numerous writings upon various subjects. He died in 1711, having shortly before re-entered the Anglican communion.—D. contributed largely to classical literature, including works on philology, antiquities, the history of literature, chronology, geography. These were his best productions. But his theological writings are also numerous. They include: A preface to a transl. of Fr. of Sales' *Introduction à la vie dévote*; two "Letters of Advice, 1, for the suscepcion of Holy Orders, 2, for studies Theological," to the 2d ed. of which he added a discourse upon the Phoen. Hist. of Sanchoniathon, which he thought spurious. From 1674 to 1688 he was chiefly occupied with patristic studies, connected with a contemplated vindication of the Anglican C., and produced: 1) *Dissertationes Cypriunicæ*, Lond., 1684, which display learned acuteness, but also an inclination to strange opinions; the theme of the 11th diss. is *de paucitate martyrum*, its aim to prove that the number of martyrs was small (refuted by RUINART: *Præfat. gener. in acta Mart.*, and recently by Wiseman: *Connect. between science and revealed Religion*). 2) *Diss. de jure laicorum sacerdotali ex sententia Tertull., &c.*, Lond., 1685. 3) An ed. of the *opp. posthuma* of B. PEARSON with a treatise *de success. primorrm Romæ episcop.*: Oxford, 1687. His *diss. in Irenæum*, were written during his professorate at Oxford. In *diss. I.* he disagrees with the then prevalent views of inspiration, in *diss. II.* pronounces the N. T. demoniacs epileptics;—both gave offence. After resigning his professorship he wrote a treatise upon the use of musical instruments in churches (1698), a letter against Toland's views of the N. T. canon (1701), a treatise against mixed marriages (1702), against occasional communion with Dissenters (1705), and a letter against the use of incense in churches (1711). His "Epistolary discourse," &c., Lond., 1706, advocating "the mortality of the human soul, and that it is rendered immortal only by the pleasure of God," &c., excited much opposition. As he connected the conferring of this immortality with baptism, the work was composed in the interest of the episcopacy. He also contends, here, for sacerdotal absolution. By opponents D. was charged with impiety, Popish tendencies, &c. But in his private life he was strictly religious, and even ascetic; he fasted thrice a week, and during all Lent. In his later visits to London and Oxford, he always took his Hebr. O. T., Greek N. T., and Thom. a Kempis, &c., along. Of his sons we mention: *Henry*, a lawyer (see *Deism*), and *William*, Archd. in Berkshire.—(See FRANCIS BROOKESBY, *Life of Dr. H. Dodwell, &c.*: Lond., 1715, 2 vols.—Ersch and Gruber).

HERZOG.*

Döderlein.—There are several German theologians of this name. But *John Christopher D.* exerted most influence upon the development of later Protestant theology, and forms a transition from strict orthodoxy to the more liberal views of moderatism. He was born at Windeheim, Jan. 20, 1745, educated at the University of Altorf, and in his 22d year became dean in his native town. Having won reputation by his *Curæ critica et exegetica*, he was appointed theol. prof. and dean of Altorf University. In 1782 he accepted a call to the 2d theol. chair at Jena, and died there Dec. 2, 1792. His *Comm.* on Isaiah and Proverbs were highly prized; and his *Instit. theol. Christ.* created an epoch in that department. The standpoint of his system appears from a remark in the preface, saying, that the theologian of our day must not invent doctrines, or go beyond the Bible; neither must he adhere to the old simply; but more fully define older views, use new expositions of particular doctrines, and have special reference to the demands of the times.—(See HÄNLEINS u. ARMONS, *Journal I.*; SCHLICHTEGROLL'S *Nekrology*, 1792; DÖRING, *d. deutsche Kanzelredn.*, p. 36. ERSCH u. GRUBER). HAGENBACH.*

Doeg, an Idumean (1 Sam. 22: 9, 18; Ps. 52: 2), was the overseer of the shepherds and flocks of Saul (the LXX says, on 1 Sam. 22: 9, ὁ Ξυρὸς, νῆμω τὰς ἡμετέρας Σαοῦα, cf. Jos., *Ant.*, 6, 12, 1). It was an important office at Eastern courts. Having been confined at Nob (1 Sam. 21: 8), on account, probably, of some Levitical impurity, contracted after his conversion to Judaism, Doeg witnessed the assistance which Abimelech afforded David, but also how innocently the Highpriest had acted. But he had the boldness to report the case to Saul in a false light, and the cruelty to execute the King's bloody vengeance, even after Saul's body-guard had shrunk from the deed. David had previously (1 Sam. 22: 22) discovered the bad character of this man, but hardly thought him capable of such villanious cruelty. A subsequent delineation of him is given in Ps. 52. (See *Vaihinger's Comm. zum Psalter*, I., 280–84).

VAIHINGER.*

Dog.—This animal, which is now a general favorite, was regarded with contempt (Eccles. 9: 4) by the Hebrews—as it still is in the East, being an unclean animal; it was classed with swine (Is. 66: 3; Matt. 7: 6. Cf. HORACE *Epp.*, I., 2, 26; II., 2, 75) and rarely used except for watching herds (Job 30: 1; Is. 56: 10) and houses. Still, large numbers of dogs ran at large in the cities (see Luke 16: 21), and were often savage, ravenous, and dangerous (Ps. 22: 17, 21; Is. 56: 1. Cf. BURCKHADT'S *Travels in Syria*). Even buried human corpses were not secure against them (comp. 1 Kings 14: 11; 16: 4, &c.). Allusions are made to their filthy habits (Prov. 26: 11; 2 Pet. 2: 22).—Some ancient tribes offered dogs in sacrifice (PAUSAN., 3, 14, 9; PLUTARCH, *Romul.*, c. 21, *quæst. rom.*, c. 52), and even ate their flesh (PLUT., *de sol. anim.*, c. 2; JUSTIN., 19, 1); but the Israelites were to abhor such sacrifices (Is. 66: 3), and to regard the dog as the emblem of what was unclean, profane, vile, and impudent

(1 Sam. 17 : 43, &c. &c.). To call a person a dog was considered most insulting (2 Sam. 16 : 9). In later times it was the contemptuous title applied to the heathen (Matt. 15 : 26. See LIGHTFOOT, *hor. hebr.*) ; a reproach since retorted upon Christians by Mohammedans. — (See BOCHART, *Hierozoic.* I., 769, &c., ed., Lips. ; EDMANN, *verm. Samml. a. d. Naturk.*, V., 20, &c.).

RÜETSCHL.*

Dogmatics.—When, in the 1st cent., Christian doctrine, or a part of it, is called *dogma* (δόγματα τοῦ κυρίου καὶ τῶν ἀποστόλων. *ep. Ign. ad Mag.* c. 13 ; δόγματα θεοῦ, ORIG. in *Matth. tom.* 12, § 23 ; τὸ δόγμα, simply, for the whole of doctrine, ORIG. c. *Cels.* 3, c. 39, where the apostles are styled διδάσκαλοι τοῦ δόγματος ; ἱερὸν δόγμα, in the *Pseudo-Clementines*, 15, c. 1), it contains the idea of something determined, settled, unconditionally true. In the Church fathers of the 2d and 3d cent., Justin Martyr, Irenæus, Clement, Origin, as well as in the *Clementines*, and the newly-discovered books of the *Philosophumena*, many passages occur in which the tenets of the Greek schools of philosophy, and the heresies of the Christian Church are called δόγματα. Passages of this kind seem to lead to the supposition that Christian doctrine first assumed the character of dogma, or the essence of dogmas, through *theology*, since this gave it scientific form, or through the *Church*, in that she has made it the substance of her confession. But this second use of the word is borrowed from a heathen sphere. Yet it is very probable that the tenets of the philosophical schools and sects were styled δόγματα, not because the product of the human intellect, but in contrast with what was doubtful or disputed. At all events, in the first sense of the term, doctrine resting upon the *authority of a divine revelation*, was designated as infallibly true, as δόγμα. The use of the word in the N. T. we pass by, since our science evidently does not borrow the title from it.

The ancient Church leads us to the real point, the perception of the *possibility* and *right* of a science of dogmatics, as a member of the organism of theology. The aim of dogmatics is to represent the *Christian religion* as a system of *knowledge, doctrine*. In the performance of this task, we do not expect to be told what has been regarded as truth in a particular age or circle, what others have believed ; but to be taught what is *unconditionally true* in matters of religion. And here very important thoughts are suggested by a fundamental distinction in all human knowledge. We have to do not with the sphere of nature, but of the *spirit*. In this sphere, the most complete division springs from the difference, whether the object of knowledge, as such, is temporary and exposed to change, or independent of time, a portion of the absolute truth, which never has become, and cannot perish ; which the mind cannot discern without being conscious of a necessity which compels it to acknowledge as true to-day what was so regarded thousands of years before. In the first case, the mind derives its knowledge from experience ; in the second, from a principle of reason immanent in itself. In the former the tendency is toward separation and diversity ; in the

latter, toward universality and unity. The one kind of knowledge may be designated as *historical*, in the broadest sense of the word ; the other as *rational*. The question arises, to which of these two spheres does the science of Christian doctrine belong ? The answer is, to the former only in a *relative degree*. Its great mission is to teach the *unconditionally true*. — This distinction avails only so far as it embraces those objects of human knowledge, which rise out of *the nature and development of the mind of man itself*. But the science of Christian doctrine derives its material from *the saving revelation of God in Christ, the God-man*. In this revelation, which is the sum of all others, that antagonism between what reason seeks — the absolutely true — and that which history gives — the relatively true — is abolished. Here, that which is particular, actual, limited by time and space, is also absolutely and unconditionally true, the norm and measure of all other knowledge in the sphere of religion. — Thus, the scientific representation of Christian doctrines can preserve its historical character, without detriment to its higher aim ; for the religion of Christ is itself a historical fact — the absolute fact in history. On this depends the peculiar and unique position of the science of dogmatics among the other sciences. The limitation which affects the solution of this problem, is the limitation of the appropriating and reproducing personality, and does not lie in the object. — A science of Christian doctrine is possible, because its object, the revelation of God in Christ, possesses an *internal unity*, which so embraces all its manifold parts, that it develops itself in them, and becomes the key to their true understanding. This unity is the *redemption of man*, fact and idea in one. The incarnation of the Logos, the indissoluble union of the divine and human in the person of Jesus Christ, is the proper centre of Christianity ; but as this does not belong to the natural order of this world, the whole course of things must be brought into harmony with it. To have led the way in this work of reconciliation is the imperishable merit of Anselm's work, *cur Deus homo*.

A system of Christian doctrine, which does not limit itself to telling us what certain men or communities of men have believed, or still believe, but deals with eternal, unchangeable truth, can only proceed upon the ground that the Christian religion is a *divine revelation* and *the completion of all the revelations of God in history*. — From those only who have faith in it as such can the science spring. *Fides præcedit intellectum. Credo ut intelligam*. Not Cartesian doubt of everything beyond the existence of the thinking, doubting Ego, but *active faith* is the pre-requisite of Christian γνῶσις. They who lack this faith either confound their variable opinions with the truth, and utter them unconsciously, whilst they dream they are giving scientific expression to Christian doctrine ; or they are perfectly conscious of the difference, and the interest which they take in the Christian religion as doctrine, is only historical. — As long as the Christian revelation meets the human spirit as mere *external authority*, a kind of faith is indeed possible, but not such as to give rise to a scien-

tific knowledge of its object in a systematic form, for in such a form, doctrine is not contained in the records of this revelation. Lacking the *central idea* which binds all together in one harmonious whole, it only gives an aggregate of particulars, not a system.—It is the great merit of *justifying faith*, that it does away with this relation of mere external authority. In it knowledge has a starting-point, an organizing principle. It includes the certainty of the forgiveness of sins in the appropriation of the atoning work of Jesus Christ, and the most intimate union with the person of the Redeemer himself. This certainly rests upon the witness of the Spirit, the *testimonium Spiritus Sancti*. Thus it is *justifying faith*, as the real deliverance of man from the bonds of the natural life, and his elevation to a new world of communion with God in Christ, by which the objective centre of Christianity, the redemption of man, enters first truly into the *subjective life and consciousness*. And then only, when the essence of the Christian religion dwells in the spirit of man, does the knowledge of its doctrines, in the development of their particular parts, become no mere external copy, but a living picture derived from within.

Our older theologians, Lutherans as well as Reformed, teach, along with many of the schoolmen, that theology is a *practical science*. For reasons, which will soon appear, we cannot endorse the expression; they confounded it with religion, and this arose from an insight into the fact, that a true theology presupposes a life of true piety. By this acknowledgement, however, the question concerning the *theologia irregeneratorum*, as agitated between pietism and the orthodoxy of the time, is not decided; for such a decision would certainly require a more thorough investigation than has yet been given to the subject. Suffice it to say, that according to the true order of things, the rise of theology can only be conceived on the basis of the new birth by the divine power of salvation.—As now the science of Christian doctrine springs from faith and regeneration, it naturally requires also in those who teach it such regenerating faith. The truth of Christianity cannot be demonstrated to the unbeliever; that which rests upon the new creation in Christ Jesus cannot be proven upon the principles of natural reason. Renouncing all such vain attempts, the science confines itself to the endeavor to raise believers to a consciousness of the true glory and wealth of their inheritance.

From the *conditions* of the science of Christian doctrine, we pass to the consideration of the *motives* or reasons which give rise to it.—The want of such a scientific organism of doctrine is not felt by simple piety. Not, however, because piety is only the immediate closing in of the soul with God. Apprehended exclusively as such, it lacks the determinative elements of knowledge; the scientific tendency is not only wanting, but all the germs of it. Whatever value this conception of piety may possess under some aspects, it is evidently a mere abstraction. Such a position of the mind in relation to a religion embracing *definite facts* and *positive doctrines* is a sheer impossibility. The scientific tendency

is wanting to simple piety, only because the knowledge it possesses is received in implicit confidence as taught in the communion of the Church.—But as the spirit of scientific culture in general acquires more importance within the communion of the Church, pious men of scientific attainments come to occupy a different relation to received doctrines. They are met by contradictions, not only between different departments of Christian knowledge, but also in the same department and in the teachings of the same persons. Some of them do not escape the attention even of unreflecting piety; though it leaps over the difficulty with ease without making any attempt to remove it. But whatever limit we may assign to scientific knowledge, the possibility of it rests absolutely upon acknowledging the axiom, that *two contradictory doctrinal propositions cannot both be true*. Any one who rejects this axiom must at the same time turn his back upon all theology. From the perception, therefore, of the contradictions which attach to the manner in which Christian doctrines are exhibited, arises the conviction that errors must have been introduced. And this conviction is inseparable from an effort to determine by a valid process what the *true doctrines* are.

From what has thus far been said it is evident that we have had in view the *first beginning* of the science of Christian doctrine. The occasion of this has undoubtedly been the development of heretical opinions; an occasion, however, which is essentially the same at every subsequent stage of the science. The first fruits of the scientific spirit of the Church, apart from the simple baptismal formula of most ancient times, were the oecumenical creeds and the theological treatises of the Fathers; and to ignore or oppose these results would certainly betray a false tendency of scientific culture. Yet we must neither assume that the doctrinal teaching of the primitive period, though it exclude the heresies of the age, has actually surmounted all confusion and contradiction; nor that it possesses normative force for subsequent scientific labors. The same motives exist now as then for the effort, by means of scientific helps, to work out a true and complete exhibition of Christian doctrine.—The scientific spirit, when truly awakened, puts forth its demands as unconditionally as divine revelation itself; for it is nothing else but the disposition of the reason to subject itself to the absolute truth of that which is received by faith. Any desire to accommodate the truth to any practical interest must therefore be denied. This entire subjection of the reason to revelation is the proper beginning of the science of Christian doctrine. It is a *theoretical want* accordingly in which dogmatics takes its rise—a necessity of the reason to know the grounds and the internal connection of all that faith holds to be true. Scientific knowledge is at the same time the condition of thorough religious instruction; though this practical purpose is not the ground of the science.—There is still another aspect of the theoretic nature of this want. Could we conceive of Christian instruction being free from error and perpetuating itself thus, the same im-

pulse would, nevertheless, assert its demands; for it is of the nature of the reason to possess knowledge under a scientific form. A religion, therefore, that lays hold of the whole being of man and calls it into activity must of necessity awaken the tendency to possess a scientific knowledge of its doctrines. But more on this point in another place. Historically considered, the practical needs of the Church are the first occasion of the science.

As all the elements of Christian doctrine grow forth from the idea of redemption as from a gem, there is the best reason for unfolding these elements as *one whole*, as has been recently done very scientifically by Nitzsch (*System der Christ. Lehre*, 6th ed., 1852), notwithstanding the contrary practice of resolving them into two separate sciences. It is true, indeed, that these doctrines fall into two distinct classes. On the one hand, redemption is represented as proceeding from God, as entering into and developing itself in the history of fallen humanity, and completing itself in eternity. On the other, certain obligations are laid upon man, which, in the exercise of the power imparted by God, he is required to meet. Yet as it is redemption itself from which these peculiar duties spring, there is no *necessity* for developing them as a separate science. — Nevertheless there is a propriety in treating each side of redemption as a *particular science*. The end of redemption is not simply the revelation of the divine being, but the salvation of man. The restoration of mankind to living communion with God, is the focus of the whole system. Hence, two views of Christian doctrine arise. The one is objective, the other, subjective; the one is the constitution and completion of the truth, including its essential conditions, those in God and those in man, which are united in the incarnation and work of Christ; the other is the transformation of the life of the individual and of society by the power of redemption, and constitutes the great duty of the regenerated man. Thus originate Dogmatics and Ethics. Both are a stone of stumbling; the former to the one-sided practical spirit of modern times that would sunder moral activity from faith; the latter to the quietism that resolves faith into mere theory, and, from fear of interfering with divine sovereignty, restrains the tendency to moral activity. — It cannot be urged against this distinction that many doctrines (Sanctification, the Church, &c.) belong to both spheres; for *they are viewed, in each, from different sides*. Dogmatics presents doctrines as *realities, facts*; ethics, assuming them as facts, treats of them as *duties*, or as facts to be actualized in life.

The peculiar position of Dogmatics in the community of sciences, makes it important to determine *how it must establish its theses, and conduct its demonstrations of truth*. Redemption, as contemplating the regeneration of man, is the essential subject of Dogmatics. This redemption is entirely the work of the redeeming personality of the God-man, Jesus Christ. His sayings and doings, in the revelation of his personality and the execution of his mission, must form the original and chief foundation of dogmatic proof. Each thesis must be established

by proof of its agreement with his acts and sayings. It is upon *Christ*, therefore, that the truth of dogmatic theses must rest; or at least upon something immediately derived from Christ. Among other things his holy life, with its supernatural commencement must be taken; especially his death, resurrection, ascension, which, however, belong to the close of his life. But upon these Christ gave no full instruction; for this we are directed to the teachings of his Apostles, as complementary to his own (John 16: 12, 13; 14: 25, 26). Hence as a further basis of proof, we have the additional teachings of the Apostles upon the above points. — Were these sayings and doings of Christ orally handed down, in a reliable way, dogmatic demonstration would appeal to that. But we have no such oral tradition; and it is impossible to conceive how such tradition should have purely propagated itself even to the 4th or 5th cent. For although to pledge the authority of the C. for its purity and reliability, is indispensable to Romanism, yet by making the episcopate, as the *eccl. representativa*, the depository of an infallible judgment for deciding upon true tradition, it virtually robs that tradition of its assumed reliability, and practical significance. Christ, moreover, deposited no such authority in the Church, but provided that by his guidance of the C., those sayings and facts, pertaining to himself, should be committed to *writing* (Scripture), and in this form be securely transmitted. This *Scripture*, therefore, of the N. T., must furnish Dogmatics with the true basis for its theses concerning Christ, and no tradition can in this sense be co-ordinate with it. But the facts of the revelation of redemption, and their effects upon the inner history of mankind, form an organic whole, gradually developed, according to the necessity and susceptibility of those to whom they are revealed. They are all concluded in Christ, who prepared the way for his advent by those revelations which are found in the forms of history, prophecy, and doctrine in the O. T. Hence, the importance of the O. T. for Christian Dogm., is conditioned by the N. T. According to the normal process of religious development, the dogmatic theologian, as every Christian, reaches the O. T. through the N. T., and recognizes the former as a divine revelation, not merely because Christ and his apostles refer to it as such, but also because the N. T. leads to and illumines the O. T. — But it may seem more difficult to perceive how the Testament of promise and preparation should still serve to *establish dogmas*, since the T. of fulfilment and completion has appeared. Of course, no Christian dogma has its sole basis in the O. T.; the latter can furnish corroborative or co-ordinate proof of such as are taught in both; and it does this by virtue of its organic relation to the N. T. *Novum Test. in Vetere latet, Vet. in Novo patet*. Thus, then, the SS. form the only basis of proof for Dogmatics. But, as seen above, the formation of dogm. theol. presupposes a living personal faith in the redemptive revelation of God in Christ, *wrought by the Holy Ghost*, so that the mind of man may get into a position for understanding the contents of Scripture. It is the *witnessing of the Spirit* which qualifie

expound the SS. This witnessing, which is essentially associated with the Word, produces an *unconditional certainty* in the consciousness of the Christian, which no opposing conclusions of the reason, and even no seeming contradictions of the SS. themselves, can mislead. This is the real significance of *religious subjectivity* in Dogmatics. It does not form a second special ground of demonstration, but a rich source of theological views and conceptions, and an indispensable condition for the right use of the Scripture basis. It is also an obvious error to conceive of religious subjectivity as a right and prerogative of the human spirit, set over against the authority of revelation; for religious subjectivity is the work of the divine Spirit, and will therefore be subordinate to the revelation of the Spirit. From this it may be seen with what limitations *Schleiermacher's* idea of the *Christian consciousness* must be applied to the case. Until, therefore, revealed truth takes such possession of the mind, the theologian's work must be confined to the collection and arrangement of Bible passages under their proper doctrinal heads; he might prepare a Bibl. Theology, but he could not produce a Dogmatics. — This religious independence, however, which each one acquires through justifying faith is not religious isolation. For each Christian finds that he is not alone in the possession of redeeming truth; rather that he has, with rare exceptions, acquired it through the instrumentality of the *Church*, planted by the Apostles, and inwardly united by its common possession. The testimony of all experience proves it obviously false, indeed, to bind this instrumentality exclusively to an eccl. office, forms of worship, or eccl. ordinances; the channels are various, and are found not only in the spheres of oral communications or official functions, but in those of literature and art, those definitely constituted ones being merely the most prominent. And even when a single Christian becomes participant in this life of faith in an independent way, his own experience must soon convince him of the existence of a Church of God on earth, a communion of redeemed and regenerated men; and he will feel constrained to seek their testimony, to listen to their voice, and willingly to learn from them their deeper insight into the Word of God. To such an one, the Church will, in the main, be the expounder of that Word, and he will gladly use the helps thus furnished, to solve the numerous questions which will continually arise. — But, in all this, he will not — with Calixtus — allow the Church of the first five centuries to bind his conscience, and set limits to his inquiries. He is, unconsciously and consciously, under the living influence of the Church, cherishes for her love, reverence, and confidently believes that the Holy Spirit has kept her mainly in the way of truth. But he knows, as a Christian who has come to the knowledge of *sin*, that sin and error, though broken in principle, are not annihilated, but still remain in the actual life of the Church. He knows that it is an aim of the Church to present a pure system of doctrine, towards which she is ever *approximating in her earthly course*, and that hence she is his helper and guide to the knowledge of divine truth, but without ignor-

ing his right and duty to consult for himself the highest norm of truth. If the Church claimed power to determine doctrine for him by her unconditional teaching, he must be convinced that such authority was exercised by a direct revelation, which would not only externally bind him, but with which he would find himself, as a Christian, in full unison. As this is impossible for the evangelical Christian, for whom the quasi divine authority claimed for the Church by the Romish system is manifestly unfounded—such a normal character of eccl. decisions would be a mere external law for Dogmatics, and thus deprive it of its scientific character. The eccl. determinations of doctrine which resulted from the controversies of the 4th and 5th cent., and of the Reformation, possess their high value for the evang. theologian, because he sees their substantial truth ever confirmed anew by the Bible.

In view of the continued presence of sin and error in the Church, a *purifying and correcting power* is required, which shall be superior to this evil. This cannot be lodged in the Christian consciousness of the single theologian; for, first, this is only a transient element in the consciousness of the Church, and then each theologian is himself subject to this evil, and needs the influence of that purifier and corrector; yea, he needs it more than the Church, which, as a whole, is more likely to be right in conclusions reached by common effort, and mutual comparisons and corrections, than the single theologian. If, with all repudiations of Pelagianism, it is Pelagian to make the decisions of the Church an infallible, binding authority for the conscience, it is doubly Pelagian to transfer the authority of correcting errors, of which no results of the general Church are wholly free, to individual theologians. The true corrective can be found only in the SS., as the true Revelation of God. But, besides exercising these regulative and critical functions, the Bible is also a *fertilizing source* of new thoughts and views for the dogmatic theologian; in which respect, however, it does not stand alone, but in connection with the entire course of eccl. development and doctrine, as these have originally sprung from the SS. as the head-fountain.

In regard to the *method of using Scripture proofs in Dogmatics*, an enlarged spirit is to be commended. For Dogm., the old distinction of proofs, *κατὰ ἡγρόν* and *κατὰ διάνοιαν*, is of no account, because, as a science, it must rely upon a strict and necessary connection of its conceptions. For the same reason we must affirm that dogmatic conceptions and theses, which have no immediate Scripture basis, but necessarily follow from others which rest on such basis, may be considered as being essentially as well founded in the SS. as those which may be substantiated by express passages. The Bible is not a collection of aphorisms, designed to serve as proof-texts for Dogmatics, nor a magazine of *dicta probantia*, but a collection of writings which sprang immediately from the religious life of God's people, and is intimately joined to their circumstances and wants; and every expression in it belongs to its proper connection, and has its true meaning fixed by that. The anxiety

of Dogm. to quote biblical proofs, may easily betray theologians into an atomistic mode of procedure, which tears passages out of their connection, and makes them isolated proofs for equally isolated dogmatic theses. — But if the use of the SS. in an enlarged spirit shall not be abused into an excuse for silently disregarding Scripture proof, the best plan would be to introduce each dogma with a biblical-theological exhibition of the Scripture grounds on which it rests, and by which its positions are substantiated, and then, in the scientific development of the dogma, to refer to the Scripture results thus obtained. If the agreement of the chief points of the dogma with the SS. is thus established, the minor points may be safely admitted from their internal connection with the rest.

Schleiermacher classifies Dogmatics under *historical theology*. But whatever may have prompted this arrangement, it involves an entire displacement of the idea of D. Its prominence among other theological disciplines, and even the arrangement of S.'s "Glaubenslehre," as well as the influence which it has ever exerted, are incomprehensible, if this science, made parallel with eccl. statistics, is merely to state what is believed and taught, for the time being, in this or that branch of the Church, and not to settle or teach anything itself. Were this Dogmatics, another theological discipline would be required, which should *present absolute truth in a scientific form*. — Upon the proper place and office of Dogmatics in the theological organism, the following outlines are offered. *Practical theol.*, as the *second* chief part, should be preceded by a first part, which might properly be termed *theoretical theol.*, because it would include departments springing from a purely theoretical desire to determine their contents in a scientific way. *Theoretical theol.* would be divided into *historical* and *thetic* theology. The former section would describe the historical origin and development of Christianity in Revelation, and man's gradual apprehension and appropriation of it. *Thetic* (thesis) theology would present absolute Christian truth in a scientific form, and this again 1) as dogmatic; 2) as theol. ethics. — If, now, it is the proper business of Dogmatics to set forth absolute truth in the purest scientific form; and if, in doing this according to Protestant principles, it makes the SS. its only norm and highest source, it is undeniably a misnomer to speak of Lutheran, Reformed, &c., Dogmatics. Each Church, of course, has its confessions, its symbolical theology, and dogmatic theologians; but, among Protestants, Dogmatics can only be *Christian*, and denominational theology is not to be identified with it, as is done by the Romish Church.

The *History* of Prot. Dogmatics has been recently enriched by the more thorough and comprehensive work of W. Gass, 1st. vol. 1854. — It must suffice, in presenting the recent literature of this science, to mention only the more important works. — The personality of Jesus Christ (see above) being the central point of Dogmatics, the latter science will not be supplanted by Philosophy, even when Philos., its pantheistic period having wholly passed away, shall have settled upon the true basis of the theistic principle. —

Hence, it was only a remarkable *episode* in the history of German theology, that, for a time, Dogm. was chiefly treated as a handmaid of systems of truth erected upon natural or rational grounds. Of this character were, not only the works of the school of *popular eclectic rationalism*, as the compendiums of *Eckermann*, *Henke*, *Stäudlin* (with closer attachment to the critical philosophy), *Ammon*, *Wegscheider*, the last ed. of *Bretschneider*, but those also who followed a definite *philosophical system*, as *Daub*, and *Marheineke*, at first based upon Schelling's system, and in later ed. upon Hegel's. In opposition to these, arose those of the *historical supernaturalistic* school, as the works of *Storr*, *Reinhard*, *Schott*, *Knapp*, *Hahn*, *Steudel*. The work of Schleiermacher (see Art.): "Der chr. Glaube nach d. Grundsätzen d. ev. Kirche, &c.," created an epoch by its lofty independence and religious depth, combined with masterly systematic and dialectic qualities. The modification which this last system most needed, concerning the *Biblical idea of Revelation*, was made by *Nitzsch* (Syst. d. chr. Lehre, 1st ed. 1829, 6th ed. 1851) and *Twisten*, Vorlesungen über d. Dogm. d. ev. luther. Kirche, 1st. vol. 1st ed. 1826, 3d ed. 1834; 2d vol. 1837 (not completed). Of the like spirit, and largely following S. and newer philosophical systems, but pervaded by the supernatural principle of Christianity, are *Th. A. Liebner's* chr. Dogm. aus d. christolog. Princip &c. (not completed); *J. P. Lange's* chr. Dogm., erster Th., philos. Dogm. 1849, zweiter Th., positive Dogm. 1851; *H. Martensen*, d. chr. Dogm. (Danish); *J. H. A. Ebrard*, chr. Dogm. 1851, 1852. — The subject is treated in the rationalistic spirit, but in an improved form, by *K. Hase*, ev. Dogm. 1st ed. 1826, 4th ed. 1850. — *W. M. L. de Wette* (Dogm. d. ev.-luther. Kirche, &c. 1st ed. 1816, 3d, 1840), *K. Hase* (Hutterus redivivus, &c. 1st ed. 1828, 8th, 1855), and *H. Schmid* (d. Dogm. d. ev.-luther. K. 1st ed. 1843, 3d, 1854) have gone upon the view that dogmatics should simply set forth the doctrines held by a particular Church, without regard to the actual convictions of the author. Upon the same principle, but of a more apologetic character, is the still unfinished work of *G. Thomasius*, Christi Person u. Werke; Darstellung d. ev.-luther. Dogm. &c., erster Th. 1853, and that of *Alex. Schweizer*, d. Glaubenslehre d. ev.-reform. K., 1844, 1847. — An able, independent effort to derive a system of Christian theology, in a strictly genetic way, from the Bible, has been begun by *J. C. K. Hoffmann*, d. Schriftbeweis, erste Hälfte, 1852; erste Abth. der zweiten Hälfte, 1853. The method adopted, however, makes the work more of a Bibl. Theol. than a Dogmatics. Related to this in spirit and tendency, if not in dogmatic results, is *J. T. Beck's* chr. Lehrwissenschaft nach d. bibl. Urkunden, 1841, and his Einl. in d. System d. chr. Lehre, 1838. — Finally, we name, *Fr. Strauss*, d. chr. Glaubensl. in ihrer geschichtl. Entwicklung u. im Kampfe mit der modernen Wissensch. 1840, 1841.

J. MÜLLER.*

Dolcino, a leader of the Apostolic Brethren (see Art.). His peculiar views are set forth in three prophetic works, the third of which is lost, whilst only abstracts of the others are preserved

in the *Additamentum ad hist. D.* The first was written, 1300, in Dalmatia, whither he had retired with most of his followers; it is addressed, like those prepared three years later, to scattered members of the sect, and to Christians in general. After declaring his orthodoxy, he announced 1303 as the year of his enemies' destruction, and the complete victory of his party and cause, appointed by God for the renovation of the world. The prophecy having failed, he postponed the time to 1304, affirming that God had revealed to him the true import of the prophecies of the Bible. — He distinguished four *status* in the history of the divine life on earth; each good at the start, but, having degenerated, supplanted by the next. The first was that of the O. T. patriarchs. In the second, Christ appeared, with his Apostles, to establish new virtues; these were celibacy, in opposition to marriage, and poverty, in opposition to earthly possessions. The third period began with Pope Sylvester and the Emperor Constantine, when the Church was compelled to use wealth in the training of the newly-converted heathen, to show them how it can be used for God's glory. But the love of the world becoming predominant, a reaction appeared in the rule of St. Benedict. This, however, also failed to restore poverty as a virtue, especially among ecclesiastics and monks. The Dominicans and Franciscans succeeded no better. The fourth *status* began with Segarelli and Dolcino, who aimed to restore the apostolic manner of life; this period shall reach to the end of the world. They required the renunciation of all worldly possessions, and the unity of the brethren in the love of the Spirit, without imposing forms, customs, or any external rules. Dolcino was evidently influenced by the doctrines of the Abbot Joachim. — D. prophesied, also, that Frederic of Sicily, then under a ban, would become Emperor, set up new kings, and cast Boniface from his throne; that then a new head of the Church, sent of God, would reign in peace, and the Holy Ghost be poured out as of old. Apart from his prophecies, D.'s views betray that mysticism which would renounce everything outward as the cause of evil, in order that the spirit might rule in its ideal freedom; perfect love, as the bond of souls, should be realized in its exaltation over all law; all human relationships should rest upon a purely spiritual communion, &c. D. himself carried out this theory; he had no property; he lived with a former nun, Margaret, whom he called his *dilectissima soror*. — That D. saw the errors of the Church, and was animated by a religious sentiment, must be admitted; but his misapprehensions of Christian doctrine, and sensual fancies, rendered his attempts futile. But his memory lived in the hearts of the people, who thought him a hero and martyr, whilst, his foes denounced him as a false prophet, whom the hand of God punished. Dante compares him to Mohammed (Hell, XXVIII., 55, &c.). — (See *Hist. D.*, and the *Additam.* by MURATORI, *Script. rer. Ital.* IX. 425, &c.; MOSHEIM, *Ketzergesch.* &c.; HELMST. 1748, p. 193, &c.; SCHLOSSER, *Abtillard u. Dulcin.* &c.; GUTHA, 1807, 8vo.; BAGGIOLINI, *Dolcino e i Patareni*: Novara, 1838, 12mo.; KRONE, *Fra Dulc.* &c.: Lpz. 1844, 8vo.

C. SCHMIDT.*

Dolet, a native of Orleans, a humanist and philologist, the author of many works, was imprisoned for being inclined to the Reformation, but set free upon a promise of fidelity to the Romish religion. Subsequently he caused dissatisfaction, and was strangled and burnt, 1546. It is said, but not proven, that before his death he abjured his errors, and invoked the Virgin. Protestants never counted him among their martyrs, for the reason assigned by Calvin, in his *de scandalis*: *Agrippam, Villanovanum, Doletum et similes vulgo notum est tanquam Cyclopes quospiam Evangelium semper fastuose spreverunt. Tandem eo prolapsi sunt amentia et furoris, ut non modo in filium Dei execrabiles blasphemias evomerent, sed quantum ad animæ vitam attinet, nihil a canibus et porcis putarent se differre.* In a word, he was considered an atheist. — (See Bayle, *Iseli.*)

HERZOG.*

Dominic and the Dominicans. At Calaruega, or Calervoga, in the bishopric of Osma, Old Castile, lived, at the end of the 12th cent., Felix, of a good family, though not of the Guzmans—with his wife, Joanna of Aza. The latter was of an extraordinary piety; and when, in view of her approaching delivery, she redoubled her zeal at the grave of St. Dominic, Ab. of Silos, the St. revealed to her the grand future of her child. In 1170, she gave birth to a son, and called him Dominic. The boy grew up wholly to the mind of his mother, and, in his earliest years, took delight in visiting the church, in prayer, and voluntary mortifications. When six years old, he was sent for his education to his uncle, Archpresb. at Gumyel de Ycan. Here he studied the sciences, and practised with increasing pleasure exercises of devotion. In his 14th year, he visited the univ. of Palencia, prosecuted for several years general scientific studies with the utmost ardor; and then applied himself with the same eagerness and perseverance to theology. His learning soon distinguished him among his fellows. But much more was he esteemed and praised for his piety. He had a tender heart, and was ever ready for the greatest sacrifices, which he felt bound to render to God and to his fellowmen. During a famine, he gave away all that he had, even his books. At another time, he offered his own person as ransom for a captive. He was deeply concerned for the salvation of his fellows, spent tears and prayers to God for it, and felt himself called at last to do his part in the conversion of sinners and heretics. And since his expostulations, counsels, and admonitions proceeded from an undoubting faith and a glowing love to God, they could not otherwise than melt and convince. At this time the Præmonstratensians and Carthusians, but especially the Cistercians, stood high in favor; and Dom. would probably have entered one of them and vanished in it, if, in his 24th year, Diego of Azevedo, B. of Osma, had not called him to himself. Diego, wishing to reform his chapter according to the rule of St. Augustine, appointed Dominic, who was born in his diocese, perhaps related to him, and celebrated for his learning, piety, and pastoral fidelity, as canon of his cathedral, that he might be a support to himself, and an example and ornament to his clergy. Under the direction of his Bishop, D. redoubled his zeal, preached throughout the

diocese, was ordained priest, and made subprior of the cathedral chapter, and again sent out for the conversion of Mohammedans and heretics. In 1204, Diego was sent by Alphonsus of Castile, to seek a wife beyond the Pyrenees for Prince Ferdinand. He chose the renowned Dominic, his model preacher, as his companion. His mission having been successful, Diego was again sent, at the head of a numerous and splendid cortege, to convey the Princess across the Pyrenees. He found her dead. Deeply moved by this sad occurrence, Diego resolved, renouncing for a time his episcopal duties and honors, to give himself up to works and exercises of piety. The brilliant embassy returned to Spain without their leader. The latter, with his private attendants and Dominic, to whom the resolution of the Bishop is, perhaps, mainly due, went to Rome, whence they returned home not until they had satisfied their pious desires, and, perhaps, also paid their respects to Innocent III. They for a fifth time entered S. France; this time to remain there. In this country, the extreme degeneracy of the clergy was used by old heretical and heathen elements, to the ruin of the Church; and, in a short time, an unruly spirit of disorder had taken possession of all classes of society. Pantheism and Antinomianism, Atheism and Libertinism were spreading. Science and art had become thoroughly irreligious. City and country had thrown off all authority, both of Church and State. The movement found a supporter in Raimond, Count of Toulouse, whose interests were involved in its success. The clergy having utterly neglected their duty, it seemed likely that total ignorance and contempt of all true doctrine, as ignorance and contempt of Christianity and the Church, would soon be universal. It was, at least, universally doubted whether the Church knew, and was willing and able to fulfil, its mission, to lead every one, even the poorest and most despised layman to salvation, and to sanctify all departments of life and labor. The Waldenses, the poor men of Lyons, had made a beginning towards removing these evils. Tied to no place or office, addressing all classes of society, despising all gain, discarding all outward pomp and power, their apostolical preaching of the gospel was a labor in the service of Christ, and by no means begun in conscious opposition to the Church. And yet it had sprung up upon the soil of subjectivism, from despair in the will and power of the Church and clergy. Hence it had much in common with the decided opponents of the Church; and, in the case of some, every difference vanished. Nor did the Pope, seeing the great danger which S. France was preparing for the Church, after his unsuccessful effort to regain the poor of Lyons, as poor Catholics, make the proper distinction. He did not use the Waldenses as Gregory VII. the Patariens, against the enemies of the Church; but demanded an unconditional obedience to the Church and its hated hierarchy. The Pope, in order to execute his will, had sent legates to these regions; but they, coming in the pomp and power of their commission, estranged the minds only the more. The task of converting the heretics had been assigned to the Cistercians; Bernardine

abbots preached among them; but the Romish doctrines and commands found no ears. Coming as great lords, they did not reach the hearts of the people, but were despised as the representatives of the formal, heartless, rich, and proud clergy and monks. They held a meeting at Montpellier; and, discouraged by their want of success, were about to give up their mission, when the B. of Osma with his suite arrived at M. Diego and Dom. were consulted, and they brought about a resumption of the work with greater success. Dominic was, more than all others, qualified to understand and manage the matter. As itinerant preacher, he had early learned the views of the people and of the heretics, their likes and dislikes. In S. France he had observed what kind of preaching and preachers alone enjoyed the confidence of the people. He had seen the right of Christendom to demand this kind and no other. He saw that time and place demanded a re-institution of the Apostles' office, and that the successors of Peter should send forth true successors of Paul, who, by preaching and suffering, might show that the Church had still a heart for the poor, estranged, and deluded laity. To the latter belonged his entire heart, and he felt himself called to devote to them his whole life. He advised the assembled legates to lay aside all pomp, pleasure, and wealth; to go forth in pairs, and in the simplest attire; zealously to preach the Gospel and the epistles of Paul to all the people; and to commit themselves confidently to them. The enthusiasm of D. carried away the legates, and they determined to make the effort. Diego sent his horses and retinue to Osma, and took the lead in the new mission. But, except Dominic, none of those engaged in it were called to the work. The work was difficult; there was little success, and that among the humble; there were no conversions of masses. D. was soon forsaken by all his associates. Diego had to return to his diocese, the Cistercian abbots to their monasteries; nor did they send others to take their place. Dominic was not, indeed, without assistants—his own brother was one of them; but they were few in number, and often changed. He also received some aid from the Church authorities, from Fulco, B. of Toulouse, among others; but still all traces of his labors were constantly vanishing. He now founded an asylum for females at Prouille, in the diocese of Toulouse. Of the first 11, 9 were converts from the Albigensian heresy. He prescribed absolute claustration, strict silence, and labor. The enterprise was a labor of love well suited to impoverished noble families of the land; for, an asylum being thus opened for their unmarried daughters, there was no necessity for them to seek alliances with the heretics, whilst also their cloistered daughters bound them closely to the Catholic Church. Thus, also, the women, perhaps the chief agents in spreading the heresy, were gained for the Church, or, at least, made harmless. With this institution the first band of his companions were connected; D. himself gladly lingered there. But, soon after, the brothers Cellini, of Toulouse, who had become his followers, presented to him their house in the city for monastic purposes. This became the head-

quarters of his company, whence itinerant preachers were sent out. It soon received liberal grants from the B. of Toulouse, and from wealthy laymen. Among the latter was Simon, Count of Monfort, who otherwise also sustained the labors of Dominic. The Cath. party gave testimony of their obligations to D., by offering to him the bishoprics of Beziers, Convenans, and Conferans; but it also showed thus that it did not feel the necessity of a standing itineracy, nor estimate duly the importance of D.'s mendicant mission. It is certain that this conviction was wanting to the C. Church as a whole, and also to the Pope. After the murder of the legate, Peter of Castelnau, Innocent III., despairing of a peaceful conversion of S. France, called the hostile N. France to arms, published a crusade instead of the Gospel, and placed into the hands of S. of Montfort the sword for the extirpation of the heretics. This laid upon D. the alternative either of giving up his apostolical labors, or, to rescue his orthodoxy, of prosecuting them, like Arnold of Citeaux, in the destructive train of Montfort. He chose the latter, and was now used as a tool in convicting the suspected and prisoners of heresy, that they might be delivered to the stake. So far, of course, he was implicated in the inquisition, which, however, was not until afterwards separated from the duties of the Bishops, and committed to special officers, chiefly to the followers of Dominic. At this price, he bought the favor of the Legates, and thus he disgraced his own work, and brought it to the verge of destruction. Its condition at the close of the Albigensian war was such that we wonder that it was not wholly destroyed, or absorbed in the Cistercian order. Perhaps the oppressive influence of the latter stirred up D. to maintain his independence against them. Perhaps Fulco of Toulouse was ambitious that his diocese should give rise to a new order, designed for the extirpation of heretics. But it is also probable, and very pardonable, that D., in return for his protracted labors and sacrifices, coveted the honor of being the founder of an order; and wished to pave the way to his successors of resuming the apostolical office of preaching in better times, with the sanction of the Church, and with more hopes of success. However this may have been, in 1215 he accompanied Fulco to Rome, to the Lateran Council, assembled by Innocent III., with the design of obtaining the confirmation of his company as an order. The Council resolved that no new order should be established. The Pope, with the assembled fathers, did not dream that their age was about to produce the fullest development of western monasticism. The repeated requests of D. and his friends were refused. Innocent is said to have consented to give to the order a verbal confirmation; but the demand, to adopt a rule already sanctioned by the Church, betrays the desire of the Pope to connect the disciples of D. as closely as possible with an already existing order, or to make them colleagues of the canons. To the latter, D., who was himself a canon, assented. On his return, he consulted with his 16 companions, chose the rule of St. Augustine, and formed a new society of canons. In completing his rule, however, he accepted a

number of statutes from the Præmonstratensians. Constant silence, except on express permission of the superior, almost incessant fasting, total abstinence from meat, disuse of all linen garments, poverty, etc., were agreed upon. Their dress was a long black cassock, reaching to the feet, and a short white surplice, with sleeves. In the mean time, Innocent had died, and Honorius III. had become Pope. The latter had a juster apprehension of the value of monasticism to the Church, and, D. having hastened to Rome for the purpose, confirmed the new order, approved their statutes, and furnished, before Christmas of 1216, the bull of confirmation. The preaching brothers were required by their sermons to defend the Church against heresy, and to explain the true faith. In reference to the former, the clergy were often compared with shepherds' dogs, who were expected to bark when danger was near. Hence it was, perhaps, that Dom. and his associates had to endure the same comparison. In reference to the latter, they were represented as torchbearers. The two were afterwards melted together into the wretched symbol of a dog bearing a lighted torch. It was afterwards told that the mother of D., during her pregnancy with him, had dreamt that she had given birth to such a dog. Such a dog, also, was adopted into the coat of arms of the order. D. obtained, in three successive bulls, numerous privileges for his order, made his profession to the Pope, and was named *superior et magister generalis* of the preaching monks. In 1217 he returned to Toulouse, received the profession of his disciples, and bound them to the observance of the rule. He now strove to make his order useful; or rather, at first, to enlarge it. He therefore sent some to Spain, others to Paris. He himself once more went to Rome, in order to secure for his order a place in the government of the Church. Mathew of Paris, the provisional leader of the order, founded a monastery in the house of St. James in Paris, whence the Dominicans were called Jacobites throughout France. On his journey, D. met with much acceptance, and founded monasteries at Metz and Venice. Honorius again received him with honor, and gave to him and his monks the church of St. Sixtus. He charged him also with the Reformation of the Roman nunneries. D. succeeded in uniting all the nuns under strict retirement in his monastery of St. Sixtus, instead of which the church of St. Sabina and a part of the papal palace were vacated to him. Pitying the servants of the Pope, who were either idle and neglected, or were prevented by their labors from attending upon divine worship, he delivered special sermons to them. In return for this the Pope created him *magister sacri palatii*, or chief chaplain; an office which has ever since been filled by a Dominican, and has been of great importance, since it has determined the theology of the R. court, and held the supreme censure of literature. After this, D. is said to have journeyed to Spain; this, however, seems to be a mere fiction, designed to make him appear independent of St. Francis. It seems, indeed, that D. himself wished to prevent all relationship with the Minorites; for, in 1219, he adopted for his order the dress of the Carthu-

ians, and thus connected himself decidedly with the older monasticism. But in the same year yet he probably attended the Chapter-General of the Minorites at Assisi, and allowed himself to be drawn into an entirely new course. Their almost insane love for the rags, filth, and noisome diseases of the lowest populace, carried him away also. The extreme poverty which the religious paraded, made them popular, made them one of the leading powers of the 13th cent., and insured to them a great future. Without it no new order of monks could even exist; with it a large field of operation and an easy growth awaited them. Hence, D. quickly followed in the steps of St. Francis, and secured with him the favor of his age. At the first Chapter-General, held in 1220, in the monastery of St. Nicholas, at Bologna, he renounced all property and regular income, and commanded poverty and the begging of the immediate necessities of life. Thus his order became a mendicant order. He forbade the reception of lay-brothers, that his monks might not, like those of former orders, become indolent and lordly. As to organization, it was resolved that there should be Priors, Provincials, Definitors, and one General, all to be freely elected by the order. A Chapter-General was to be held every year. The second C.-G. was held at Bologna, in 1221, where 60 monasteries were represented. After D. had visited the cities of Upper Italy, he returned to Bologna, and soon felt the approach of death. He yet cursed those who should introduce property and a fixed income into his order, and died Aug. 6, 1221. In 1233 he was canonized by Gregory IX. — D. was deficient neither in the discernment of an educated mind, nor in enthusiasm, or the gentleness of a pious heart; but he lacked comprehensiveness in his view of the Church of his age, originality, independence, and firmness to maintain his own views and measures. Not until he had passed from the scene of his ardent labors to Rome, could he come in contact with Francis. His enthusiasm for the latter enabled him to elevate his work to the stars. As the imitators and rivals of the Minorites, the Dominicans became greater than any former order. They, nevertheless, maintained their original peculiarities, their predilection for the *doctrine* of the Church. To apprehend this scientifically, to proclaim it from the pulpit and desk, to defend it by writing and speaking, to avenge it by censure and the inquisition, was claimed by the Dom. as their peculiar work. The Franciscans claiming to be followers of the Apostle of love, the Dom. set up a like claim with regard to Paul, and founded everywhere cloisters and churches in honor of this Apostle of faith. But this faith, whose champion they were, the successors of Peter had reduced to a set of formulas, the first article of which was the Pope. The best weapon against evil which they distributed among the people was the rosary—completed, though not perhaps invented, by D.—and the psalter of Mary. This method of pastoral labor and their paraded poverty rapidly elevated them everywhere in the favor of the people. The story, however, of a cloister in Ethiopia numbering 9000 monks and 3000 servants, and of another of four miles in

circumference, is a mere fable. But in cities, monasteries arose in great numbers. Begging friars could not live in a desert; preaching monks needed populous centres. Other orders were also beginning to enter the cities; but the begging orders outstripped them all. The meanest hovel sufficed for a beginning; to the Dominicans, indeed, only for a beginning; for they soon renounced begging, and by donations and bequests became rich, and built stately cloisters and churches. Hence, we owe to them many of the most splendid Gothic churches, which style of architecture they assisted in developing. Their labors in the sphere of science are still more important. When, in 1228, the doctors of the Univ. of Paris had been dismissed, the Dominicans were permitted to establish there a professorial chair, to which, in 1230, they added a second. The Franciscans also crowded into it. The Univ. of Paris thus became the model of all subsequent universities; but thus, also, all free movement in science came speedily to an end. Theology, instead of ennobling and sanctifying the other sciences, impoverished them; its only mission was to dissect the R. Church doctrines into subtle formulas; to unfold and define them to their furthest consequences; and, by a compact with philosophy, to substantiate them in this form to the understanding. Scholasticism is the fruit of the learned labors of the Dominicans. If they did not have full sway in the last third of the middle ages, it was because the Franciscans entered into competition with the rival order on its own ground. In the sphere of science, we accordingly soon hear of none but the Dominicans and Franciscans, in whose disputes consisted the entire theology and science of two centuries. They were marshalled in hostile array, as Thomists or Scotists, as Nominalists or Realists; and, besides the priority, excellence, etc., of the two orders, they made the immaculate conception of the Virgin a subject of bitter controversy. But the Minorites retired from the literary arena; the Dominicans became the sole guardians of theology, a capacity which they fulfilled, true to their chosen symbol, a dog carrying off the torch of truth like a stolen bone. Thus, when the 16th century began, they had perverted their original calling of preaching the Gospel; thenceforth, also, they despised their mission, as confessors to the poor, when they allowed themselves to be used in the sale of indulgences. Thus they brought on the rupture with the entire Church and school of the middle ages. All individual, national, and even episcopal elements in the Church having been crushed in favor of a papal monocratic absolutism, the people in the 16th cent. were wholly averse to a return to the older form of the Western Church. The Dominicans were unable to prop up or defend the R. Church. They could not even reform themselves, much less breathe a new life into the Church, as was done by the Jesuits. They became a burden to the Pope himself; and their losses by the Reformation and revolution no one has deplored. Their greatest blow was the sanction of the doctrine of their rivals, the immaculate conception, as a doctrine of the R. Church, as was

done by Pius IX., Dec. 8, 1854. The order has given to the Church above 800 Bishops, 150 Archbishops, 60 Cardinals, and 4 Popes. Many learned and pious men, such as Albert the Gr., Thomas Aquinas, Master Eccard, John Tauler, Henry Suso, Savonarola, Las Casas, have adorned it. There were also Dominican muns. (See *Biogr. of Dom.* by JORDANUS, first General of the Order, in the BOLLANDISTS, *Acta SS.* Aug. I. 545, seq.; HELYOT's *Gesch. d. geistl. Klost.-u. Ritter-Ord.* III. 235-317; *Annal. ord. Prædicat.: Rom.* 1746; Hurter's *Gesch. P. Innoc. III.*, IV. 282-312; LACORDAIRE, *Vie d. st. Dom.: Bruz.* 1848; CARO, *St. Dom. et les Dominic.: Par.* 1853.

A. VOGEL. — Reinecke.

Dominicum, 1) i. q. κυριακον διπνον, among the Latin fathers, the Lord's Supper. CYPR., *ep. ad Cæcil.*: numquid ergo Domin. post cœnam celebrare debemus?—2) The possession of a dominus, or what serves for his support. 3) The fisc of a prince, *Capitul.* 3, a. 813, c. 3, . . . in *Dominico tertiam partem componat.* 4) The church edifice, the estate of the Church, as belonging to the Lord (DU CANGE, s. v.). HERZOG.*

Domitian, Emperor of Rome from 81 to 96. The persecution which occurred under the reign of this despotic, suspicious, but by no means fanatical ruler, took place as follows. Under Vespasian and Titus, a tax was imposed upon the Jews, in favor of Jupiter Capitol. SUTTON., in *Domit.* c. 12, reports that under Domitian, this tax was levied upon all who, without professing to be Jews, lived according to their laws, or, by concealing their nationality, had evaded the levy. Among these there were, doubtless, Jewish Christians. They were also accused, under Domitian, of impiety (αθεοτης, αθεος, h. e., μη σεβόμενος τους θεους). Some examples are cited, without its being expressly said that the persons were Christians; but it is added that all who let themselves be seduced into Judaism were charged with αθεοτης, and this must include Christians (DIO CASS. *Hist.* 67, 14). Eusebius (*Chron.*) expressly states that many Christians suffered martyrdom under D. This will explain Tertullian's statement (*Apolog.* c. 5), that D. commenced persecuting the Christians, but soon desisted, and recalled the exiles. The investigation instituted by D., in imitation of Vespasian, into the genealogy of David, was a purely political movement, and accomplished nothing (EUSEB. III. 12). As D. was told that Christians were politically dangerous, he summoned two of them before him, and questioned them concerning Christ and his kingdom. They replied that it was not of this world, but a heavenly and angelic kingdom, and one that would not fully come until the end of the world, when Christ would appear in his glory, to give to every man according to his deeds. D. ridiculed them, and ordered the persecution to cease (Καταπαύσαι δε δια προσταγματος τον κατα της εκκλησιας διωγμον). Hegesippus (EUSEB. III. 20) says those summoned were leaders of the Church, and relatives of Christ. HERZOG.*

Donatists.—Among the heretical sects to which the persecutions and the dissensions in the Church, occasioned by the growing influence and arrogance of the confessors, gave rise during 250-350 (fuller accounts of which will be found

in other Articles), the Donatist schism was remarkable for its spread, duration, and controversial zeal. This has been attributed to the strong passions of the Africans; but the treatment of the Donatists by the State must also have served to excite them, and confirm them in their opposition. They must likewise have been influenced by the insurrections and intestine wars, of which the province of Africa was then the scene. These prepared the way for all sorts of socialistic theories and political schemes against the existing authorities and customs. The Donatists could not keep clear of these agitations, being themselves arrayed on other grounds against the State. For just when they separated themselves from the Catholic C., this became the Church of the State. After some hesitation, they felt compelled to urge a strict sundering of Church and State, and insist that the latter should keep within its own limits. Their doctrine of the Church must be commended; in other doctrines they adhered to the ante-Nicene standpoint. There were, consequently, enough points of discord, besides the original causes of their separation, to give a constantly new impulse and a new turn to the strife. And the Church cannot boast of having terminated the schism, or subdued the schismatics. We shall briefly sketch the course of events and their results.¹

The Diocletian persecution kindled a fanatical spirit of martyrdom. And, in proportion as martyrs and confessors were honored, traditors were despised and hated. Even those Christians who evaded the imperial edict, requiring the surrender of all their sacred books, by giving up some other writings instead, excited the indignation of more zealous brethren. Mensurius, B. of Carthage, fell under the censure of this rigoristic party, whom he still more offended by opposing the fanaticism of voluntary martyrdom, and the undue reverence paid to confessors. He caused those congregated in the prisons to disperse. They, of course, resolved upon vengeance. Among the Numidian clergy, however, many agreed with Mensurius. The matter was brought before the Synod of Cirta, 305. The primate of the Numidian Church, B. Secundus, of Tigris, desired to ascertain before opening the Synod, that no traditor was among them. The inquiry brought out all sorts of accusations, implicating nearly all the Bishops present in the above-named evasion. Even Secundus was suspected. The investigation was dropped, but Secundus maintained the position of leader of those zealous for discipline. He heard of the dissension in Carthage, and wrote to M. in disapproval of his course. Accusers went to Rome, and M. was summoned thither to answer their charges. He obeyed, vindicated his course, and started homeward. He died on the road, 311.

¹ Comp. OPTAT. MILEVITANUS, *de schism. Donat. libri VII.* &c.: *Par.* 1700. AUGUSTINUS, *contra epist. Parmen. libri III.*, *de baptismo, libri VII.*, *contra litteras Petilianæ libri III.*, *contra Cresconium libri IV.*, *brevic. collat. contra Donat. libri III.*; *Benedict. ed. vol. IX.* NORISII, *hist. Donat.*, in the 4th v. of his works, publ. by the Bullerini: Verona, 1729, &c. WALCH, *Hist. der Ketzereien*, &c. 4. Th.; NEANDER, *Eocl. Hist.*; GRÜNER, *K.-Gesch.*; KURTZ, *Handb. d. K.-Gesch.*

His Archd. Cæcilian would, according to the rule, have been his successor; and the moderate party desired he should be. But as he had actively sided with M., the rigorists unanimously opposed him. They were headed by a distinguished woman, Lucilla, whom Cæcilian had once reproved for publicly kissing the bone of a reputed martyr. It was feared that at a general Synod the rigorists would prevail. The other party tried to forestall this, and too precipitately elected C. They had designedly not awaited the arrival of the Numidian Bishops, nor asked the Numidian Primate to consecrate C., but obtained the service of Felix, of Aptunga. As Felix was considered a traditor, the election gave superfluous offence. Soon after, Secundus, with 70 Bishops, among whom Donatus, of Casa Nigra, was most prominent, arrived at Carthage and claimed his prerogative. A Synod was called, and Cæcilian required to answer the charges of allowing himself to be irregularly elected and consecrated. He declined to appear, and was deprived of his dignity and excommunicated;—the chief reason for this assigned by his enemies was, that he had accepted consecration from a traditor. The lector Majorinus was, at Lucilla's recommendation, chosen in C.'s place; and after his death, 313, Donatus became B. of Carthage. Thus there were two Bishops for the one See, each with his party. But as this schism was caused by a prevailing diversity of views, it soon spread over the whole of N. Africa. Beyond Africa Cæcilian was almost generally considered the regular Bishop, and the opposite party as schismatic, at first designated *pars Majorini*, then *pars Donati*, hence called *Donatists*, or as the party itself suggested, *Donatiani*. Most of those who resided in the country districts, and a large number of Bishops joined the party of Donatus, so that it was widely spread, and hated, when Constantine, 313, testified his regard for the African C. in an edict; but the Donatists were expressly excluded from the imperial favor. They immediately solicited an investigation of their charges against Cæcilian. Constantine, accordingly, appointed a commission of five Gallic Bishops, with Melchiades, B. of Rome, at their head. This commission invited C., and ten African Bishops of each party, before them. Donatus was the leader of his party, but all his skill could not prevent a decision in favor of Cæcilian. D. was deposed. His adherents were allowed to retain their offices and dignities, if they would return to the Church. Those condemned complained to Constantine of the partiality of the decision, and begged a more thorough investigation. Their request was granted; commissaries were again sent to Carthage; but they found no reasons for considering Felix, of Aptunga, a traditor. A Synod convened, 314, in Arles, also decided in favor of Cæcilian, and further decreed that the validity of a sacramental act did not depend upon the worthiness of the official who performed it. The Donatists could not, of course, rest with this decree, and rashly appealed to the Emperor. Constantine was amazed and offended at the presumption of such an appeal to him, a heathen. But he soon resolved to admit the appeal, cited

Cæcilian and his accusers to meet him at Milan, 316, and there, after a brief process, condemned the latter for slander. Further resistance would now be an offence against the Imperial Majesty. But what would assuage the embittered feelings of the Donatists? D. found it easy to excite his followers against their temporal ruler. It was speedily resolved that the Emperor had no eccl. authority; and though they had sought his interference, the question was raised, which has not yet been fully settled: *quid imperatori est cum ecclesia?* Constantine replied with severe penalties. The Donatist Bishops were banished; their churches were taken from them. This only increased opposition and fanaticism. Thereupon Constantine wisely resolved, 321, to inform them once more of his displeasure, but then leave them to the judgment of God, stop persecution, and admonish the Catholics to exercise patience and forbearance. This measure at first, of course neither shamed, won, nor weakened the Donatists. At a Synod of 330 no less than 270 of their Bishops were assembled. But the continued ignoring of them on the part of the State would soon have put an end to the schism. Unfortunately the sons of Constantine did not inherit his wisdom. Constans revived, it seems, severer measures against the Donatists, and immediately dangerous manifestations appeared. Africa was then infected by a species of asceticism, of whom coenobitism subsequently freed the Church. Having no fixed abode, and no regular mode of life, they went begging through the land. They called themselves *milites Christi* and *Agonistici*; others styled them, *Circumcelliones*. Their numbers were greatly swollen by farmers, who had lost their possessions through taxation, or political agitations, and slaves who had cast off their yokes. The movement thus acquired a socialistic character. Much was said of freedom and fraternization; masters were compelled to do menial service; murder, arson, and robberies were frequent. With all this the Circumcelliones maintained their asceticism, became insane fanatics, and often sought the martyr's crown. But their fanaticism had points of agreement with the zeal of the Donatists, many of whom joined the Circumcelliones in their revolutionary movements. Such were called *Montenses*, *Campitæ*, *Rupitæ*. In 345 Taurinus was sent out to exterminate these fanatics. He succeeded in restoring order. During the same year Cæcilian died, and an opportunity seemed to offer for healing the schism. But the Donatists, despite their numerical strength, were too much despised by Church and State to allow of the recognition of their Bishop of Carthage, or any compromise with him and his party. Gratus was chosen as C.'s successor, and thus the episcopal duality continued in Carthage, and in nearly all the towns of N. Africa. The Donatists, being mostly composed of the poorer portion of the congregations, found themselves straitened. Constans took advantage of their circumstances, and sent (348) Paulus and Macarius to Africa to win them by bribes and promises. Donatus, of Casa Nigra, denounced the scheme, whilst Donatus, B. of Bajai, led a body of armed Circumcelliones against those who executed it. This was the signal of new disturb-

ances, which, however, were soon quelled by force. Donatus, of B., and others were condemned to death, whilst D., of Casa N., was banished, and the Donatist churches were locked or taken from them. Matters did not change until Julian's time. It was Julian's policy against Christianity to revive old Church feuds and bind the hands of the Catholic C. against heretics and schismatics. He restored to the Donatists their churches, and reinstated the exiled Bishops. Meanwhile Donatus died, but to perpetuate the schism Julian had Parmenianus elected successor, and escorted into Carthage by imperial soldiers. The liberated Donatists naturally ran into extremes, and perpetrated various acts of violence against the Catholics. But they were soon again vanquished, intellectually by the Church, politically by the State. The work of Optatus, of Mileve, upon the Donatist schism, was written about 368, and directed against a partizan account issued by Parmenianus. In 373, 375, Valent. I. and Gratian issued severe edicts against the Donatists, and allowed violent measures to be used against the Circumcelliones. Until the close of the 4th cent. the schismatics had maintained a regular, though not very harmonious, life. They produced some poets who prepared metrical versions of the Psalms, for public devotions, and wrote hymns in which Donatist doctrines were set forth and praised. It was, indeed, usual for heretics to popularize their views in this way. But as the Church also soon composed and introduced hymns, the Donatists may have adopted this measure from a proper sense of the wants of the people, and desire to use their talents in a worthy way. Augustine subsequently composed a hymn, *contra partem Donati*. The Donatists also cultivated science. The grammarian Tychonius distinguished himself by his learning. He wrote: *Regulas septem ad investigandum intelligentiam SS.* (GALLANDI, T. VIII.), and a history of the doctrine of the Church, which he represented as a *corpus Domini bipartitum*. He also rejected the Novatian views of the Donatists, and opposed the rebaptism of those whom the Catholic clergy had baptized. Many shared his sentiments. This gave rise to violently hostile sects among them. The Claudians were, probably, one of them; certainly the Rogatians, so-called after Rogatus, B. of Carthage (370). Parmenian was succeeded by Primianus, a moderate man. He had conflicts with the rigoristic party, headed by the deacon Maximianus, whom he even ventured to excommunicate. This incited a Synod of Rigorists to elect M. in place of Primianus, so that there were three Bishops in Carthage, despite the recognition of P., and reiteration of M.'s excommunication by a Donatist Synod at Bajai. This was their distracted state in 400, when the most energetic attacks were made upon them. But these assaults served once more to unite, purify, and strengthen them, so that they passed through the struggle with credit, although not without severe losses, and deadly wounds. Augustine, B. of Hippo, finding himself cramped and annoyed by a respectable Donatist congregation, began, about the time just named, to preach and write against the heresy, and re-

solved to secure the credit of their reunion with the Church. But as the Donatists shunned debate with him, to avoid the shame of a defeat, A. roused the entire African Church against them. Several Synods tried to effect a reconciliation. But few were won over. Others became more violent than ever, and the Circumcelliones revived. Earlier fanatical scenes were re-enacted, and it is not surprising that the Catholics desired to retort, and called for the extermination of the heresy. Whilst Augustine hoped to succeed by other means, he discarded the interference of temporal power, but at length he gave form to the wishes of his more violent colleagues in the command: *coge intrare in ecclesiam* (Luke 14: 23). In 405 a Synod of Carthage requested the Emperor Honorius to issue penal laws against the Donatists. Severe measures were adopted. Laymen were fined, the clergy banished, the churches alienated. Honorius soon repented having multiplied the enemies of the sinking empire, and issued, 409, an edict of toleration. But this exasperated the more numerous Catholics of Africa, and he was constrained to annul the edict. The Donatists were now compelled to hold a disputation with the Catholics, which should decide their fate. The *Collatio cum Donatistis*, held in Carthage, 411, was attended by 286 Catholic and 279 Donatist Bishops; Augustine and Aurelius were the leaders of the former, Primianus and Petilianus of the latter. For three days they debated whether Felix was a traditor, and whether the Church ceased to be the true Church by tolerating mortal sins. Marcellianus, the imperial commissioner, declared the Catholics victors. An appeal was made to the Emperor, who confirmed the previous decision, and threatened the refractory with banishment and confiscation. In 414, the Donatists were deprived of all civil privileges; in 415 they were forbid holding assemblies on pain of death. Still they survived, until they, with the Catholics, were decimated by the Vandals, and perished, in the 7th cent., by the swords of the Saracens.

A. VOGEL.*

Donus I., or *Domnus*, a Roman by birth, chosen Bishop in 676, died 678. He beautified some of the churches of Rome, and reduced the Archbishopric of Ravenna to submission to Rome. — II., a Roman of the Tuscan party, a peaceable man, chosen B. of Rome in 974, and died the same year.

Dor, a royal city of the Canaanites (Josh. 11: 2; 12: 23) lying within the borders of Asher, but assigned to Manasseh (Josh 17: 11; 1 Chron. 7: 29). It was not immediately taken (Judges 1: 17), and first occurs as an Israelitish town in 1 Kings 4: 11. From 1 Mac. 15: 11-14, 25 (see Jos. *Ant.* XIII., 7, 2, and *Antiochus* VII), we learn that it was then besieged by Antiochus Sidetes; it was subsequently stormed by Pompey (Jos. *Ant.*, XIV., 4, 4), restored by the Roman general Gabinus, and furnished with a harbor (Jos. *Ant.*, 5, 3). It early became an episcopal See, but at the time of Jerome was lying waste, about nine Roman miles from Cæsarea, on the road to Ptolemais (HIERON., *Onom.*), with extensive ruins (HIERON., in *Epitaph. Paulæ. Opp.*, IV., 673: *mirata ruinas*

Dor urbis quondam potentissimæ). It must have been afterwards rebuilt, for during the Crusades it was the seat of a Bishop under the Archb. of Cæsarea. When ancient writers call the place a small town, they allude to the small Phœnician settlement of the seaport Dor or Dora, which Stephan Byzant., following Claudius Julius, describes (s. v. Δωρος p. 113, ed. *Westerm.*) Pliny (*Hist. Nat.*, V., 17) calls it Dorum, and places it in Phœnicia. Upon the *Tab. Peut.* *Segm.*, IX., F., it is called *Thora*, and located 56 miles from Cæsarea. The present Tantûra, (Tartûra, Dandôra), is about 8 miles N. of C., with a harbor for large ships, and a miserable Khan, a short distance N. of which some ancient and mediæval ruins are found—no doubt the remains of Dor.—(See D'ARVIEUX, *Nachrichten*, II., 11, 12; POCOCKE, II., 85; BUCKINGHAM'S *Travels*, I., 102; RELAND, *Palest.*, 738–41; BACHIENE, *Pal.*, II., 3, p. 261, &c.; RAUMER, *Pal.*; ROSEN-MÜLLER, *Alterthumsk.*, II., 2, p. 323; RITTER, *Geogr.*, XVI., 1, p. 608, &c). ARNOLD.*

Dorothea, the *Calender St.*, was a native of Cappadocia, whose martyrdom is adorned by *SURIUS, de probatis SS. vitis*, with all sorts of fabulous incidents.—Her namesake was a Prussian peasant girl, who, after having lived in matrimony, in Danzig, until her 44th year, and borne nine children, devoted herself to a solitary ascetic life, and, after 1394, occupied a cell in the cathedral at Marienwerder, where she lived according to a rule professedly received from the Lord.—The common people regarded her as the Patron St. of Prussia. ANON.*

Dort, the Synod of.—After the various ecclesiastical, national, and political parties of the Netherlands had been reduced, in the beginning of the 17th cent., to two parties, the Armenians, (see Art.) or Remonstrants and Contraremonstrants, defined their opposition in such a manner that the latter represented predestinarian, deterministic Calvinism and the idea of eccl. autonomy and vigor, whilst the former represented the idea of a national Church, and acknowledged no creed but one which set forth doctrines in Biblical simplicity, or had an immediate bearing upon religious experience and practice (see DR. EBRARD in the *Ref. K.-Zeitung*, 1853, Nr. 21).—At the head of the Armenian party stood Simon Episcopius (see Art.), John v. Oldenbarneveld, and the learned statesman and syndic of Rotterdam, Hugo de Groot. The chief of the other party was Prince Moritz, of Orange. The political contest of the parties began when Oldenbarneveld and Groot effected, 1609, a 12 years' armistice with Spain, against the wishes of Moritz. Forthwith the cry was raised that the country had been betrayed, and the Armenians were accused of having brought about the armistice. Soon the conviction spread through Zeeland, Friesland, Gröningen, and Guelderland, that the Armenian party, as dangerous to the State, should be rendered harmless by a common act of the confederacy, and that to this end a national Synod should be called. In almost all the towns of the country both parties got up menacing gatherings, and wild excitement, and the safety of the State required that the strife should be speedily quelled. But Holland, Utrecht, and Overissel, where the Armenians

predominated, so decidedly opposed the demands of the Orange party, that the States-General could secure a national synod only by the apprehension of Oldenbarneveld, Grotius, and Hogerbeets. At length, Nov. 11, 1617, they resolved to call a synod for the adjustment of the dissensions agitating the Netherland Church. This was not to be a Reformed General Synod, or a council of all the Reformed Churches of the country, but a *National Synod*, i. e. an assembly of all who represented the Netherland Church, to confer upon the interests of that Church, and only incidentally a representation of the collective Reformed C. The States-General did not contemplate to secure by this synod an action which should fix and regulate the unity and connection of the Netherland Reformed Churches. Hence, all the Reformed C. of Germany (Anhalt excepted, which was not thought sufficiently orthodox), Switzerland, Scotland, and England, were invited to attend the Synod, in order that, by their associated counsel, they might assist in restoring peace. Many of the foreign Churches sent no delegates; none were present from Brandenburg or France; Louis XIII. had forbid the French clergy to attend. And yet the Synod of Dort was one of the largest Ref. synods ever held. There were 28 theologians, or other deputies, present from the Palatinate, Hesse, Switzerland, Nassau, East Friesland, Bremen, England, and Scotland; from the Netherlands, of course, there were many more, including 5 professors, 36 clergymen, and 20 elders. The members of the Synod were all Contra-remonstrants; the Armenians were admitted only as an accused party, to answer to charges pending against them.

The Synod was opened on Nov. 13 (3), 1618, at 8 A. M., by public worship in the great church of Dort; pastor Lydius preached. The Synod was then constituted with prayer. At the second session, John Bogermann, minister of Leuwarden, was elected president. Two other clergymen were chosen as his counsellors, and two others as secretaries. At the third session, the deputies presented their credentials, and at the fourth, it was resolved that Episcopius of Leyden, and twelve other Remonstrants from different parts of the country, should be invited to state and defend their views before the Synod within 14 days after receiving the citation; meanwhile, the theologians of the Synod were requested to prepare themselves to refute the Armenian errors. At the fifth session, a form of citation was adopted, and, during the next 17 sessions, various matters were acted upon. A new Holland version of the Bible was determined upon, and a committee appointed for the purpose. Rules were adopted regarding regular catechization and sermons upon the catechism, and instructions for Holland missionaries in the E. Indies, touching the baptism of the children of heathen parents; rules for restraining the press were also discussed.

At length, at the 22d session, Episcopius and the others cited appeared. E. handed over to the foreign theologians an extended apology of his doctrine, and defended the same so frankly and decidedly, that the Synod, which saw in this course only the audacity of a heretic, reminded him that it would become one cited as

an offender to show more modesty. It was especially offensive that he boldly called the Synod a schismatic assembly. The Remonstrants were also urged to present fuller expositions of their five articles. Thus began a discussion, continued through many sessions, which resulted in the exclusion from the Synod of the Remonstrants, as proven liars and deceivers (at the 57th s., Jan. 14, 1619). But the discussions also showed less agreement among the orthodox in their positive views, than in their opposition to Armenianism. The question, *num secundum Eph. 1 : 4, Christus fundamentum electionis sit*, called forth violent debates, the German Reformed and Anglican members affirming it, whilst others, insisting upon absolute predestination, denied it; so that when several commissions, appointed at the 73d s., convened to draw up general results, they found it almost impossible to harmonize the various views upon election into one formula. The *Canones Synodici*, however, adopted and signed at the 136th s., April 23, though not endorsing supralapsarianism, decidedly laud predestinarianism. — Apart from various special matters, it now remained for the Synod to fix penalties upon the convicted Remonstrants. Here again the Hessians and Anglicans interfered, declaring they would not assent to personal penalties. All the other members approved of the censure proposed by the President, viz., that the Remonstrants, as disturbers of the Church and blasphemers, should be excluded from all eccl. offices, and that the provincial synods, classes, and presbyteries, should execute this sentence. The Heidelberg Catechism and Belgic Conf. were then unanimously declared orthodox, and in full harmony with the Word of God. During the 144th s. the Synod went into the great church, where the Canons touching the five articles and the censure against the Remonstrants were read in Latin, before a vast assemblage. The Synod closed with the 154th s., May 9 (April 29), after which the magistracy of Dort gave a brilliant entertainment.

Whether contemplated prospectively or retrospectively, the canons of Dort possess the same significance for the Calvinistic Reformed C. which the Form of Concord possesses for the German Protestant C. In both cases, the back was turned upon union compromises; the former did this, especially, by adopting extreme determinism and predestinarianism. Hence, the Ger. Ref. theologians, particularly those of Bremen and Hessa, not only expressed their dissent from the Dort doctrine of election, but subsequently impugned the authority of the Synod. Dr. Martinius, of Bremen, long afterwards, exclaimed "O Dort, O Dort, would God I had never seen thee!" — Of course Armenianism in the Calvinistic C. must not be identified with Melancthonianism, which was the true and complete exponent of the Augustana, 1540, and its various repetitions, 1551, whilst Armenianism was but a perverse exhibition of the Reformed faith, as set forth in the Conf. Helvetica, II., and soon declined into semi-Pelagianism, and other anti-churchly errors. It cannot be shown that the Synod really foresaw, and hence condemned, the perilous errors concealed in Armenianism. The adoption of those *Canones*, therefore, must

be considered as that act by which the Church of Holland renounced the evangelical unionism and Philipism of the *Conf. Helvet.*, and fixed its high and rigid predestinarianism. For they do not contain the clear and sharply defined supralapsarianism of Calvin's Institutes, or the *Cons. Genevensis*, but rather, amid all the formulas sounding like supralaps., a badly-concealed infralapsarianism, which does not venture to utter the inmost and deepest thoughts of Calvin's system. — A cheering act among the decisions of the Synod, was the recognition of the Heidelberg Catechism as the symbol of the entire Reformed C. This formed a conservative offset to the otherwise one-sided position taken by the Synod. The acts of the Synod were publ. officially at Dort, and also by the Remonstrants at Harderwick, in 1620, 4to. — (See J. HALESI *hist. Cons. Dord.*; J. L. MOSHEMUS *verit., variis observ. et vita Halesii auxil.*: Hamb. 1724; the reports of the Scotch theologian, *Balcanquhallas*; H. HEPPE, *hist. syn. nation. Dord.* in NIEDNER's *Ztschr. für d. hist. Theol.* 1853, p. 227-37.) H. HEPPE.*

Dositheus, a Samaritan false Messiah, and founder of a sect, of whom less is known with certainty than of Simon Magus and Menander. His history is obscured by his being often confounded with an earlier person of that name. The priest mentioned in 2 K. 17 : 27, 28, is also said to have been called Dosthai (cf. DRUSIUS, *de tribus sectis Jud.* III. 4), the teacher of Sadock, the founder of the Sadducees. The fathers wrongly represent him, as they do Simon, as the founder of a Christian sect. He is rather a Samaritan false Christ. The opinion that he apostatized from Judaism to the Samaritans is probably based upon the confounding of him with the older D. (cf. EPIPH. *Hær.* XIII.). ORIGEN calls him a Samaritan (c. Cels. I. p. 44; VI. p. 282, ed. Spencer). He probably appeared contemporaneously with Christ, or soon after him, as about that time the Samaritans were earnestly expecting the promised prophet (Deut. 18 : 18), whom D. pretended to be; he also proclaimed himself the son of God (c. Cels. VI. 282; I. 44: καὶ μετὰ τοῦ Ἰησοῦ δὲ χρόνους ἠδέλησε καὶ ὁ Σαμαρεὺς Δοσίθεος πείσαι Σαμαρείτας ὅτι αὐτὸς εἴη ὁ προφητευόμενος ὑπὸ Μωσέως Χριστός). His doctrines hardly differed much from those common among the Samaritans, but cannot be precisely ascertained. But from EPIPH. *Hær.* XIII. we learn that he pressed the literal observance of the law of the Sabbath (comp. ORIG. *de princip.* VI. 17; *Philocal.* c. 1). He died of hunger whilst fasting in a cave (EPIPH. *Hær.* XIII.). His adherents, few in number, at Origen's time not more than 30, continued until the 6th cent. In 588, Dositheans and Samaritans disputed about Deut. 18 : 18 (cf. PUOTIUS, *Biblioth. cod.* 230). The statements of the pseudo-Clementines (cf. *Homil.* I. 24; *Recogn.* II. 8, &c.) are either traditions or inventions. — (WALCH, *Hist. d. Ketzer.* I. 182-5; MOSHEIM, *Instit. Hist. Chr. maj. Sæc. I.* 376-389; *De rebus Chr. ante Constant.* M. 188, &c.; GIESLER, *Eccl. Hist.*) G. UHLHORN.*

Doxology (δοξολογία, glorificatio). 1. The *Major doxology*, or *Gloria in excelsis*, also *Angelic hymn*, consisted originally of the few words found in Luke 2 : 14. The form in the Western

C. was "*Gloria in excelsis Deo, et in terra pax hominibus bonæ voluntatis.*" These original 'imple forms were early amplified, it is not certainly known *when*, or by *whom*, though there is great probability that *Hilary of Poitiers* († 368) was the author. As early as the 5th cent. it had acquired its present form.¹ At the same time, there were many who opposed these additions, even as late as the 7th cent. But the 4th Council of Toledo (633) sanctioned the amplifications (*can.* 13). Indeed, all kinds of additions were allowed, especially on festival days.²—As a rule, the *Gloria* was sung, 1) On all Sundays, excepting during Advent, and from *Septuagesima* to Easter; 2) on all festivals, excepting on the Holy Innocents, unless this falls on a Sunday; 3) at all votive masses to Mary, the saints, and angels; 4) at the Epiphany, Ascension, and Whitsuntide vigils. Of course, it is never used on mournful occasions. The Lutheran C. retained the Romish use of the *Gloria*, even in Latin, until towards the close of the 16th cent. a German translation was introduced. — The position of the *Gloria*, between the Confession and Kyrie El., and the Scripture lesson, was determined by its liturgical significance. In the ancient, especially the Oriental, Church, public worship assumed the form of a symbolical, liturgical drama, designed to represent the work of redemption, from the birth to the ascension of Christ; the confession of sin and Kyrie El., therefore, were intended to set forth the ante-Christian age, and its longings after the promised Redeemer. Hence, the *Gloria* celebrated his birth, and after it followed the lessons, as an exhibition of his prophetic office. The Romish, and then the Lutheran, C. followed this example, whilst the Reformed C. purposely departed from it, omitting the *Gloria* in the regular liturgical service. Even the Anglican C., though frequently using it, gives it no place in the regular

morning and evening prayer, but only in the post-communion service, where it answers to a second thanksgiving prayer.

2. The *Minor Doxology* consisted originally of the simple formula: "*Gloria Patri et Filio et Spiritui sancto in sæcula sæculorum. Amen.*" (Greek: δόξα πατρὶ καὶ υἱῷ καὶ ἁγίῳ πνεύματι καὶ νῦν καὶ ἀεὶ καὶ εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας (ATHANAS. *de virgin.* II. 218, *Paris.*) During the Arian controversies, it was left optional to use "*in the Son and the H. G.,*" or "*through the Son, in the H. G.,*" for the usual formula; but subsequently these variations were declared heretical, and, to preclude all Arian evasions, there was added, "*sicut erat in principio et nunc et semper et in sæcula sæculorum,*" (see *Conc. Varense*, II. c. 5). — Another amplification, recommended by the 4th Council of Toledo: "*Gloria et honor Patri*" (comp. Ps. 28 : 2; Rev. 5 : 13), was adopted only by the Spanish churches. Anciently the *Minor Dox.* was sung at the conclusion of a psalm, said or sung. The priest pronounced *Gloria Patri, &c.*, and the congregation responded, *Sicut erat, &c.* The expressions of praise, &c., at the conclusion of prayers, &c., as often found in the N. T. (Rom. 16 : 27, &c.), are called *doxologies*, especially the closing words of the Lord's prayer (Matt. 6 : 13). H. A.*

Dragon. The apocryphal account of Bel and the Dragon (LXX. Dan. 14) relates that, under the reign of Cyrus, a living serpent (δράκων) was kept and worshipped in the great temple of Bel, in Babylon. Modern critics question the entire narrative, because, 1) the Babylonians did not worship animals, but stars; 2) what *Diod. Sic.* (II. 9) relates of silver serpents in the temple of Belus refers to symbols, not to the worship of living animals. Hence the inference that Alexandrian Jews erroneously transferred, in the legend underlying the above account, the Egyptian animal worship to the Babylonians (thus EICHORN, WINER, &c.). — But that such a serpent worship existed in Babylon is less improbable than the assumed ignorance of the Alexandrian Jews. We believe that the tradition or myth is linked with actual facts. Among all ancient nations, not excepting Greece and Italy, not only animals, but especially serpents, were worshipped (see J. G. MÜLLER, *Monogr. über d. Mexican. Nationalgott, &c.*, p. 12, 41, &c.). Thus of the two near the temple of Apollo, in Epirus, from which tradition derives the Delphic Python (see ÆLIANI, *Hist. Anim.* XI. 2). A soothsaying serpent was also worshipped in Lavinium (Lanuvium? Cf. ÆLIANI, l. c.; PROPERT. IV. 18; PLUTARCH'S *Parall. minora*, § 14). Roman vestals also had their chastity tested by an oracle of living serpents (TERTULL. *ad uxor.* I. 6; PAUL. NOLAN in *Murat. anecd.* I. 133). Sacred serpents were kept in the temple of Jupiter, Thebes (HEROD. II. 74), and were worshipped as household gods (ÆLIAN. l. c. 17, 22) If Greeks and Romans, who, more than others, converted the ancient animal worship into mere symbols, retained so many living instances of it, why should the tradition of Bel and the Dragon be incredible? It is well known that fish worship was common among all the Shemites (see *Atargetis, Dagon*). Indeed, Philo of Biblos (44, 46, 48) derives the serpent worship of other

¹ "*Gloria in excelsis Deo, et in terra pax hominibus bonæ voluntatis. Laudamus te: benedicimus te: adoramus te: glorificamus te: gratias agimus tibi propter magnam gloriam tuam. Domine Deus, rex cælestis, Deus Pater omnipotens: Domine, Fili unigenite, Jesu Christe, Domine Deus, agnus Dei, Filius Patris, qui tollis peccata mundi, miserere nobis: Qui tollis peccata mundi, suscipe deprecationem nostram: Qui sedes ad dexteram Patris, miserere nobis: Quoniam tu solus sanctus, tu solus Dominus, tu solus altissimus, Jesu Christe, cum Sancto Spiritu in gloria Dei Patris. Amen.*" The following, with some variations, is the Greek text (Constit. VII. 47): Δόξα ἐν ὑψίστοις θεῷ καὶ ἐπὶ γῆς ἐιρήνῃ, ἐν ἀνθρώποις εὐδοκία. Αἰνοῦμέν σε, ἡμνοῦμέν σε, προσκυνοῦμέν σε διὰ τοῦ μεγάλου ἀρχιερέως, σε, τὸν ὄντα θεόν, ἀγέννητον ἕνα, ἀπόστολον μένον διὰ τὴν μεγάλην σου δόξαν· κύριε βασιλεῦ ἱεραρχεῖς, δεῖ πάτερ παντοκράτωρ· κύριε, ὁ θεὸς ὁ πατὴρ τοῦ Χριστοῦ, τοῦ ἀμώμου ἀμνοῦ, ὃς αἴρει τὴν ἁμαρτίαν τοῦ κόσμου· πρόσδεξιαι τὴν δέησιν ἡμῶν. ὁ καθήμενος ἐπὶ τῶν Χερουβὶμ· ὅτι σὺ μόνος ἅγιος, σὺ μόνος κύριος. Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς, τοῦ θεοῦ πάσης γεννητὴς φύσεως, τοῦ βασιλέως ἡμῶν· δι' οὗ σοὶ δόξα, τιμὴ καὶ σέβας. Ἀμήν.

² Thus one for the festival of the consecr. of a Church was, according to BONA (*rer. liturg.* I. 2, 4), GLORIA IN EXCELSIS DEO, quem cires cælestes sunctum clamantes laude frequentant, ET IN TERRA PAX, quam ministri Domini verbo incarnati terrenis promiserunt HOMINIBUS BONÆ VOLUNTATIS, &c. And, at the festivals of Mary, after "*Quoniam tu solus sanctus,*" they inserted "*Mariam sanctificans;*" after "*tu solus Dominus*"—" *Mariam gubernans;*" and after "*tu solus altissimus*"—" *Mariam coronans.*"

nations from the Phœnician Taut, who introduced it to them. Moreover, the worship of stars and that of animals are so far from excluding each other, that they are usually found side by side, or even combined. This parallelism is found everywhere, in representations of the transmigration of souls through animals and stars, and in astronomical myths, in which animals and animal metamorphoses play a part. As to Babylon, we conclude, not only from the statement of Diodorus, but from many others, that a serpent cultus existed there, of which the living dragon in Dan. 14 (LXX.) was a relic. Thus Alexander M. found a *serapeum* in Babylon (ARRIANI, *exped.* VII. 26; MOVERS, I. 535). It is also obvious, from Philo of Biblos, 48, that the Persians adopted this cultus in Babylon, worshipping serpents as gods, and the creators of all things. The use of animal symbols among the Hebrews does not disprove our theory; for even the Hebrew symbols point to a primitive animal cultus, if not among the Hebrews, still among their heathen neighbors. The Hebrews, in the outward exhibition of their cultus, borrowed many things from heathen which did not grow naturally out of their monotheism. The peril attending this is illustrated by the worship of the golden calf and brazen serpent.

J. G. MÜLLER.*

Dräseke, John H., Bishop, was born, Jan. 18, 1774, at Brunswick. His father, a subaltern, could give little attention to his training: but his pious mother he cherished in grateful remembrance. In 1792 he went to the university of Helmstädt, at which the strictly rationalistic but highly gifted Hencke was at that time the ruling spirit. D., however, was less attracted by the positive doctrines of rationalism than by the humanistic atmosphere which it helped to create. It was the period of an enthusiastic cultivation of dramatic literature. Humanistic studies were pursued with fondness, by theologians even, and D. gave himself up to the new tendency of literature, viz. the drama, with an enthusiastic eagerness. At this time he wrote a play, which was performed at Brunswick. After 1817 appeared his work, "*das Heilige auf der Bühne*," in which he defends the use of religious subjects upon the stage. In his 21st year he was called as deacon to the town of Mölln; became the chief pastor three years after; and, in 1804, became pastor at Ratzeburg. Here he published his "*Predigt. für denkende Verehr. Jes.*," 1804-12, 5 vols., and his *Glaube, Liebe u. Hoffnung*. Here also his patriotic sermons made such a stir among his French enemies, that a detachment was sent to seize him. He escaped by flight, but his house was plundered. — In 1814 he was called to a larger sphere, to Bremen. The leading families of this city were accustomed in every manner to patronize a clergyman who pleased them, and to pay court to any one of marked superiority. This his present position may have fostered in him his peculiar weakness, vanity. His best works belong to this period: "*Predigt. über Deutschl. Wiedergeb.*" 3 vols. 1814; "*Predigt.-Entw. über freie Texte*," 2 vols. 1815; "*über d. letzt. Schicks. uns. Herrn*," 2 vols. 1816; "*über frei gewähl. Abschn. d. heil. Schr.*" 4 vols. 1817-18; "*Christ. a. d. Geschl.*

dies. Zeit," 1819; "*Gemäld. aus d. h. Schrift*," 4 Samml. 1821-28; "*Vom Reich Gottes. Betracht. nach d. h. Schr.*" 3 vols. 1830. Filled with the grand patriotic hopes of his age, D.'s sermons, from his entrance upon his new sphere, were largely devoted to the reformation of the state; his "*Predigt. üb. Deutschl. Wiedergeb.*" are given entirely to this theme. His views and principles, with his bold language, could not long escape notice. The *Bundestag* ordered the senate either to prevent such political sermons, or to remove the preacher. D. was silenced. — After the death of *Westermeyer* (†1832), Bish. of the province of Saxony, D. was appointed to that post by Fr. William III. In his new sphere he gained that importance which will hand down his name in the history of the Prussian Church to posterity. In the present century, and perhaps for centuries past, no church prince has arisen to whom so large a measure of admiration has been awarded — an admiration extending from the King to the lowest subject. Though his eloquence was the chief cause of this, yet his freedom from party preferences, his humane disposition, and his imposing outward appearance, also lent their weight. Rationalism was on the decline, and a longing was springing up for Christ and Christianity. Few, however, were yet willing to bear the reproach attached to the name of pietist. But a Bishop now arose who gave an enthusiastic testimony in favor of the Gospel, and yet stood in the most friendly relations to those against whom pietism was contending, as enemies of Christ. The demands of the Gospel, also, from his lips were so mild and liberal, so far from pietistic rigorism. No wonder that on these conditions so many attached themselves to the new brilliant meteor. Amid this general applause, this blaze of glory, the Bishop passed through the cities and villages of the Saxon provinces, preaching at one time to rural congregations, at another time in the royal chapel at Berlin, up to 1840, in which year he was forced into a party position, by which the hidden foe was called to light. *Sintenis*, a rationalist pastor, had, in a newspaper article, pronounced prayer unto Christ to be a superstition. The heart of D. spoke out against him. But the Bishop also could not be silent, and, in the name of the *Consistory*, laid a retraction before the offender. The latter refusing, D. pronounced upon him the episcopal sentence of deposition. But the supreme shepherd was not sustained by the authorities, and hence the prosecution, commenced so energetically, ended in a tame warning. This only increased the boldness and rage of the enemy. The long-restrained spite of Rationalism found a vent in the pseudonyme work of *König*, pastor at *Anderbeck*: "*Der Bish. Dräs. u. sein achtjähr. Wirk. im preuss. Staat*," 1840. The labors of D. are here reviewed with the envenomed criticism peculiar to the rationalism of those times, and from a mere business point of view: the spirit of these labors was wholly forgotten, whilst his personal weaknesses and derelictions in official routine were visited with the most biting sarcasm. Against an attack of this kind, D., who had long been accustomed to admiration, had no weapons. He was wounded to the

quick. From this time he desired a discharge from his office, which, though several times refused by the king, was obtained in 1843. He was dismissed with his full salary, and directed to live at Potsdam, in the immediate vicinity of the King. Here he applied himself to study, and at times preached also before the monarch. He died Dec. 8, 1849.—As a *theologian*, D. held, up to the third decade of his life, the position of the humanism of Herder, with a Pelagian basis. He regards Christianity as the manifestation of the truly human. Having no apprehension of sin, his sermons are silent on *repentance*. He speaks often of the abstract ideals of "light, power, truth." Christ, however, appears with him more distinctly personal than with Herder, though it is only as the "adored master," the "divine sufferer." In his "*Predigt. üb. d. Reich G.*" his views of Christianity become deeper and more positive, and he even teaches the personality of Satan. His positive confessions become still more energetic in his Magdeburg sermons. But, measured by the orthodoxy of the *Church*, he falls short, even in his latest productions. He knows no other bond for the unity of Christians than the Scriptures, and, hence, declares himself against human creeds and confessions. This became afterwards a point of attack by his enemies.—Of D. as an *orator*, there can be but one opinion—that he belongs to the first pulpit orators of Germany. His earliest sermons lack a popular vein, for he wishes to address "thinking admirers of Jesus," and has always the higher classes in view. His subsequent sermons became more and more plain and adapted to the people. They are full of imagination, though there is no redundancy of it. He acquired that language which at once charms the educated, and speaks to the heart of the illiterate. In the division of his theme he was systematic. But in his later sermons there are also some things wholly out of taste, such as dwelling on the etymology of the names of distinguished persons, or of places where he preached. In this the great orator allowed himself to be misled by a desire for piquancy.—(See "*Dräseke als geistl. Redner*," *Hallische, Jahrb.* 1838; "*Blätter für liter. Unterh.*" 1851, No. 133, etc.

THOLUCK. — *Reinecke*.

Drogo, B. of Metz, b. 807, the fifth son of Charlemagne, was at first devoted to the priesthood against his will by Louis the Pious, but subsequently freely chose the profession. After filling several inferior offices, he was invested with the archiepiscopal title, and the dignity of a papal Legate. He was drowned on a fishing excursion, in 835.

HERZOG.*

Drost of Vischering, Clem. Aug., Baron, Archb. of Cologne, b. at Vorhelm, Jan. 22, 1773, and educated for the priesthood, at Münster, where he was consecrated a priest in 1797. He was active in the discharge of his duties, and exhibited special interest in the benevolent institutions of the diocese. He belonged, furthermore, to the circle of which the Princess *Galitzin* was the centre. In 1806 the Chapter, *sede vacante*, elected him General-Vicar in Fürstenberg's place, but he retired again in 1813, owing to political agitation. The Pope, however, not approving of this step, he resumed the post in

1815.—After the Rhinish-Westphalian provinces were acquired by the crown of Prussia, that government sought to extend its educational system over those provinces. This brought Drost into opposition to the State, and also to *Hermes*, who favored the measures, and accepted a call to the university of Bonn, recently established by the government. Another occasion of conflict arose in the new laws enacted, concerning mixed marriages, which placed the Evangelical C. on an equal footing with the Romish C. Drost zealously strove for what he believed to be the rights and interests of his Church, and maintained the conflict to the last. He was a man of high integrity and distinguished for the ability with which he labored to defend the principles of the Romish C. in reference to the points involved in his controversy with the Prussian government. His zeal and services were also appreciated at Rome. The Pope thrice offered him a cardinal's hat, but he always declined the honor. He died Oct. 19, 1845.—(See "*Ueber d. kölnische Angelegenheit*, von IRENÄUS (Gieseler), Lpz. 1838; cf. articles *Hermes* and *Marriage* (mixed m.) ANON.*

Druses (also *Druzes*) a brave people, who with the so-called Maronites inhabit Mt. Lebanon. Their religion is a bastard offshoot of Islam. Concerning their origin opinions vary, but the most probable one is, that like their neighbors, the Maronites, they are mostly descended from the ancient Syrians, with an occasional intermixture of foreigners, especially Arabs. Although some of the Crusaders settled in this region, the assertion, that they are the descendants of the French colony of a Count Dreux, is a sheer fancy. The territory of the Druses, which belongs to the Ottoman Pashalik of 'Akka, embraces the extreme western slope of Lebanon, with nearly the whole of Anti-Lebanon, and extends N. and S. from Beirût to Sûr (Tyre) and W. and E. from the Mediterranean to Damascus. The residence of the political chief, the Grand Emîr, is at Deir el-Kamar (convent of the moon) in the province of Schuf, whilst the spiritual head, the Sheikh of the Initiated (Sheikh el-Okkâl or el-Okul), has his palace elsewhere, but comes frequently hither. In Haurân (Gr. *Auranitis*), east of Palestine, the Druses have greatly increased in modern times; a few also are found around Safed, in Palestine proper. It is said too that some yet exist in Egypt, where their faith took its rise, *e. g.*, in the environs of Cairo, but they are obliged, through fear of the civil power, to maintain the most profound secrecy. On Lebanon even, they are not tolerated as a religious sect, but because they are able by their energy and valor to keep their enemies at bay, for they are only sham-Moslems. Hence in one of their books of doctrine, to the question: "What do we say of Mohammed?" the answer is given: "He is a devil and the son of a whore," whilst to this: "What do we say of the Gospel of the Christians?" the reply is: "The Gospel is true."

Here we have only to do with their religion. Although by external profession Moslems, and esteemed such by those who do not know their real belief, they are at heart less hostile to Christianity than Islam, of which they are an

abnormal growth. This circumstance has secured them the attention of European Christians. But with all the effort which has been made to penetrate the shroud of mystery, it is very difficult to discover what their true faith is. *Ph. Wolff*, in an excellent monograph (*Die Dr. u. ihre Vorläufer: Leipz., 1845. 8vo.*) speaks thus: "Concerning the religion of the Druses I have neither in Häsbeiya, one of their seats, nor elsewhere in Lebanon, been able to discover anything new; in this respect they are exceedingly uncommunicative; and if Christians or Mohammedans are asked what they know, the only answer is, that *the Druses have no religion.*" Up to this time no change has taken place in their policy. Hence the accounts of most travellers are to be received with the greatest caution. The latest and best are: "*Churchill, Mt. Leb.; a Ten Years' Residence, from 1842-52: Lond., 1853, 3 vols. 8vo.,*" and "*G. W. Chasseaud, The Druses of Lebanon, their Manners, Customs, and History: Lond., 1854.*" Of the reports of earlier travellers the most reliable are: *Carsten Niebuhr* (*Reisebeschr. 2, p. 428, sq.*), (*Volney, Voyage en Syrie, etc., 2, p. 37, sq.*), *J. L. Burckhardt* (*Travels in Syria and the Holy Land, p. 193, sq.*—and a translation by *Gesenius with Notes, p. 523, sq.*), *Robinson* (*Palestine, 3, p. 752, sq.*), and the anonymous work: *Die heutigen Syrier od. gesellige u. pol. Zustände d. Eingeb. in Damaskus, Aleppo u. im Drusen-gebirge (Stuttg. u. Tüb., 1845).* In recent times there are some who cherish the hope that the Druses and the Maronites may yet form a nucleus for the spiritual regeneration of the East. But if it ever be fulfilled, which is not very probable, it will not be *through the faith of the Druses*, but in spite of it.

About the origin of the name there has been much dispute. It comes, however, from Mohammed ben Ismael *Darasi*, who first ventured to assert openly that the divinity was incarnate in the person of the Fatimid caliph, Hakim Biamrillahi. Some of their own writers derive it from the Arabic verb *darisa* (with *Se*), interpreting it "*placed in possession*" (of the faith), or they ascribe to this word meanings, which it has not elsewhere (*to go out, to submit*): "because they *have gone out* from all nations and *have submitted* to the laws of our Lord" (*Hamsa*, or *Hakim*), or they deduce it from *darisa* (with *Sin*), so that a Druse is one, "who *reads* the books of *Hamsa*, as he is bound to do." Usually they style themselves *Confessors of Unity, Unitarians* (*Muhwahhidun*), and their doctrine, the *Confession of Unity* (*Tauhid*), which certainly points to the fundamental idea of their system.

The sect of the Druses first came into notice in the year 407 or 8 of the Hegira (A. D. 1016-17). Its ultimate source lies in the doctrine of the *Batiniyeh* (the Esoterics), a branch of the *Isma'iliyeh*, one of the many divisions of the Shfites (*Shi'ah*, opposed to *Sunna*, Sunnites). The Batinites asserted, "that every *outward* has an *inward*, and every passage of the Koran an internal allegorical meaning." Of course by the aid of this principle they could find anything they pleased in the Koran. Like all the Shfites, the Isma'ilites especially adhered to *Ali*, whose issue could not be deprived of the *Imamat* (the

first and highest position of Mohammedanism), and distinguished themselves from the other Shfites in this, as their name indicates, that they regarded Isma'il as rightful Imam after his father *Dschafar Zadik*. If the Karmathians be considered as that sect, from which the Druses have directly sprung, the view is correct, for these were a later offshoot of the Batinites. They not only carried allegorizing to excess, but made use also of philosophy and speculation to undermine and overthrow justice and order as well as every kind of divine revelation and authority; they taught the most absolute atheism and materialism, but kept these things as secret doctrines from the majority of their members.

But the Druses went beyond the Karmathians, in believing that the Deity had appeared in the person of a capricious, cruel, insane tyrant, the sixth caliph of the Fatimids (the third of them in Egypt). This caliph, on ascending the throne, assumed the honorable title, *Hakim Biamrillahi* (He who judges by the command of God), reigned from 386 to 411 a. Heg., had many internal troubles to contend with, and at last perished by assassination. At the death of his father, the caliph *Asin Billah*, he was still very young (not quite 11½ years old); but he very soon rid himself of the men under whose care his father had placed him. A continual change of officers and measures characterized his whole reign. The Shfites' tendency showed itself in many of his acts. Thus, in 391 a. Heg., he caused a man from Syria to be beheaded, because he refused to acknowledge *Ali*. In 393 his zeal for Islam and *Ali* in particular increased, and he began to persecute the Christians and Jews. Up to 405 it is said that more than 30,000 churches and monasteries (among them the Church of the Resurrection at Jerusalem), as well as many Jewish synagogues, were destroyed by his orders, in Egypt and Syria. Meanwhile (a. Heg., 400) *Hakim* again solemnly renounced the usages of the Shfites and appeared to incline to the Sunnite party. This seeming change, however, was of short duration, for he suddenly returned in 403 to his old position, and from 404 to the day of his death showed himself hostile to the Sunnites. The licentious manners of the Egyptian women he used as a pretext, to forbid them from going abroad by day or night, and even from looking out of doors or windows, so that many, for whom no one cared, perished in their houses, through lack of food and raiment. But this act produced universal indignation, and led to a conspiracy, on the part of his sister and a high dignitary of State, which resulted in his death.

The year 408 (according to another account, 407) of the Hegira is fixed by the Druses as that in which *Hakim's godhead was revealed*; hence we find in one of their catechisms (v. *Eichhorn's Repert. 12, p. 156, sq.*): Quest. "How and when was our Lord, *Hakim*, visible? Ans. In the year 400 of the Flight of Mohammed. 2. And how was he visible? A. He was visible, and said he was of the lineage of Mohammed, in order to conceal his godhead. Q. And why did he conceal his godhead? A. Because his sojourn was only brief, and they who loved him were not many. Q. And when did he

appear and manifest his godhead? A. In the year 408. Q. And how many years did his godhead remain visible? A. Eight years altogether, and he concealed himself in the ninth year, because it was the year of tribulation and recompense."—A missionary (dai) of the Batinite sect, Muhammed ben Ismael *Darasi*, called *Neschtekin* by Druse writers, said to be a Persian by birth, came to Egypt and entered the service of Hakim, by whom he was loaded with the highest honors, in return for which he called upon the people to acknowledge the caliph as God, the Creator of the world, and wrote a book to prove the claim. But when he read aloud from this book in a mosque at Cairo, the people became so enraged at him, that he escaped with difficulty; a riot of three days ensued, and many of his party perished. The caliph did not venture to support him publicly, and hence advised him to withdraw to Syria, where, among the rude and simple inhabitants of the mountains, he might propagate his doctrine. This *Darasi* did in the valley of *Tel'm Allah*, west of Damascus, in the district of *Paneas*. He succeeded by a liberal distribution of gold and promises of sensual indulgence. The dogma of the transmigration of souls was a chief point in his theology; for the soul of Adam was said to have reappeared in Ali ben Abu Taleb, then in the ancestors of Hakim and now in Hakim himself. Druse writers say that D. with many of his adherents perished in 410 of the Heg.; other accounts speak of him as fighting in 411 against the Turks, by whom he was probably slain in battle.

After a second unsuccessful attempt, by a certain Hasan ben Halidara Fergani, surnamed *Akhrum*, to secure divine honors to Hakim, the scheme was taken up by a skilful man, who had probably been the secret spring of the whole movement, and hence is justly regarded by the Druses to this day as the founder of their religious communion—the turban-maker, *Hamsa* ben Ali ben Ahmed, surnamed *Hadi* (the Leader). Of Persian descent, he came to Egypt, took up his abode outside of Cairo in the mosque *Bir*, and gradually and prudently won followers, several of whom he sent out as missionaries into Syria and Egypt. He first began to preach publicly in the year of the H. 408. Young *Neschtekin Darasi* was one of his proselytes; through him he may have wished to test public opinion, but it is more probable that the scholar attempted to steal a march upon his master. At least *Hamsa* accuses him of pride and presumption, and even of aspiring to the Imamatus. There existed, of course, a mutual understanding between H. and the caliph, and the real designs of the latter became more and more apparent. He discontinued his customary prayers in the mosque on festival days, discouraged the pilgrimage to Mecca, and sent no more presents for the adornment of the Caaba. As the sect of the *Darasites* (Druses) grew under his protection and favor, the wrath of the genuine Moslem also increased, and a hostile collision could not be avoided. When, therefore, in 411, a band of *Hamsa's* associates, crowded into the mosque and summoned the *cadi* to acknowledge Hakim's godhead, the speaker was slain and

many with him. The caliph caused the murderers to be seized and put to death, whilst *Hamsa's* dwelling was attacked by the opposite party, plundered, and destroyed with all his servants. He himself escaped to the castle of the caliph, by whom he was concealed. From the year 408 Hakim aspired to divine honors, and to ascertain the temper of the people by means of a widely extended system of espionage, gave out, that he stood in special communication with God, and desired every one to rise at the mention of his name in public prayer. The blind multitude began first to believe and then to act; indeed, they surpassed his wishes and even beyond the walls of the mosque did him reverence by shouting: "*O Thou sole One! O Thou, who bestowest life and death!*" These impious words were not displeasing to him, for he responded in the same spirit: "*The Nile is mine, and I am He who created it.*" His feeling toward the Jews and Christians now underwent a change; he ceased to persecute them, and even allowed Christians who had been forced to become Mohammedans to profess their former faith openly (6000 availed themselves of the privilege). The churches which had been closed were again opened; those that were destroyed, rebuilt; confiscated estates were restored, and oppressive laws repealed.

Hakim is said to have learned from his horoscope that on the night when he perished, and on the following day, great danger threatened him; hence his mother begged him to pass the critical time in his palace, which he promised to do; but prompted by old habits, after the best part of the night was gone, rode to *Karafa* on his ass. On Mt. *Mokattam*, usually visited by him, he looked toward the eastern sky, saw Mars ascending the horizon, and murmured to himself: "So thou hast risen, cursed one, shedder of blood! My hour is come." The assassins, whom his sister had hired and concealed here, now fell upon him, killed him and a young slave, his only companion, maimed his ass, and carried the corpse to the palace, where it was buried. His sudden disappearance, at the age of 36 years and 7 months, his sister explained, when questioned, as a voluntary concealment, in order to escape the danger, which threatened him for 7 days. This week she used, by the liberal distribution of money and other means, to secure the succession for Hakim's son, who was yet a child. Then she put all out of the way, who were privy to the affair. A portion of the Egyptians firmly believed that H. was not dead. His worshippers, the Druses, still look for his return. Others asserted, that he had gone into the desert and became a monk. Impostors were not wanting, who claimed to be the true Hakim; *Scherut*, a Christian apostate, who had a similar voice and form, under the name of *Abularab*, played this part for 20 years. In consequence of a work of *Hamsa*, the Druses believed that Hakim had disappeared, because of the sins of men; hence their teacher forbade them to make any search after him (*Silv. de Sacy*, *Chrestom. Arab.* I. pp. 275, 277, 279). The god of the Druses had large dark blue, sparkling eyes, and a strong, terrible voice; instability and cruelty, unbounded vanity, an inclination

to folly, singularity and superstition, a lack of all moral principle, along with a certain prudence and sagacity, joined with occasional, though rare, traces of a feeling for justice, equity and nobleness, are the prominent traits of his character. His enemies may have exaggerated his faults; but even if it be so, enough remains (18,000 men were the victims of his cruelty) to render his name accursed. The historical proof of his divinity, in the very classic writings of the Druses themselves, gives clear evidence of the moral corruption, savage caprice, and madness of their deified hero.

From the pretended revelation of Hamsa, the D. reckoned their *era* (called the year of Hamsa). It corresponds with 408 of the Hegira. Hamsa's first disciples, up to this time, were Abi ben Ahmed Habbal, who in turn converted Darasi, and Mobarek ben Ali. The year 409 is excluded from Hamsa's era, and is regarded as the year of trial and sorrow. In it H. had to remain hidden; but employed his leisure in writing those books, which form the groundwork of the Druse system. Important extracts from this source are given by *Silv. de Sacy*, in his *Chrestom. Arab.*, accompanied by a French translation; much also is incorporated in his famous work, *Exposé de la religion des Druses*, T. I. and II., and *Ph. Wolff*, from the same source, has embodied much in his German elaboration of Sacy's *Exposé*. From these authentic records it appears that Hamsa was no common man, and least of all a blind fanatic, who knew not at what he aimed. They give us, however, no direct knowledge of his secret convictions, and since his narrative of events, in which he himself was an actor, is far from truthful, there is room to suspect that he did not believe in his own colossal system of error. But when we look at the wild, allegorical mode of interpreting the Koran, long in vogue among the Mohammedans, he may have been self-deceived. And yet it is hard to think so, when we read in his work, "The Cause of Causes," declarations like these: "I am the root of creatures; I am the right way; I am he who knows his will; — I am — the lord of the resurrection and the last day. — I am the lord of the last judgment, and by me all rewards will be distributed. I am he who abolishes all former laws, and exterminates the adherents of polytheism and lies." Be that as it may, he was truly a blind leader of the blind, whether his fall into the ditch was so deep as his enemies assert, as that he permitted carnal intercourse with sisters, daughters and mothers, we cannot decide; his writings, as far as known, contain nothing of the kind. He rather enjoins purity of morals and conjugal fidelity. If the modern Druses do not contract marriages within the forbidden degrees, it is a necessary result of their external confession of Islam, which does not allow it. That they, however, like other secret sects of Syria, have an ill name in this matter, is not to be disputed.

Next after H. among the Druse leaders stood Ismael ben Muhammed *Temimi*, the so-called *second* mediator, likewise a skilful writer, from whose works *Sacy* and *Wolff* borrowed largely. Concerning the *third* and *fourth* mediators little is known, but the *fifth*, *Moktana* or *Behaëddin*,

exerted a wide and permanent influence. He was a very fruitful author, and the period of his activity extends from 411 to 430 a. Heg. After Hamsa's withdrawal he took the lead, and left no means untried for the propagation of the sect. His letters went in the East as far as Multan and the borders of India; in the West as far as Constantinople. Two of them are addressed to the emperors Constantine VIII. and Michael the Paphlagonian. He endeavored to prove in them, that in Hamsa the Messiah had reappeared. Hamsa could not have a better representative of his views — one who could defend them with more zeal and power. After him the D. were not lacking in men of literary activity, but none of them acquired the consideration of the earlier leaders. Of later date is the catechism, which *J. G. Ch. Adler*, in the *Museum Cusicum Borgianum*, p. 116, sq., and *J. G. Eichhorn*, in the *Repert. für bibl. u. morgenl. Lit.* 12, p. 155, sq., have given in the original with Latin and Germ. translations. When Behaëddin retired the progress of the sect appeared to cease, and up to the present time its history is involved in darkness.

The creed of the D., as drawn from their scriptures, may be briefly summed up as follows: There is only *one* God, but the nature of his being and attributes cannot be fathomed, the senses cannot comprehend him, nor words define him. Yet he revealed himself to men at various times in human form, without sharing in human imperfection and weakness. Last he appeared in the person of *Hakim Biamrillahi*, and a further revelation is not to be looked for. In order to try the faith of his followers, and separate hypocrites from the true worshippers, Hakim concealed himself, but will soon return again in majesty, to extend his kingdom over the whole earth, and bestow eternal salvation on his faithful people. The first of the creatures of God, his only direct offspring, the first emanation of the beaming light of the Godhead is the *universal intelligence*; it has appeared in every revelation of God, and last under the form of *Hamsa ben Ahmed*. By this *first mediator* all other creatures were brought into existence; he alone has the knowledge of all truth, and out of the treasures of grace and knowledge bestowed exclusively on him by God, imparts it directly or indirectly to all other mediators, as well as to the body of believers, in proportion to their power of understanding and their merit. He alone has direct access to God; all others need him as a mediator; he will receive the sword of God for victory over his enemies, the triumph of the true religion and the distribution of rewards and punishments. Under him stand mediators of lower rank, who likewise have a claim to implicit obedience on the part of the faithful. The number of men, whose souls were created by the *universal intelligence*, remains ever the same; but their souls pass gradually over into various bodies. In this way they attain to a higher grade, if they do homage to the truth and ponder it well, and the contrary, if they neglect it. Earlier religions are only types of the true, and their rites only allegories; hence, after the revelation of the true religion, they must be abolished. The renun-

ciation of all other creeds, veracity, brotherly love and submission to the will of God are the chief duties of a *confessor of unity*. [Comp. the summary in *Sacy's Exp. T. I.*, p. 76, sq., repeated by *Ph. Wolff*, *die D.* p. 435, sq., and in his *Reise in das gelob. Land*, p. 232, sq., also *K. Graul*, *Reise nach Ostind. über Palästina*, T. I., p. 76, sq.]. To ascertain the key-note of the Druse system requires a close attention to details. Like Islam it lays great stress on the divine essence, but differs from it in making the doctrine of its *mediation* a cardinal point.

Considering the difficult metaphysico-theological language of the Druse writers, and the abstruseness of their speculations, it is not to be wondered at that so distinguished a scholar as *Silv. de Sacy*, even after 40 years study, should fall into some errors. Still, his book is the best we have upon the subject. The authors before him worthy of mention are *Adler* (*Museum Cuf. Borg. Rom.*, 1782), *J. G. Eichhorn* (*Repert. d. bibl. u. morgenl. Lit.* 12, p. 108), *Venture* (*hist. Mem. on the D. in the Appendix to the Memoirs of Baron de Tott*, Lond. 1786), *J. G. Words* (*Gesch. u. Beschreib. des L. d. D. in Syrien*, Goerl. 1799), and *J. Hammer-Purgstall* (*Journ. Asiat.* 1837, Nov., 3d Ser. T. 4, p. 483, sq.). *Regnault's* *Recherch. sur les D. etc.*, in the *Bullet. de la Soc. de géog.*, and *Gius. Bakti's* *Notizie etc.*, in the *Fundgrub. d. Orients*, T. I., p. 27, are of little value. A critical compilation of the accounts of Oriental writers and European travellers is a desideratum, but the main thing is, to put the most important Druse works into print. A list of these is given by *Sacy* in his *Exp. T. I.*, p. 454. The MSS. are to be found at Rome (in the Vatican), at Paris, Vienna, Oxford and Leyden. Since then, whole collections have reached Upsala (*s. Journ. Asiat.* Dec. 1841) and Munich. The latter were obtained by *Clotbey*, chief of the Egyptian medical staff in Syria, and presented to the King of Bavaria.

In regard to the *rites of worship* used by the D., there is little known. Their sacred day is Friday. Their temples are without ornament and built in secluded places. The male portion of the congregation is separated from the female by a screen. Before the service begins matters of public and private interest are discussed and settled. A passage from their holy books is read, and hymns sung; then figs, raisins, etc., are eaten at public expense, and the assembly disperses. At the temple of the Sheikh, the chief men remain behind to sit in council. The D. are said to pay divine honors to a golden calf, which they keep hidden in a chest. It is generally thought to be an image of Hakim. *Adler* has given a picture of it, after a copy in the *Museum Borgianum* at Rome. It is covered with secret characters, more or less resembling Arabic. *Venture* already declared the supposition that it was an idol incorrect, because their religious books expressly forbid the worship of images, and *Silv. de Sacy* (*Exp. T. I.*, p. 231) sustains his view. This calf, according to *Venture*, is nothing but a symbol of other religions, which in their books are represented by the figure of a calf or ox; or perhaps, as *de Sacy* thinks, it symbolizes the enemy of Hakim. It

is very probable that the whole thing was unknown among the earlier Druses.

A. G. HOFFMANN. — *Porter*.

Drusilla, the daughter of Herod Agrippa I. (*Acts* 12 : 23) and Cypra, and sister of Agrippa II., Bernice, and Mariamne, lost her father in her sixth year, but was previously betrothed to Epiphanes, the son of Antiochus, King of Comagene, on condition of his submitting to circumcision. E. afterward repented of the promise, and she married Azizas, K. of Emesa (*Jos. Ant.* XIX., 9, 1; XX., 7, 1). But Felix, Procurator of Palestine, having been smitten with her beauty, induced her, through Simon the sorcerer, to abandon Azizas, and marry him. By this adulterous act she hoped to escape from unpleasant relations with her sister Berenice, who was envious of Drusilla's beauty. Agrippa, her son to Felix, perished in an eruption of Vesuvius (*Jos. Ant.* XX., 7, 2). It was under Felix that Paul was brought bound from Jerusalem to Cæsarea, whither Felix himself had gone, probably at Drusilla's instance, who as a Jewess may have been curious to hear something concerning the Messiah. Paul improved the occasion by rebuking their sins; but they did not heed his rebuke. HERZOG.*

Drusius, John, born in Oudenaarde, E. Flanders, June 28, 1550; † Feb. 12, 1616 (old style), was a distinguished Orientalist and Exegete. He was one of those scholars who shed renown upon the Universities and schools of Holland, and whose learning was acknowledged by the theologians of Germany, Denmark, and Sweden. In his 10th year his father (whose family name was *van d. Driesche*) sent him to Ghent, where he learned Latin and Greek, and three years later to Louvain, where Corn. Valerius and John Stadius were his teachers. Through the religious strifes of 1567 his father lost most of his large estate, and was compelled to flee to England (*CURIANDER, vita Drusii*, p. 34). His mother, a strict Romanist, would not allow her son to follow, but sent him to Tournai. But near the close of 1567 he escaped to London, and joined his father. There *A. R. le Chevalier* taught him Hebrew, and on his becoming Prof. of Hebrew in Cambridge took young Drusius with him into his own house. In 1571 he returned to London, and soon received calls to desirable posts in Oxford and Cambridge. He chose Oxford, and there, in his 22d year, became Prof. of the Oriental languages, and taught for four years with great success. Then he went to Louvain to study jurisprudence. Religious wars again breaking out, he once more repaired to his father in London. After the Peace of Ghent he returned with his father, 1576, to Belgium. He declined the offer of a civil office, but in 1577 became Prof. of the Oriental languages in Leyden. In Leyden he married, 1580, *Maria van d. Varent* (Varentia), a Romanist; she, soon afterwards, became a Protestant. As, notwithstanding the desires of the Prince of Orange, the Board in Leyden made no effort to retain D. in the University, and he wished to be more free of pecuniary anxieties, he accepted a call to Franeker, as Prof. of Hebrew, and remained there until his death. That he could not pursue his labors in perfect quietness is clear

from his description of himself: *Non sum theologus; an Grammatici nomen, quod aliquando probose mihi objectum, tueri possem, nescio. Amici, quos nosti, negant: ego non contradico. Quid igitur es, inquit? Christianus sum, φιλαλῆς sum, qui scribendo proficio et proficiendo scribo* (*Drusii tetragrammaton*, Franeker, 1604, p. 81). But his learning and ability were acknowledged by all whose judgment was not obscured by theological prejudices. In 1596 the authorities of Friesland appointed a commission to prepare a new version of the Dutch Bible, and D. was recommended for this work by Arminius and Uytenbogard. The movement, however, failed. In 1600 the States General employed him to write annotations upon difficult passages in the Q. T. The work proceeded slowly. He suffered annoying interruptions from the enemies of Arminius, whose errors he was suspected of favoring. During his lifetime only a small portion of these Annotations was published. Those upon the Pentateuch were published posthumously by Amama and others, Franeker, 1617, 4to.; those on Joshua, Judges, and Samuel, Fran., 1618, 4to.; on the 12 Prophets, Fran., 1627, 4to.; on Job, Fran., 1636. In the *Criticis Sacris* they follow those of Seb. Münster, Paul Fagius, Vatablus, Castalio, and Clarius; they are among the best in this great collection (Cf. RICHARD SIMON, *hist. critique du V. T.*: Paris, 1680, p. 499).—For a list of D.'s writings, mostly exegetical, see MEURSIUS, *Athenæ Bat.*, p. 254; VRIEMOET, *Athen. Frisiac. libri*. II., p. 59, &c.; NICERON, *Mémoires*, &c., XXII., p. 67.—Upon his life, besides the works named: *Vit. operumque J. Dr. edit. et nondum editorum delineatio*, &c., per ABELUM CURIANDRUM: Fran., 1616; BAYLE; THOLUCK d. akad. Leben d. 17. Jahrh., II., 377, Note 11. BERTHEAU.*

Druthmar, Christian, surnamed *Grammaticus*, for his learning, lived in the ninth century; was first a monk of Corvey; about 860 he went to Liege, expounded the S.S. to the monks there, and wrote for them a commentary upon Matthew, remarkable for clearness, and the prominence given to the historical sense, as the *fundamentum omnis intelligentie*, to which the mystical must be subordinate. The first ed., by Wimpheling, 1514, Strassburg, is lost; a second was issued by Seeger, Hagenua, 1530; this was adopted in the *Bibl. patrum* (T. IX.), and the Lyons *M. Bibl. patr.* (T. XV.). It has the expression: *hoc est corpus meum, i. e., in sacramento, and transferens spiritualiter corpus in panem, et sanguinem in vinum*. But Sixtus, of Sienna, found it in a cod. of the Franciscan library in Lyons, thus: *h. e. c. m., i. e., vere in sacramento subsistens, and transferens corpus in panem et vinum in sanguinem*. Protestants and Romanists each claim him for their peculiar view. HERZOG.*

Dubosc, Peter, born at Bayeux, 1623, a clergyman of the Reformed C., distinguished for his pulpit talents. From 1646 to 1685 he preached in Caen. The parliament of Rouen then forbade him to exercise his office longer in France. He went to Holland, was honorably received by the Prince of Orange, and preached in Rotterdam. He died Jan. 2, 1692.—2 vols. of his sermons were publ. in Rotterdam, 1692, 8vo., and

4 vols. in do., 1701, 8vo. His stepson, Legendre, publ. his life, with a selection of Discourses, &c., Rotterdam, 1694, 8vo.; enlarged 1716, 8vo.—See Bayle. C. SCHMIDT.*

Du Fresne (du Cange), the father of the French history of the Middle-ages, born Dec. 18, 1610, at Amiens, gave early signs of remarkable talents, which were carefully cultivated by his father, in the Jesuit College at Amiens, and further developed at the University of Orleans, where he studied Jurisprudence. In 1631 already he became an advocate, but never plead. Mediæval history absorbed his attention. Through modesty, however, he long refused to publish any of his writings. The solicitations of friends were answered with: *Mihi cano, et Musis*. His first work appeared in 1657: *Hist. de l'empire de Constantinople sous les empereurs françois*. Though well received eight years passed before he issued a second work; but thenceforth he often appeared in print. His literary labors were a source of pleasure to him. He freely allowed others to use the results of his researches. The value of his labors can only be estimated by considering that to this day little had been done in this department of study. There was, as yet, no Chronology, Numismatics, Archæology, Paleography, and Geography of the mediæval period.—The published and unpublished works of Du F. embrace not only the general history of Europe during the Middle Ages, but refer to the history of France, and especially of the Byzantine empire. Of his unpublished writings upon these subjects recent scholars have made use as though they were the fruits of their own researches. His chief works are the *Glossaries mediæ et infimæ latinitatis*, and *mediæ et infimæ græcitalis*. They are real Encyclopedias of the Byzant. empire. The Latin Gloss. appeared 1) in Paris, 1678, 3 vols. fol.; 2) in Franf. on the M., 1681 and 1710, 3 vols. fol.; 3) in Venice, 1733–36, 6 vols. fol. *Opera et studio Monach. O. S. Bened.*; 4) taken from this last is the ed. of 1762. The Bened. Carpentier added a suppl. in 4 vols. in 1766; 5) an abstract from Du F. and Carpentier's works, Halle, 1772–84, 6 vols., by Adelung; 6) the latest ed. by HENSCHEL, *cum suppl. integris Carpent. et additam. Adelungii et al.*, 7 Thm. Par., 1840–50, *Firmin Didot*.—The Greek Gloss. appeared, Par., 1688, 2 vols. fol.—His last work, completed after his death, was the editing of *Chron. Puschale*, Par., 1688; Venice, 1729.—(See PERRAULT in the *Journal d. savants*; Du PIN, *bibl. d. auteurs eccles.*; NICERON, CHAUFFÉ, and especially LEON FAUGÈRE, *essai sur la vie et les ouvr. de Du Cange*, Par., 1852).

HERZOG.*

Du Moulin, Peter (Molinaeus), a distinguished controversialist of the French Reformed Church, was born in 1568. As a youth he narrowly escaped the massacre of St. Bartholomew. After pursuing his studies at Sedan and in Paris, he fled to England in 1588, and in 1592 went to Leyden, where he became a teacher of the ancient languages, and in a short time Professor of Philosophy. But feeling under obligation to serve the church of his native country, he returned to Paris in 1599, obtained ordination, and accepted a chaplaincy at Charenton,

from Catharine, the wife of Duke Henry of Bar, and sister of Henry IV. He had numerous disputations with Romanists, and many of his works upon the points of controversy between Protestantism and Romanism were published.¹ Catharine soon died, and Du M. returned to Paris. He was urged to accept a call to Leyden, but preferred to remain in Paris. Subsequently Tilenus, Prof. of Theology at Sedan, charged him with ubiquitarianism. A long and angry controversy arose, which was not settled until 1617. Meanwhile Du M. prosecuted his polemics against Romanism with untiring zeal, as the dates of his works, in the annexed list, will show. In 1617 the National Synod of Vitré appointed him, with several other theologians, to draw a plan of union for the Reformed Churches, and to propose it to the Synod of Dort. But they did not obtain the king's permission to visit the Synod. Du M., therefore, sent in a memorial against Arminianism (*Anatomie de l'Armin.*: Leyden, 1619, and often), for which the Synod voted thanks. At the Synod of Alais, 1620, he likewise denounced Arminianism. This course involved him in disputes with the Remonstrants. About the same time he was accused of interference in politics, for which Louis XIII. deprived him of his place. He went to Sedan, and obtained an appointment from the Duke of Bouillon. In Sedan he wrote several religious tracts. From Sedan he went to London, but returned to S. in 1626, became Prof. of Theology, and there spent the rest of his life. He died March 10, 1658. The only biography of him is the small work of ARMAND, *Essai sur la vie de D.*, &c.: Strassb., 1846, 8vo. He had several sons. The oldest, Peter, was also a theological writer. He lived in England, where he became a Royal Chaplain and Canon of Canterbury. He died in 1684, aged 84. His principal works are: *Vindication of the Sin-*

cerity of the Prot. Religion, and *De la paix de l'âme et du contentement de l'esprit*, new ed.: Amsterd., 1675, 18mo., Paris, 1840, 8vo.

C. SCHMIDT.*

Dungal. — In the Art. upon Claudius of Turin, the Scot Dungal is referred to. Of his life little is known. Some notices of a Dungal, recluse of the Abbey of St. Denis, are found in the *Hist. littéraire de la France*, IV., 493, which ascribe to him the *Responsa contra perversas Claudii sententias*, of 828 (printed in the *Bibl. PP. Max. XIV.*). But this Dungal was probably the author only of some Latin poems (in MARTENE ET DURAND, *ampliss. collectio*, &c., VI., 811, &c.), and an *Epist. ad Carolum M. de duplici eclipsi solari* (in D'ACHERY, *Spicilegium*, III., 324, new ed.). The *Responsa* were more probably written by the Dungal mentioned in a decree of Lothaire, 823, as teacher in Pavia. The *Responsa*, addressed to Louis the Pious, and Lothaire, his son, oppose the views of Claudius, and defend the adoration of saints, the cross, relics, &c.; but warn against its degenerating into superstitious worship.

C. SCHMIDT.*

Dunin, (Martin of,) Archbishop of Gnesen, Poland, was born Nov. 11, 1774, in Val, near Xava, and finished his studies at Rome, and became a priest, 1793–97, and having been appointed Canon, first in Wislica, then in Cujavien, 1808 in Gnesen, 1824 in Posen, and, after the death of the Archbishop of Wolicki (1829), administrator of the diocese, and, in 1831, Archbishop, died Dec. 26, 1842. The controversy touching mixed marriages invested the episcopal reign of D. with special importance. To ignore the canonical laws of Rome on this subject (see Art.), which obtained in the Polish dioceses and had been strenuously enforced by Benedict XIV., in decrees of June 29, and Aug. 8, 1748 (*Bullarium Magnum ed. Luxemburg.*, tom. XVII., fol. 230, 272), Russia, Prussia, Denmark, England and Sweden entered into a treaty with Poland at Warsaw, Feb. 13 (24), 1768, which ordained that no one should prohibit mixed marriages, that, in the event of issue by such, the sons should be educated in the religion of the fathers, the daughters in that of the mothers, and that the pastor of the bride should perform the marriage ceremony. See the testimony of Dunin in "Jacobson on mixed marriages in Germany and Prussia," Leips., 1838, p. 45. Though the Papal chair never formally approved them, necessity compelled it for the time being to connive at them, whilst it laid hold on every favorable opportunity for the carrying out of its principles. With 1815 began a reaction, and the Romish Church strove to regain its lost ground. In obedience to a brief from Pius VII., Oct. 31, 1819, the clergy of the Rhine province, Prussia, made arrangements for the enforcement of the canonical laws; and to bring about a proper understanding between conflicting parties, Pius issued another brief, March 25, 1830. Having been refused the liberty of acting according to the principles of his church, Dunin determined to abolish the regulations above-mentioned, touching mixed marriages, and addressed two circulars to his clergy, one in the Polish, Jan. 30, 1838, the other

¹ *NARRÉ de la conférence verbale et par écrit, tenue entre Mess. P. Du M. et Cuyet (sic) par Archib. Adaire*, &c.: Geneva, 1533, 8vo. *Cartel, de deffy du sieur de Dunin*, &c., &c.: Gen. 1636, 8vo. — *Eaux de Siloë pour éteindre le purgatoire*, 1602, and *Accroissement des eaux de Siloë*, &c., &c.: Laroche, 1604, 8vo. — *Trente-deux demandes proposées par le P. Cotton*, &c., &c.: Laroche, 1607, 8vo.: Gen., 1635, 8vo. — *Véritable narré de la conf. entre les sieurs Du M. et Gontier*, 1609: Gen., 1635, 8vo. — *Anatomie du livre du sieur Cuvetteau*, &c.: Gen., 1625, 8vo. — *Accomplissem. des prophéties*: Laroche, 1612, 8vo., Sedan, 1624, 8vo. — *De monarchia temporalis papae*: London, 8vo. — *Défense de la confession de l'Eglise réformée de France*: Charenton, 1617, 8vo. — *Bouclier de la foy*: Char., 1617, 8vo., 3d ed., 1619, Gen., 1624, 8vo.; in German: Bremen, 1643, 8vo. — *Fuites et evasions du sieur Arnoux, jésuite*: Char., 1619, 8vo. — *Nouveauté du papiisme opposée à l'antiquité du vray christianisme*: Sedan, 1627, 4to., 3d ed., Gen., 1633, 4to., rich in historical material. — *De tradit. et de la perfection de l'Ecriture sainte*: Sedan, 1631, 8vo., and Gen., 1632, 8vo. — *Theses de imaginibus et idolis*, &c., in the *Thesaurus disput. theol.*: Sedan., I., 262, &c. — *Strigil adv. Comment. Grotii ad loca de Antichristo*, under the assumed name: Hippol. Fronto Caracolla, Amst., 1640, 8vo. — Against Amyraut: *Examen de la doctrine de Mess. Amyraut et Testard*, &c.: Amst., 1638, 8vo. — *Eclaircissement des controverses Salmuriennes*, &c.: Leyden, 1648, 8vo. — *Dix décades de sermons*: Gen., 1643, &c., 8vo. — For other works, of which the titles are imperfectly given, see *Aymon, Synodes nationaux de France*, II., 273, &c.

in the Latin language, Feb. 27. Now ensued a conflict between him and the government, and a legal investigation was the result, June 25, 1838. Imprisonment for half a year, and deposition from office was the punishment imposed by the Court of Posen, Feb. 23, 1839. Having quit his confinement to attend to the duties of his office, he was captured and taken to Colberg, where he lived till the King's death. Promising to modify his earlier circulars, he was restored to his post by Fred. William IV., Aug., 1840. The circulars of 1837 had ordained that, unless the non-Romish party would promise that the children should be educated in the Romish faith, no priest could assist at the wedding, under penalty of suspension. On Aug. 27, 1840, was issued an archiepiscopal decree, according to which priests were not to exact a promise, but to refuse their presence and aid. In 1841 the Archbishop had ordained that a Romanist contracting a mixed marriage should be excluded from the use of the sacraments; but, in a pastoral of 1842, left this matter to the discretion of the priest. Thus did the Romish principle finally triumph. For a statement of the views of Church and State touching the point in dispute, viz., the right of the civil power to meddle with things spiritual, see the Papal allocution, Sept. 13, 1838, and the *Publicandum* of the government, Dec. 30. See *Rintel*, *Vindic. of M. v. Dunin*, Arch., Würzburg, 1839, p. 154, 210; also *Biogr.*, by *Pohl*, M. v. Dunin, Marienb., 1843.

H. F. JACOBSON.—*Ermentrout*.

Duns, John Scotus, born, according to some, at Duns, on the southern boundary of Scotland, according to others, in Dunston, Northumberland; the time of his birth as well as of his entrance into the Franciscan order are unknown. Having first taught in Oxford, he went, probably in 1301, to Paris, where he was made Doctor of Theology, and vindicated the immaculate conception of the Virgin against the Dominicans. He died at Cologne, 1308, whither he had been sent to combat the Beghards, 1308. Making use of Aristotle's writings, and his Arabic commentators, and of the traditions of the Church, Duns, who was endowed with special philosophic talents, elaborated his own theological system, which stood opposed to that of Anselm and Richard St. Victor, of Thomas Aquinas, and his disciples. Adopting the faith of the Church, he believed the Scriptures only on her authority, and that only in union with her could man fulfil his mission, and receive the proper forgiveness of sin. As the knowledge of things natural could only be deduced from God, in whom everything had its being, he regarded theology as the highest science. Though man could not attain to his last end without a supernatural revelation and grace, D. also maintained that his salvation could not be accomplished without his co-operation. God imparts in a supernatural way theological knowledge which is satisfactorily recorded in Holy Writ, and, as man cannot unaided attain to the idea of the vision of God, a revelation becomes an indispensable necessity. The idea held by the Church in his time that, besides the conviction on the part of individuals of the objects of faith, God wrought *with absolute necessity* in the soul of each man the saving faith, he denied.

In opposition to Anselm's ontological argument for the existence of God, he laid main stress on the teleological, and held that neither the Almightiness of God—but simply his Eternity—nor the Trinity, could be demonstrated by any natural proof. To comprehend God is impossible for mortals whilst on earth, the words used to describe Him being accidents and not substances. Whilst acknowledging the simplicity of God, he also confessed to a certain manifoldness which he discovered in the development of the Divine attributes, of the Persons, and in His creative energy. Touching the world and its creation, D. taught a conditioned necessity, and so also a beginning. The eternity of the Divine will, which refers to God alone, does not condition the eternity of His operations which relate to creation. Only the will of God regarded as a Trinity, can be predicated of Him as such, and it alone is essential when referred to His being. The knowledge of the good, not the reason of God, determining the operation of His will. God did not create the world on account of the good, but the world is good because He made it. Still, as God cannot change, His will touching creation is eternal. As He imparts His essence to others, Thomas is wrong in asserting that He knows all things in His being. Duns distinguishes between a primary reason of God, as His knowledge of Himself, and a secondary one, as the knowledge of contingent things.

Touching redemption D. regards God as the end of man, to be reached by Divine love; the means for its attainment being accidental, as God might have selected others different from those really employed. Morality is almost entirely dependent on the Divine commands, nor is the love of one's neighbor necessarily connected with the love of God. As the unchangeable object of the human will God has determined Himself, the means for reaching this being dependent on our choice. There is in us a natural craving after perfection—God—and a free craving, both of which, however, must be made to co-operate. Man being destined for the highest good, he must possess a capacity for the infinite. In opposition to Thomas, Duns taught that, in order to be happy, the understanding, which, according to the former, cannot comprehend anything beyond itself, must be able to know everything. To the full, complete knowledge of God, man can only attain by degrees. The soul being simply the subject of knowledge, in order to know requires an object. Individuals are something real; rational souls are pure forms, joined to matter capable of perfection. If it were necessary to understand general principles, God would always have to enlighten man in a supernatural way. According to D. freedom and necessity are by no means irreconcilable, since God, though free, yet necessarily desires the good, and created nature does not destroy liberty! He held to predestination in the strictest sense, which, however, was not to be regarded as a temporary, or transient thing. As the Divine decree is independent of man, he declared himself unable to explain the reprobation of the bad. In common with all the Scholastics, D. distinguished moral and theological

virtues and three classes of works, viz., good works in general, such as sprung from love to the Divine commands and moral feelings, and such as proceeded from grace—which last alone deserve to be rewarded. Whilst acknowledging original sin, he disconnects it from the supernatural gift of grace. To effect our salvation, there must exist between the desire and the will a perfect harmony which can be brought to pass only by a supernatural power. Sin is a turning away of the will from God and to the creature. In the sacraments D. saw a supernatural power. Whilst in the body, man can aspire after eternal life, but cannot really possess it. The certainty of immortality is rooted in the Divine decree; and as different persons are differently prepared for happiness, their salvation must also be different.

The most complete edition of his works—containing, however, some writings falsely ascribed to him is by the Franciscan Wadding (Lugd., 1639, T. I.—XII., fol.) Most important of these in T. V.—X., *in tres primos libros et in quartum Sententiarum Commentaria* (so-called *opus Oxoniense*) and in the T., XI. *opus Parisiense s. quæstiones reportatæ in IV., liber. sententiarum*, and *Quæstiones quodlibetales*, XXI.—A *Summa theol. ex Scoti operibus*, by the Franciscan Jerome de Fortino, in six fol. A valuable work is—*F. El. Albergoni, resolutio doctrinæ Scoticæ*: Lugd., 1643, 8vo. Also, *Controversiæ theologicæ inter S. Thomam et Scotum, in quibus pugnantēs sententiæ referuntur, potiores difficultates elucidantur et responsiones ad argumenta Scoti rejiciuntur*, auct. Joanne de Rada: Venet. 1599, 4to.

On the Theology of Duns, Baumgarten-Crusius has written *de theol. Scotæ*: Jen., 1826, 4to., whilst his philosophical system has been discussed by Ritter. De Rada has compressed into fifty questions the points of difference between the Thomists and the Scotists, the following being especially important: I. 28, *Utrum Deus sit in omnibus rebus?* I. 29, *Utrum Deus intelligat distincte omnia alia a se?* I. 30, *An Deus cognoscat futura contingentia?* II. 3, *An principium individuationis substantiæ materialis sit materia?* II. 15, *An homo in statu innocentie fuisset simpliciter incorruptibilis?*

ENGELHARDT.—*Ermentrout*.

Dunstan, Archbishop of Canterbury, son of Heorstan and Cynedrid, born of a noble family in the reign of King Athelstan, according to Bridfert, more accurately, accord. to Osbern, in 925, in the neighborhood of Glastenbury, where he received the rudiments of his education at the hands of Irish monks, who taught in the cloister of this town. His talents attracted the notice of the King, who invited him to his court. The jealousy of the other sons of noblemen, who accused him "*avilæ gentilitatis vanissima dediciisse carmina et historiarum frivolas colere incantationum nœnias*," procured his expulsion from the royal presence.¹—Having entered the cloister

as a monk, he applied himself to the Holy Scriptures and the Fathers, and divers arts, such as painting, writing, playing on the harp, and, perhaps, also working in metals. The fame of his piety drew to Glastenb. the widow Ethelfleda—a relative of his and of the royal family—who made him her confessor and the heir of her estates. Jealousy drove him from the court of King Edmund (940–46), who, influenced by his blameless life and eloquence, had given him an honorable place in the royal house. Repenting of the injustice done D., the king made him abbot of Glastenbury, and placed him with his own hands on the "*sacerdotalis cathedra*," about 942 or 943, or, as is most probable, 946.—With a view to the reformation of the monasteries, D. introduced in Glastenb. the rule of St. Benedict, and wrote an *Expositio Regulæ Benedicti*—to be found in the British Museum (Bibl. Reg., 10, A, XIII.; 4, and 212 pages).—with etymological and grammatical explanations, which prove him to have been for his age a remarkable scholar. He established a cloister-school, in which were educated men like Ethelwold, who himself modelled the cloister Abingdon after the pattern of Glastenb., and, as Bishop of Winchester, taught the young and composed books in the Saxon language. The wealth D. inherited from Ethelfleda, he applied to the poor and the enlargement of his cloister. The death of Edred, whose counsellor he was, was unfortunate for D. no amicable relations subsisting between him and the new king, Edwy; he took refuge in Flanders with Count Arnulf, and in the cloister Blandinium, near Ghent. The Benedictines were also expelled and their monasteries plundered. The avarice of Edwy knew no bounds. He robbed his mother and grandmother, and rendered himself so detestable that the country, north of the Thames, revolted, and made his younger brother, Edgar, king (957), who recalled D. from banishment. The Synod of Bradford elected him Bishop, and put the bishopric of Worcester and London under his care, 958. On the death of Edwy, 959, Edgar became sole sovereign. In 959 D. became Archbishop of Canterbury, in which capacity he acted for thirty years. That amid the many vicissitudes, and the dangers that beset the kingdom during the reign of Edgar, Dunstan guided its affairs to a successful issue, shows that the confidence placed in him by the King was not misplaced. In order to effect his Church-reforms, he filled up vacancies with men of like mind with himself. Aided by men like Oswald, Bishop of Worcester (960–72), and afterward Archbishop of York (972–992), and Ethelwold, Bishop of Winchester (962–84), D. enforced the Benedictine rule. As immorality of every kind abounded among the clergy, it was no easy matter to suppress it. In the place of priests who misbehaved, he put monks who were willing to do what was right and proper. With the death of Edgar, 975, however, began new troubles. To prevent the succession of Edward, his oldest son, the enemies of Dunstan urged the claims of the younger son, Ethelred, and, though overcome, flew to arms in Mercia, and banished the Benedictines. Edward at last fell a victim to the sword of an assassin (978),

¹ A specimen of his skill is in the Bodleian Lib. Oxford (D. 11, 19, cf. Hick. Thesaur. I., 144)—a picture of Christ—who has in his left hand a book with the words: *Venite filii, audite me, timorem Dei docebo vos*, and a staff in the right with the inscription: *Virga recta est—virga regnabitur*. At the feet of Jesus, clothed in a gown, kneels Dunstan.

and Ethelred became king. D., however, continued to hold the reins of government till his death, May 19, 988. His remains lie in the cathedral church of Canterbury.

Endowed by nature with a rich genius and an inflexible will, a learned and accomplished man, D. was well qualified for the conspicuous position he was called upon to occupy. He led a blameless, ascetical life. Deficient in mildness and humility, he pursued his purposes regardless of consequences. And yet it may be said, that his character, made up as it was of good and bad elements, fitted him for his mission, which was to reform the Church and elevate the State. His idea of a reformation was, perhaps, too contracted, as he seemed to be satisfied with the mere enforcement of the Benedictine rule. It must not be forgotten, however, that he labored successfully for the promotion of sound learning. The rapid degradation of the country, consequent upon his death, proves that its glory was owing to the wisdom of his government.—Whilst some consider him a saint and the greatest man of his age, others—particularly writers since the Reformation—look upon him as an ambitious prelate, whose only object was to subject the State to the Church, and this to Rome. They who charge him with having introduced celibacy forget that the monks who converted the Saxons practised it; and that it was enforced in the 8th cent. under pain of the severest punishments. It is a mistake to regard Edwy as the champion of religious and political freedom—the struggles that agitated his reign having sprung from the opposition of the clergy to the Benedictine rule, and the conflict of parties. Bating his ambition and passionateness, it must be confessed that, in his time, he was the benefactor both of the Church and State.

Sources:—Of biographies (see *Papenbrock*, *Acta SS.* 19 Mai; *Wharton*, *Anglia S.*, II., 88, 211), the most important by the monk Bridferth, of Ransey, also by Osbern, a monk of Canterbury. Comp. the chronicles of the time, particularly the Saxon, and Florence, of Worcester. Of modern authors, Lappenberg (*Hist. of England*, I., 397), and Lingard (*Hist. of the Anglo-S. Church*, II., 266). C. SCHÖLL.—*Ermentrout*.

Duperron, Jacques D., born 1556, in Switzerland, of Reformed parents, apostatized from the evangelical faith, became a Romish priest, and was zealous in making proselytes, and in opposing the Reformed Church. He was especially active in persuading Henry IV. to abjure his faith, and secured his absolution in Rome, 1595. Upon this the Pope made him Bishop of Evroux. In this capacity he labored indofatigably to advance Romanism (see *Duplessis-Mornay*). In 1604 he became Cardinal; in 1606 Almoner of France and Archb. of Sens. He acquired predominant influence in Rome. He died in 1618. His works appeared, 1620–22, in 3 vols. fol., Paris. The first contains his *traité sur l'Eucharistie*, mainly against Duplessis-M. The second, his controversy with James I., of England. The third, miscellanies.—See DUPIN, *nouvelle bibl. d. auteurs ecclés.* XVII., p. 25, &c.

HERZOG.*

Duplessis-Mornay (more accurately, Philip Mornay, Seign. du Plessis-Marly) occupies in

one respect perhaps the most important position among the Reformed of France. Though he may be inferior to Admiral Coligny as a warrior and statesman, and to Agrippa d'Aubigné in general historical and *dramatic* interest, and may possess less attraction than the chaste, *iron-armed*, Francis de la Noue.—still in point of *universality*, his noble qualities made him pre-eminent among the heroes of French Calvinism. He combined harmoniously the warrior, courtier, diplomatist, publicist, financier, and administrator, with the Christian and theologian. Even his Romish antagonists pronounced him “an upright man.”—He was born in 1549 at his ancestral castle Buhi, in the French Vexin, of parents who traced relationship even to the Bourbons. His mother, already, was inclined to the “new views,” and this naturally influenced her son. As the youth was of a studious and investigating disposition, this influence became daily more deeply rooted. He especially delighted in *theology*, and improved all opportunities, particularly during his travels, to extend his knowledge of it. Had not birth, and the circumstances of his family and the times, therefore, led him into a different sphere, he would have acquired reputation as a theologian.—With evangelical impressions, with doubts regarding the old faith, and yet undecided as to the new, thirsting after knowledge and the truth, he was taken, in his 18th year, by his father, who still clung to the Romish C., to Paris, and committed to the tuition of the College de Lisieux. There he found teachers who held the new faith, but had not yet ventured to avow it, the edict of Jan., 1562, granting liberty of conscience, not having been yet published. This threw him the more upon his own independent inquiries after truth. Two years were thus passed, when the death of his father called him home again. A priest who accompanied him was amazed to hear the young man declare his evangelical sentiments. His full decision in favor of the Reformed faith was not made until after the conversion of his mother. This occurred about the time of the Religious Conference of Poissy, 1561, by which his purpose was confirmed. His new faith was now no longer a subject of speculative inquiry, but a quickening power. It also became his banner, which he lowered before no peril or temptation. His maternal uncle, Philip du Bac, B. of Nantes, and afterwards Archb. of Rheims, had previously essayed in vain to influence him by the promise of eccl. preferment. And yet his determination was free of all fanaticism, and joined with a firm, calm earnestness. From 1561 to 1567 he pursued his studies in Paris. His zeal for his religion then constrained him to take arms with the Reformed under Prince Condé. His martial course, however, was soon interrupted by the fracture of a limb in falling from his horse. The peace of Longjumeau, 1568, put an end to hostilities. Mornay, after his recovery, resolved to travel and pursue his studies. He visited Switzerland, Italy, Hungary, Austria, Germany twice, studying jurisprudence at Heidelberg, and finally the Netherlands, in whose controversies with Spain he took the liveliest interest. He had returned to Paris

before the massacre of St. Bartholomew, 1572, and miraculously escaped it. — Passing over other incidents in his history we find him in 1576 with the King of Navarre, afterwards Henry IV. From this time his peculiar talents were more eminently displayed. It would be psychologically interesting to trace the contrast between Henry and Mornay. But our limits forbid this. M. was Henry's counsellor and agent in every important act of diplomacy and administration; he wrote the most important State papers.

The Calvinism of M. was the strict moral Calvinism of the so-called "Consistorial" party, designated by later writers "puritanic;" he held the correct mean between the harsh, repulsive, republican tendency of d'Aubigné, and the political religion of Sully. Without conniving at Henry's moral delinquencies, he did not rebuke them with bitterness. Hence his influence with the King. He was a sort of moral, religious, and ecclesiastical conscience enveloping the King; and it is to the latter's praise, that he so long retained so faithful and upright a counsellor. But after Henry abjured the Reformed faith, a separation between them became unavoidable. — In 1598 M., who had retired from the atmosphere of the court to Saurmur, issued an extensive work upon the Eucharist, addressed to the "Magnates of the Romish C.," and full of citations from the Greek and Latin Fathers, scholastics, and other Church teachers. A glance at the book proves that the author's design was to disprove transubstantiation by the authorities usually quoted in its support. The plan of the argument and the fine style of the author, made the work peculiarly dangerous and obnoxious. It naturally, therefore, caused great excitement among the advocates of Romanism, and even at Rome itself. How should it be refuted? A public discussion might only increase the evil, by calling out a longer array of patristic proofs. The best that could be done would be to convict M. of having falsified his quotations. Duperron was charged with this duty. He pointed out 500 such misquotations. Henry, whose sincerity in abjuring Protestantism was still suspected, gladly seized this opportunity of gaining the confidence of the Romish party, and subjected M. to a public humiliation. M. requested an investigation. A commission of laymen, of both religions, was appointed. But the King's partiality appeared in their selection; for those on the Reformed side were not trustworthy. M. sadly foresaw the issue. A list of the misquotations was not handed to him until 1 A. M. of the day of the conference, known as that of Fontainebleau, May 4, 1600. Duperron opened it. M., weary with the toils of the night in searching out and comparing the errors of quotation charged upon him, seemed poorly qualified to reply. And yet De Thou, a Romish member of the commission, reports, that the 500 misquotations were reduced to sixty-one, and that altogether but a slight victory was gained by M.'s opponents.

Instead of being driven from the field by the result of this conference, M. engaged in the theological conflicts with increased energy. He

published a "History of Popery"¹ with allegorical illustrations. It was a masterpiece of polemics. But his exaggerations and prognostications put a weapon of ridicule into his opponent's hands, of which they made effectual use. — Notwithstanding the polemical spirit exhibited in these works, M. advocated peace and union among the Reformed churches themselves. During the Synod of Dort he addressed letters to members attending it, in which he deprecated the theological strifes which then agitated Holland. — The reputation of the Oracle, or "the Pope of the Huguenots," as M. was called, rests, therefore, upon a better basis than merely his polemical activity. He participated most actively in all the important plans and operations of the Reformed, and not only effected a living union between the native and foreign churches, but often succeeded in restraining the stormy zeal of his French brethren. But he could not keep them from ultimately vindicating their rights by an appeal to arms. Indeed he cannot be wholly defended from the charge of inconsistency, in having expressed, in a letter to Louis XIII., of April 24, 1617, his approbation of the murder of Marshall d'Ancre.

The last years of M. were overcast with manifold trials, to which, however, his faith proved superior. In 1605 his promising son fell in the siege of Guelders. The condition of his country and Church waxed daily worse. In 1621, by an act of revolting perfidy, he was driven from Saurmur. The indemnification offered to him in 1623 he declined. This was the year of his death, the circumstances of which, his dying words, &c., are full of instruction. His will is an interesting document. It can be said without exaggeration that *with Duplessis-Mornay was buried the counselling guardian, and warning genius of the French Reformed Church.*

In addition to the works already named he wrote: 1) *Traité de vie et de la mort*: Genève, 1575, written at the request of his bride. 2) *Traité de l'Eglise, auquel sont disputées les principales questions qui ont esté meues sur ce point en notre temps*: Gen., 1579. 3) *Méditation Chret. sur quatre Psaumes du Prophete David*, 1591. 4) *Mémoires*, with the "Suite," and "Supplement," ed. by Elzevir, 4 vols., 4to. This ed. is imperfect. So is that of 1824, by Anguis (see *Bulletin de la Soc. de l'Hist. du Prot. Français: Deuxième Année.*, p. 100–107, &c., and p. 630, 640, 649, also 1 Année, p. 292, 239). — Literature: 1) "*Hist. de la vie de M. Philip. de Mornay*, A. Leyde, 1647." "*Les dernières heures*,"

¹ "*Le mystère d'iniquité, c'est-à-dire l'Histoire de la Papauté.*" A Latin ed. without illustrations, entitled: "*Mysterium Iniquitatis, seu Historia Papatus. Quibus gradibus ad id fastigii enisus sit, quamque acriter omni tempore ubique a piis contra intercessum. Asseruntur etiam jura Imperatorum, Regum et Principum Christianorum adversus Bellarminum et Baronium Cardinales.* Auct. Phil. Mornayo ; 2d ed., locupletior, ab ipso Auct. recognita: Salmurii, 1612. This work, according to M.'s biogr., was the result of less than nine months' labor, and, to save his eyes, was dictated. The Latin transl. was the work of five months, also dictated; and so rapidly that his amanuensis could hardly keep pace with him. This explains the inaccuracy of the citations and dates charged upon him.

&c., at the end are by *Dailé*. 2) "*Dupl.-M., ou Etudes historiques et politiques sur la situation de la France de 1549 à 1623, par Joachim Aubert, Officier supérieur. Deuxième Ed.: Paris, 1848,*" with a Portrait and fac-simile. More popular than critical. 3) *Dupl.-M. et son époque*. In the *Semeur* of 1848; very good. 4) *Bibl. universelle*. Besides these there are: a biogr. by his wife, an "*Éloge, &c., par Henri Duval, couronné par l'Athénée de Niort*" in the "*Recueil*" of this society, and specially in 1809, and in the "*Vies de plusieurs anciens seigneurs de la maison de M., par R. de Mornay de la Villet., 1689.*" V. POLENZ.*

Duræus, John (properly *Durie* or *Dury*), born 1595 or 1596, in Edinburgh, died Sept. 28, 1680, in Cassel (according to *Strieder*, hess. Gelehrten-gesch., II., 418), was a Presbyterian clergyman, who devoted his long life to the cause of union among Protestants. His father, banished for opposing James VI., and his introduction of Scotch bishops, went to Leyden, and became the pastor of English and Scotch refugees there. After young D. had finished his studies at Oxford, he also went to the continent, and took charge of some English settlers in Elbing, just when Gustavus Adolphus took that city from the Poles. There, about 1628, a plan of union of the Lutherans and Reformed, was submitted to his consideration, by the Swedish jurist, Caspar Godemann. Thus began his peculiar career. About the same time Sir Thomas Roe reached Elbing as ambassador, and became interested in D.'s union schemes. The fair prospects opened by the union religious conference in Leipsic, 1631, seemed full of promise for the success of these schemes. D., therefore, began what he considered the mission of his life with great confidence. He made several journeys to England and back again, in the zealous prosecution of the object. But though he persuaded many to examine his plans, and succeeded in enlisting the sympathy and co-operation of influential members of the various conflicting parties, he had at last to look back with grief upon a long life spent in fruitless efforts. (See *Diss. de Jo. Duræo, pacificatore celebr., maxime de actis ejus Seucanis: Helmst., 1744, 4to.,* mainly by MOSHEIM (cf. *Institt. H. E., p. 929,* and PFAFF, *hist. lit. theol., II., 184*); *Bibl. Brit., Edinb., 1824, I., 324. f. — k.*) HENKE.*

Durand de St. Pourçain entered the Dominican order in Clermont, Auvergne, taught for a time in Paris, then at Avignon, in 1318 was made B. of Annecy, by John XXII., and in 1326 B. of Meaux, where he died in 1333. He wrote a comm. upon Lombard's sentences, a treatise *de orig. jurisdict. quibus populus regitur*, and one *de statu animarum post separationem a corpore*, occasioned by a declaration of John XXII., in a sermon, that the souls of saints cannot clearly see the nature of God before the day of judgment, and that their present views of it will then cease. D. was summoned before the Pope for opposing this opinion, but escaped a verdict through the mediation of the King of France.—Durand was the first Thomist nominalist, and fully exhibits the nominalism of the 14th cent. Earlier scholastics had assumed, as nominalists, that human knowledge served as a pre-

parative for revelation, and that the reason might comprehend the will of God as set forth in nature. The nominalists of the 14th cent., D. included, pronounced this a presumptuous claim. This caused a total separation of theology from philosophy. Nominalism maintained that all knowledge of God's will must be derived from the sacred Scriptures, as interpreted by Rome. Thus rationalism, philosophy, pietism, and practical as well as speculative mysticism were at once excluded, and the exegetical, and doctrinal authority of the Romish court fully asserted. Faith in the Bible was faith in Rome, and this faith transcended all demonstration. D. denied the opinion of Thomas Aquinas, that the reasonableness of the doctrines might be proven, or that inspiration might supersede faith, and that the system of faith could not contain impossibilities. D. referred to the doctrine of the Trinity, and held that faith was meritorious in proportion to its difficulties. He did not regard even theology as the loftiest science, because the knowledge of believers surpassed it; nay, he could not consistently consider it a science, because it rested ultimately upon the articles of faith, not upon scientific principles. It is chiefly valuable as a practical discipline. God cannot be the subject of theology, because then predicates, of which God would be the subject, would have to be pronounced by theology, and thus the infinite be taken into our finite spirits. Its only office is to point out, from the SS., the way of life; it has to do therefore with man's will as a practical science. God is, indeed, the chief object of its teaching, but not God *per se*, but God in his relation to creatures, so far as the knowledge of this relation promotes man's salvation. Man's highest end is to enjoy God; this presupposes knowledge, but is an act of the will, not of the reason. D. wholly denies an abstract knowledge of God; sensuous objects never exhibit the essence of God; the supernatural can never manifest itself through the natural. D. seems to contradict himself, by proving the existence of God from our experimental knowledge of created things; but the contradiction is solved by his declaration, that it is not God's nature, but only his relation to external things, which can thus be shown.—The difficulties of D.'s system continue to this day to perplex the minds of theologians.

His Comm. on Lombard was publ.: Paris, 1508, fol.; Venice, 1571, fol. An abstract of his tract against John XXII., was publ. by Raynaldus, 1333, § 48–69, with the inscription: *libellus episcopi Meldensis*. According to Oudin Durand wrote two Comm. upon Lombard; one whilst a Dominican, the other whilst he was Bishop; the second is the one printed, and the first to be found, with his other writings, in MS., in Paris. ENGELHARDT.*

Du Vergier (or *du Verger*), called *St. Cyr* after the monastery in Brenne, Poitou, of which he became abbot, studied theology at Louvain, where special attention was paid to the Church Fathers, particularly Augustine. He formed an intimate and lasting friendship, in 1605, in Paris, with C. Jansen, a pupil of Louvain. Their dislike of the dominant scholasticism of the Paris University constrained them to seek

pure and sound doctrine in the Fathers. From 1611-1616 they lived together at a country-place near Bayonne. In 1617 Jansen returned to Louvain.—Cardinal Richelieu characterized St. Cyran as a man full of fire. St. Beuve said he had more fire than flame. The two friends maintained constant correspondence with each other. In his letters St. C. declares emphatically that he feels no less "*esprit de principauté*" than one who aimed at universal empire (Richelieu?). He sought, also, to inflame Vincent de Paula with his ideas of reform, to whom he once said: "I confess to you God has greatly enlightened me, and given me to understand that there is no Church—has been none for five or six hundred years. Formerly the C. was a great stream of pure water; now it is all filth. The channel is the same, but the waters have changed." To others he said: "The Council of Trent was mainly a political assembly;" and "the first scholastics, and St. Thomas himself, caused the greatest disorders."—At the same time he enveloped himself in mystery, and did not despise political arts. After 1621 Jansen and he corresponded in a secret language.—He was invited to become Court-preacher to Henrietta, the wife of Charles I. The position may have led him to assert Gallic principles for the Catholic C. in England, in

opposition to the infringement of the Jesuits upon the jurisdiction of the Bishops, in his chief work upon Eccl. Law, under the name of *Peter Aurelius*. The *assemblée générale du clergé* thankfully adopted the book, and had it published twice, 1641, 1646, at their own expense. (*Petri Aurelii theologi opera, jussu et impensis cleri gallicani denuo in lucem edita, Parisiis, 1646, excudebat Ant. Vitré, &c.*).—The two friends were long persuaded that they needed an order as a bearer of their views. They partly succeeded in gaining over the congregation of the Oratorium. But it proved of greater value to their purpose, that St. Cyran became, 1635, spiritual director of the Abbey of Port-Royal (see *A. Arnauld; Port-Royal*). Richelieu who was as much provoked by St. Cyran's resolute contempt of flattery and bribes, as by his religious rigor, had him thrown into the prison of Vincennes, on May 14, 1638, eight days after Jansen's death, where he was confined for five years. But during his imprisonment he "begat more sons of repentance."—On Feb. 6, 1643, two months after Richelieu's death, he was liberated. He immediately resumed his labors. He died Oct. 11, 1643. Port-Royal obtained his heart, intestines, and hands, as relics.—Concerning his other writings see *Reuchlin's Gesch. von Port-Royal*, pp. 636-7. REUCHLIN.*

E.

Eadmer, Edmer, Ediner, a monk of Canterbury, whom Anselm of C. esteemed so highly that he requested Urban II. to associate E. with him, that he might live under his direction. Anselm obeyed E. in the smallest matters—even to turning himself in bed. In 1120 Eadmer was *B.* of St. Andrews, but disagreeing with the Scotch King, Alexander, he soon again returned to his monastery. E. is among the principal English writers of that age. His works are: 1) *Hist. novorum*, in 6 books, being the history of Lanfrank, Anselm, and Radulf, Archb. of Canterbury, publ. by Selden: London, 1623.—2) The life of Anselm, in Surius and the Bollandists, for April 21.—3) Two letters to the monks of Glastenhury upon the body of St. Dunstan, to those of Winchester upon the election of bishops.—4) The life of St. Bregwin, Archb. of Canterb., of St. Oswald, Archb. of York, of St. Odo, Archb. of Canterb.—all in Warton's *Anglia sacra*.—5) The life of St. Wilfrid, of York, in the Bollandists, April 24.—6) Some writings formerly, by mistake, ascribed to Anselm: *de excellentia b. Mariæ V.*; *de Quatuor virtutibus, quæ fuerunt in b. Mariæ V.*; *de beatitudine cælestis patriæ*; *de similitudinibus S. Anselmi*. Warton and Cave mention others.

HERZOG.*

Ebbo, Archb. of Rheims, notorious for his conduct towards his benefactor, Louis the Pious, the son of peasants, and born on one of the estates of Charlemagne, was reared and edu-

cated with Louis; though a bondman he was set free, and then became an ecclesiastic. Louis, who loved him much, made him his archivist, and on his ascending the throne, Archb. of Rheims. By Louis' advice he undertook a papal mission to Denmark, of which, however, Ansgar soon relieved him. He assisted at Ansgar's consecration as Archb. of Hamburg. After this he disgraced himself by participating in Lothaire's intrigues against his father, which ended in the Emperor's humiliation. Ebbo was at the head of the clerical assembly which condemned the Emperor, 833. When the Emperor regained his rights, Ebbo was confined in the monastery of Fulda, 834. E. was present at the restoration of Louis in Metz, and declared that Louis had been wronged. Louis then accused Ebbo at Diedenhofen; E. escaped deposition by a voluntary renunciation of office, 835. He was confined at Fulda until Louis's death, 840. Having then heard that Lothaire was hastening from Italy with an army, to seize the empire, E. joined him, and thus recovered his archbishopric, 840. But he was soon, again, compelled to leave it. Even Lothaire abandoned him, and he had to be content with the See of Hildesheim. He intended to write a penitential, but circumstances preventing, he induced his friend, Halitgar, afterwards *B.* of Cambrai, to undertake it. He wrote nothing of importance.—(See HARDUIN, *Collectio conc.*, T. IV., V. *Hist. littér. de la France*, T. V. *Gallia christiana*, T. IX.) HERZOG.*

Ebed Jesus (Syriac: "Servant of God," Arabic; 'Abd Jeschû'a), surnamed *Bar Brika* ("Son of the Blessed"), a Nestorian theologian of varied acquirements, was b. about 1250, on the island of Gozarta, in the Tigris. Where he studied is not known; but his writings display familiarity with philosophy and dialectics, also with the works of the Jacobites Barhebræus. He was at home in Arabic, and could read Greek. He was early appointed B. of Sindschar and Arabia; in 1285 he still held this See. Whilst there he wrote a harmony of the Gospels; it is mentioned in a copy prepared after it in the Vatican. About 1287, not later, the Nestorian Patriarch Jaballaha appointed him Metropolitan of Nisibis, or Zoba, for which preferment he dedicated a collection of poems: "The paradise Eden," to J., 1291. After a useful career he died in Nov., 1318, soon after attending the Synod of Timothy II., which specially commended his two ed. of Canons. He wrote 20 works, chiefly theological; among them an exegetical work upon the O. and N. T. (not allegorizing); three upon the incarnation of the Logos, upon the sacraments of the Church, and one of great philosophical skill: "The book of the precious stone, upon the truth of faith" (publ. in Syriac and Latin by A. Mai, *Scriptt. vetl.*, X., 317-366), transl. by E. into the Arabic also. His letters are likewise occupied with theological inquiries. His works on eccl. law, as the homiletical and polemical, are practical. The poems above named (50, in two parts: Enoch and Elijah) are wholly theological, beginning with the Trinity and ending with the Resurrection (see ASSEMANI, *Bibl. or.* 3, 1, p. 325, &c.). Besides these he wrote 12 poetical tracts upon all the sciences (a sort of encyclopedia), a "Book of the Philosophy of the Greeks," and an Exposition of Aristotle's letter to Alexander. Of literary value is his catalogue of about 200 Syriac authors (ASSEMANI, *l. c.*).—See also BERTHOLDT's *krit. Journal*, XIV, 288, &c., and the superficial article of St. MARTIN, *Biogr. univers.*, XII., 438. R. GOSCHÉ.*

Eber, Paul, a theologian of the 16th cent., noted for his association with the leaders of the Reformation, and for his personal efforts to promote it. His father, John Eber, was a citizen and tailor of Kitzingen. Paul was born Nov. 8, 1511. In 1523 he was placed at the school in Ansbach. During this year his mother died, and he returned to his father. On his way home he had his back broken by a fall from a horse, and he was confined to the house a whole year. In 1526 he entered the new gymnasium at Nuremberg, where Joachim Camerarius, John Kezmann, E. Hess, and M. Roting were his teachers. He progressed so rapidly in his studies that in 1532 he entered the University of Wittenberg; the council, and a patrician family of Nuremberg supported him. In W., Luther, Melanchthon, Jonas, &c., were his teachers. He became specially attached to Melanchthon. In 1536 already he obtained the Master's degree, and in 1537 entered the philosophical faculty. Thenceforth Mel. and he formed so close a bond of friendship that M. rarely attempted anything without first consulting Eber, so that E. was called, in jest, *Repertorium Philippi*. M.'s letters

to Eber (see *Corpus Reform.*) bear witness to their intimacy. Luther also placed great confidence in him (see the MS. hist. of Ratzberger, über L. u. s. Zeit, v. Neudecker: Jena, 1850, p. 131, &c.). Eber was then chiefly engaged in giving private instructions in philosophical branches, with revisals and exercises in debating; he also began his exposition of Paul's Epistles. In 1541 he married, through M.'s mediation, Helena Küffner, of Leipsic. They had 9 sons and 2 daughters, of whom only 2 sons and 2 daughters survived him. In 1544 he became Prof. of Latin grammar; he also lectured on natural philosophy. He was chosen Dean of the philosophical faculty in 1550; from 1551-52 he was Rector, and then until 1553 Vice-Rector of the University. After the death of J. Förster (1556) he was appointed preacher of the Castle church, Wittenberg, and (1557) Prof. of Hebrew in the University. But in 1559 he resigned the former post, having been appointed the city preacher of W., and general superintendent of the Electorate. In 1559 he was promoted to the theol. Doctorate, and in March, 1560, entered the theol. faculty. From this time he applied his academical labors chiefly to theology. During 1561-62 he continued the Latin sermons of Mel., lectured upon the Gospels, &c. He prosecuted his general superintendency, also, with happy results. His merits as a preacher appear in the sermons on the Catechism, 1562 (Nuremb., 1577). He took part in the great questions, and public controversies of the day. To the Augsburg interim he was decidedly opposed. In 1548 he participated in the convention at Pegau; in 1557 in the colloquy at Worms; in 1564 he went to Jena on business concerning the University; in 1568 Margrave George Frederick of Brandenburg called him to aid in settling the Church strifes at Ansbach; then he attended the colloquy at Altenburg, where he remained until March, 1569. Meanwhile he was deeply involved in the adiaphoristic and Crypto-Calvinistic controversies, and wrote largely. Before he entered the theol. faculty his works were chiefly historical and philosophical,¹ afterwards they were upon theol. subjects.² He also composed some favorite hymns (see *Raumer, Sammlung*, &c.: Basel, 1831). From 1563 he was in bad health, and he had sore domestic afflictions. He died Dec. 10, 1569.—(See *Oratio de vita rev. et clarissimi viri, D. Pauli Eberi—habita a M. Balth. MENCIO: Witeb.*, 1581. MELCH. ADAMI, *Vitæ theolog.*

¹ We may mention: *Hist. populi judæici a reditu ex Bab. exilio usque ad ultimum excidium Jerusol.*: Witeb., 1548; new ed. 1562; German, Nuremb., 1667, from which a French, and from the French a Dutch transl. were made. *Calendarium historicum*: Witeb., 1550; in German by E.'s sons, Wittenb., 1582; in French, Geneva, 1639. *Scripta publice propusita a Prof. in Acad. Witeb.*: Witeb., 1553. *Apellat. Quadrupedum, Insectorum, Volucrum, Piscium, Frugum*, &c.: Witeb., 1556. *De vita et scriptis C. Plinii*: Witeb., 1556.

² "Unterricht, &c., v. heil. Sacram. d. Leibes," &c.: Witt., 1562; Latin, Witeb., 1563 (see STRONK., *Beitr. zur Lit. I.*, 2, p. 500.—"Geschlechtsregister Christi.")—*Biblia latina, quibus exhibetur quidem versio vulgata, ita autem correctæ*, &c.: Witeb., 1565.—*Psalterium cum Argumentis*: Posthum. publ. (by Cellarius): *Expos. Evangel. Dominicalium*: Francf., 1576.

german.: Heidelb., 1620. P. FREHER, *Theatrum vir. eruditione clarorum*: Nuremb., 1688. PLANCK, *Gesch. d. prot. Theol.*, II., 1 Th.: Lpz., 1798, p. 448–525. JOH. VOIGT, *Briefwechsel d. berühmten Gelehrten d. Zeitalters d. Ref.*, &c.: Königsb., 1841. Especially: Dr. Paul Eber, &c., mit 49 Original-Urk. v. Chr. H. Sixt.: Heidelb., 1843.

NEUDECKER.*

Eberlin (*Eberlein*), Anton, an important advocate of the Reformation, born at Günzburg, then in Austrian Suabia, near the close of the 15th cent., joined the Franciscans, and soon so distinguished himself by his eloquence that he was appointed preacher of the monastery in Tübingen. In 1519 he was transferred to Ulm. There he read Luther's writings, and learned the way of salvation. He began to preach evangelical sermons. This enraged the monks so much that he resolved to escape their persecutions by leaving Ulm. The people deplored this, and tried to retain him. He went (1521) to Basel, then to Rheinfelden. His sermons attracted the people, but the authorities of Ensisheim, combining with the Bishop, effected his expulsion. This brought him into fellowship with Ulrich v. Hütten and Fr. v. Sickingen, with whom he took refuge. Here he wrote, in a rather passionate and self-sufficient spirit, against the sins and errors of the times. In 1522 he went to Wittenberg and met Luther and Melancthon. The latter convinced him that his way of defending the Gospel was likely to do more harm than good. E. then adopted a milder course, and at once wrote a work upon "The Abuses of Christian liberty." From this time he exercised himself in such moderation, in his controversy with Rome especially, that many charged him with lukewarmness. He had great influence with the masses; and when the peasants succeeded in getting into Erfurt, he restrained them from great excesses. E. now gained such reputation that his interference was sought in other cities. The Council of Erfurt elected him preacher at the cathedral, but he declined, and went to Wertheim on the M., 1526, from which time we have no account of him. He must have died soon after. — His writings, 34 in number, all in German, are mentioned by ERHARD, in *Ersch and Gruber*. One of the best, upon the duties of an ev. minister, is given in an append. to A. H. FRANKE, *monita pastoralia*. See also: DÖLLINGER, *die Reform.*, &c., I., 205; STROBEL's *liter. Museum* I., 365.

HERZOG.*

Ebionites, *Ebionitism*, a sect-name variously used by the Church Fathers; it has also been differently employed and applied by modern writers. Some use it of a single sect; others erroneously extend its application, until at length it becomes identified, not only with Jewish, but with the entire primitive Christianity. It can hardly be questioned that this name, like "Nazareans" (EPIPHAN. *adv. Hær.*, XXIX., 1), designated all Christians; not because they believed in so poor a Christ (GIESELER in *Staudlin and Tzschirner*, *Archiv.* IV., 307), but because they themselves were poor, especially those of the Church at Jerusalem, around which the name had its origin, and because poverty had so deep a significance under the Gospel. Both Jewish and Gentile Christians were re-

proached by the surrounding heathen as "poor" (*Minuc. Felix*: Octav. 36: "*Ceterum quod plerique PAUPERES dicimur non est infamia nostra sed gloria*"). The name, also, being of Hebrew derivation, came to be the special designation of Jewish Christians (ORIG., *c. Cels.* II., 1, "*Ἑβραῖοι χρηματίζουσιν αἱ ἀπὸ Ἰουδαίων τὸν Ἰησοῦν ὡς Χριστὸν παραδεξάμενοι*"). And when Jewish Christianity, outstripped by the Gentile Church, separated itself heretically, whilst Christians of Jewish origin who fell in with the Gentile development became fully identified with this, the name Ebionites came to be the general designation of heretical Judaizing Christianity. Origen mentions them thus, and speaks of several parties of them, differing slightly from each other. Irenæus names but one party; so EUSEB., and HIPPOLYTUS (*Pseud. Orig. Philosophum. ed. Müller*, p. 257) who mainly follows Irenæus. Later Fathers (Epiphanius, Jerome, and, in a secondary way, Theodoret) first mention the Ebionites as a sect distinct from the Nazareans. — This history of the name refutes the assertions of those fathers who trace the name to a certain Ebion, as founder of the sect (TERTULL., *de præscr. hæc.* c. 33. Lightfoot even traces the name to the Talmud. Cf. GIESELER *Eccl. H.*), or, one hardly knows whether in jest or seriously, to the contracted views of Judaizing Chr. (ORIG., *Philoc.* I.), or to their beggarly notions of the law and of Christ (ORIG., *c. Cels.*, II., 1, 1. EUSEB., *H. E.*, III., 27). In a certain sense the name is older than the party, as the common name of Jewish Christians, even of Christians in general; in another sense we may say the party is older than the name, since an extensive party of this kind existed among Jewish Christians before the name, previously in general use, (but which Justin M. does not mention, and which Iren. and Orig. use as a common name), was employed as that of a specific sect.

The nature of Ebionitism and its history, which can be understood only in its connection with Jewish Christianity in general, are so obscure, and have led to so many and such conflicting theories, because the sources of information are scanty and confused. Even though later Fathers, as Epiphanius, report what they themselves saw, their accounts refer to a period too remote from its origin to throw satisfactory light upon its earlier history. Two errors must be especially avoided: 1) that of combining all the accounts into one picture, and thus, in conflicting statements, giving one the preference. Each of the Fathers may furnish a description of the Judaizing Christians of his time, so far as known to him, and the diversity of these descriptions may serve to exhibit the history of Jewish Christianity. 2) That of regarding the various parties of Judaizing Chr. as forming such distinct sects, as the Fathers (especially Epiphanius) represent them to be. Subordinate diversities of sentiments among themselves did not constitute them into separate sects. — In the N. T. we may discover party differences among Jewish Chr., but no sects, in a proper sense, or heretical organizations. These first appear at the downfall of the Jewish State, especially the founding of *Ælia Capitolina*. During the Apoc-

tolie period the legalistic party, which opposed Paul in Galatia and elsewhere, was in the minority, and was kept down (Acts 15, &c.). The judgment then executed upon Israel must have exerted a mighty influence. The people had rejected Christ, and Jewish Chr. lost its inner precedence. By the founding of *Ælia Cap.* it was externally driven from its metropolis, sundered from the current of development. Then it became heretical, and fell into different sects. Epiph. shows a consciousness that this disruption dates from the period named, by saying (*Hær.* XXX., 2) that Ebion first spread his errors in Pella, and Euseb. by stating that Thebutis (EUSEB. *H. E.*, IV., 22) was the originator of the divisions among the Judaizing Chr. after the death of Symeon; though we cannot say with GIESELER (*Stäudlin and Tzschirner*, l. c., 320) that this mysterious personage was the founder of a sect. — Apart from the fact that during this period many Jewish Chr. relapsed into Judaism, or fell entirely over to heathenism, the judgments which befell Israel must have exerted a different influence upon those who remained Christians. One portion still maintained the prevailing moderate views, another became more rigidly legalistic. This forms the radical distinction between the parties subsequently called Nazareans and Ebionites. Stability characterized the former; the Ebionites had more life, and hence more variety of development, embraced the Gnostic element, universalism (the Clement. Hom.), and thus Gnosticism, into which they finally dissolved.

The treatment of Gentile Christians, and the requirements to be made of them in reference to the law, led to the more strict separation of the Jewish parties. The moderate party were satisfied with observing the law themselves; the other party insisted the more upon its observance by others, and thus excluded themselves from the Catholic Church (for they must have separated from the Catholics, not the reverse) whilst the moderate party were not yet considered heretical. This is the position of Jewish Christianity which Justin M. had in view. (*Dial. c. Tr. c.* 47, p. 265–6). But before *Irenæus* wrote *adv. Hær.* this party, left behind by the rapid progress of the Catholic C., must also have separated. Hence Iren. names only *one* heretical form of Jewish Chr. (I., 26. Comp. III., 11, CREDNER, *Beitr. zur Einl. in's. N. T.*, Vol. I., upon the Gospels of the Judaizing Chr.). But now they embraced and taught the heresy of Cerinthus and Carpocrates in regard to Christ (*consimiliter ut Cer. et Carpocr.*, cf ORIG., *Philosoph. ed. Miller*, VII., 34, p. 257: τὰ δὲ περὶ Χριστὸν ὁμοίως τῷ Κηρ. καὶ Καρπ. μὲνενονεν); denied that Christ was born of a virgin, and regarded him as a mere man (IV., 59; V., 11). These errors acquired growing ascendancy among them, in proportion as the Catholic C. laid greater stress upon the Christological doctrines. Thus ORIG. calls all Judaizing Chr. Ebionites, but distinguishes two parties (*c. Cels.*, V., 61–65), the one holding, the other denying Christ's miraculous birth. These two cannot be the Gnostic and common Eb., but the Nazareans, and the Eb. in the narrower sense (GIESELER, *H. E.*), with the same difference, essentially, which Justin M.

mentions (cf. EUSEB. *H. E.*, III., 27). — The fullest accounts of the Eb. are found in *Epiph.*, *Jerome*, and *Augustine*. *Theodoret* (*Hær. fabb.* comp. II., 2, 3) errs in making the Nazareans a third party. But apart from the Gnostic errors thus embraced (see *Elzautes*) we shall hardly discover any other marks of Ebionitism. Like the Nazareans they were Chiliasts (JEROME, *ad. Es.*, 35, i. f.; 11, 15, &c.). They rejected Paul (EPIPH., XXX., 16; JEROME, *ad. Matth.* 12, 2); imposed the law upon all Christians (JEROME, *ad. Es.*, 1: 12; TERTULL., *de præscr. hæc.* c. 33); considered Christ a mere man, the son of Joseph and Mary (l. c. and EPIPH., XXX., 2, 34; JEROME, *Ep. 89 ad August.*; TERTULL., *aut. de carne Chr.*, 14; *de virg. vel.*, c. 6; ORIG., *Hom. XVII. in Luc.*, &c.). Hence similar views were subsequently called Ebionitism; thus *Alexander, B. of Alex.*, calls the doctrine of Arius (THEODOR., *H. E.*, I., 3).

At the time of Epiphanius the Eb. lived chiefly in the country along the Dead Sea, in Nabathea, Paneas, Moabitis, Cochaba — but were also found in Rome and Cyprus (see *Elzautes, Clementines*). — (See GIESELER, l. c., CREDNER in Winer's *Ztschr. für wissenschaft. Theol.*, I., 2, p. 211, &c. (Sulzbach, 1829). BAUR: *De Ebionit. origine*, &c. (Tübinger Osterprogr. of 1831). SCHLIEMANN, "Die Clement.," &c.: Hamb., 1841. HILGENFELD, *Die Clement. Recogn. u. Hom.*, &c.: Jena, 1848. RITSCHL, *Die Entstehung d. altkath. Kirche*, 247, &c. UHLHORN, *Die Hom. u. Recogn. d. Clem. Rom.*: Göttingen, 1854, p. 383, &c.). UHLHORN.*

Eck, John, properly Jno. Maier, the most noted, but also most notorious of the opponents of Luther and the Reformation, was born Nov. 13, 1486, at Eck, county of Mindelheim, Suabia. From his 9th to his 12th year he resided with his uncle, Martin Maier, pastor of Rothenburg, where, as he tells us, he had read nearly the whole of the Bible before the end of his 12th year. In his 12th year (1499) he visited Heidelberg, where he studied the ancient languages and philosophy. From H. he went to Tübingen, and studied the ancient languages under Reuchlin and J. Agricola. In his 14th year he was made A. M., and commenced theology. He names nine theologians, among them J. Lemp and P. Scriptoris, whose instructions he attended. In 1501 the plague drove him from Tübingen to Cologne, where he read Aquinas. At Freiburg, whither he was again driven by the plague, he studied jurisprudence, mathematics, and cosmography, and also began to teach philosophy. In 1506 he commenced his literary career with his *Logices Exercitamenta*. He seems after this to have applied himself more exclusively to *theology*, in which he soon obtained the degrees of Bachelor and Licentiate, and read lectures in the spirit and manner of Occam. In his studies thus far his aim had been learned pomp, more than thorough erudition; and he sought especially to gain fame in *controversy*, his skill in which drew to him the attention of men like C. Peutingen, of Augsburg. On the recommendation of P. he obtained a place at Ingolstadt, where he became so noted for his dialectic gladiatorship, that William, Duke of Bavaria, gave him a *professorship of theology*, on which post he entered in Nov., 1510, after

he had previously obtained the degree of D. D. (at Ingolstadt, and *not* at Freiburg). All his efforts aimed at renown, honors, and emoluments. He succeeded in obtaining a canonicate in the cathedral of the B. of Eichstätt, and the office of pro-chancellor of the Univ. of Ingolstadt (1512). He also spread his fame by the most diverse literary labors. He tried his hand at theology on the difficult subject of predestination (he published, Augsb., 1514, *centuriæ VI., de prædestinatione*, written in the semi-Pelagian spirit of the school to which he belonged), and at ethics; in philosophy he commented on the logic and physics of Aristotle, and gave also, at intervals, (thus, in 1515 at Bologna, 1516, at Vienna,) the pageant of a public discussion to his admiring contemporaries. He dabbled in mystics also, and wrote a commentary on Dionysius the Areopagite. In these labors, however, he was wanting in originality and thoroughness, and only used the investigations of others for his own purposes. Totally ignorant of the wants of the age, he followed the prevailing effects of philosophy: of an earnest conscientiousness and love of truth he shows not the least trace.—Of course, the earliest movements of the Reformation found such a man unprepared for it. He boasts of himself, that, at the very moment when Carlstadt and Luther had commenced to steer the ship of Peter towards ruin, he was deeply engaged in the "*philosophia tresmagistica, orphica, platonica, ægyptiaca et Arabum*," and the "*theologia dionysiaca*." Before the publication of the theses, Eck had already become acquainted with Luther; the latter had written to him a friendly letter, and Eck, in a letter to Carlstadt, May, 28, 1518 (LÖSCHER, *Vollständ. Ref. Act.*, II., 64), calls L. the "*common friend*." This, however, had not prevented him, after Luther's theses against indulgences had been widely circulated and very favorably received, from publishing his *obelisci*; in manuscript, indeed, but with the evident design of stirring up the opposition. The tone of the obelisks (given in LÖSCHER, II., 333) is designedly such as to bring upon Luther the odium of heresy; for at that time already, Eck was inquisitor of heresy for Bavaria and Franconia. Their chief purpose is to represent Luther as the destroyer of ecclesiastical order, busy in spreading the *Bohemian poison* (obel. 18), and in undermining the legitimate authorities of the Church. Eck charges L. with want of reverence toward the Holy Father; calls him a new prophet (obel. 24), who would be wiser than the fathers. The insolence with which he ventured against an opponent like Luther, was, however, fearfully punished. L. at first gave his defence into the hands of Carlstadt, who, in an academical disputation, May 9, 1518, proposed 380 theses, with 26 others concerning the freedom of the will. Their object is to defend the *biblical, not papal, orthodoxy of the Wittenberg professors*. C. attacks the scholasticism of Eck as merely "*opiniones novorum theologorum*," and declares his purpose of testing the controverted question by the "*decreta Christi Paulique*." In thus advancing against his opponent the authority of the Scriptures, C. also proves from them that the true justification of man comes

from God only, that our own good works have no value before God, but must come from God; that, hence our salvation depends upon the election of God, and not upon our own works; that the will is enslaved by sin; and that heresy does not consist in sinning against the Church of the Pope, but against the Word of God as interpreted by the Spirit (Th. 349). With the latter thesis C. designed not only to invalidate the charge of heresy maliciously advanced against the Wittenbergers, but also to brand the prevailing scholasticism of the R. Church as unscriptural, and therefore heretical. The closing theses show what measures Wittenberg looked for from the inquisitor and his party. Eck, informed of the campaign thus opened against him, would gladly have avoided its dreaded consequences. With this purpose he wrote, May 28, 1518, a rather humble letter to Carlstadt. He excuses the publication of his theses by saying, that they had found publicity without his knowledge and against his will, since they had been written privately for the B. of Eichstätt; but that expressing views confidentially differed widely from publishing them. He guards himself also against the charge that flattery had drawn him to the enemies of Wittenberg, and hopes that former friendship will prevent Carlstadt from opening a battle against the "innocent Eck." In the latter case, however, he also threatens to defend himself (LÖSCHER, II., 64). These concessions of Eck were made too late. The theses of C. had been published in Wittenberg, and C. even assailed Eck and scholasticism with satire, which so offended Dr. Eck, that he complained to the Elector of Saxony on account of it. Meantime a correspondence was carried on, not wholly without bitterness, between C. and Eck. The latter denied the necessity of daily repentance for all Christians, and defended the freedom of the will in an apology of his obelisks. C. replied in a "*defensio adv. Eckii monomachiam*" (Aug., 1518), in the introduction of which he defends with all his strength the *sole* authority of the Scriptures, and attacks on Scripture grounds, and with complete success, the pelagianism of Eck.—In the above work C. had expressed himself willing to meet Eck in a public disputation. Eck having more confidence in the force of his tongue than of his pen, gladly accepted the proposal. Whilst Luther was at Augsburg in the autumn of 1518, it was agreed between him and Eck to hold the disputation during the coming year at *Leipsic*. From a letter to Eck of Nov. 15, 1518, Luther seems to have entertained hopes of an amicable settlement. But Eck, only the more emboldened by this, published in Feb., 1519, a programme of the approaching disputation, in which he tries once more to bring the odium of heresy upon Luther and Carlstadt, and the University of Wittenberg in general. The attack was the more dishonorable and malicious, as L. had pledged himself to Miltitz to maintain silence. But L. held himself now as absolved from his promise, and in a public letter to Carlstadt gave Eck such a thorough castigation, that E. could no longer be in doubt as to what awaited him at Leipsic.—Eck was doubtless more anxious to win laurels in a contest with Luther than

Carlstadt. He therefore published, February, 1519, 13 theses, which he declared himself ready to defend against L., and which treated mostly of penitence and indulgences. The 13th was designed as a trap for L., and read: "*Romanam Ecclesiam non fuisse superiorem aliis Ecclesiis ante tempora Sylvestri, negamus. Sed cum, qui sedem beatissimi Petri habuit et fidem, successorem Petri et Vicarium Christi generalem semper agnovimus.*" Eck really gained his end; for L. took up the glove, and opposed the 13 theses with the following: *Rom. Eccl. esse omnibus aliis superiorem, probatur ex frigidissimis R. pontificum decretis, intra quadringentos annos natis. CONTRA quæ sunt historiæ approbatæ mille et centum annorum, textus scripturæ divinæ et decretum Niceni Concilii omnium sacratissimi.*" In order to make the presence of L. on the arena the more sure, Eck charged him, in a publication of March 14, 1519, with cowardice, and that he used Carlstadt only to cover his own retreat. L. published a rejoinder, declaring that he "feared neither the Pope nor the name of the Pope, neither popekins nor puppets." L. found it necessary, however, to encourage his friends, who had been intimidated by Eck. He was also resolved no longer to spare the papal chair. The R. Church was to him already "Babylon" (*De Wette, Luth. Brief., I., 260*); the power of the papal seat he regards a *secular* one (*Ibid. I., 264*). The promised disputation had in the meantime excited opposition in other quarters. The University and theologians of Leipsic, and the B. of Merseburg, tried to prevent it; but the personal interference of Duke George overcame all opposition. It commenced, therefore, on June 27, 1519. From June 27th to July 3d Eck discussed with Carlstadt the *freedom of the will*. The conviction of the Reformers that there was no rule of doctrine *except the Scriptures*, had already been so widely accepted, that Eck had to accede to it. He appealed, though hesitatingly, to the apocryphal passage, Sirach 15, 14, etc., and conceded also that the free will could do nothing without divine grace. C., on the other hand, maintained that the free will was *by nature* impotent, and became active only by grace. Eck advanced a synergism of divine grace and the human free will in order to the production of good works, whilst Carlstadt maintained that God *alone* was the source of good works. Eck replied sophistically, that God did the *whole* (*totum*) of good works, but not *entirely* (*totaliter*): that he gave the power to do good, though not the good work itself. The discussions themselves led to no conclusion, especially since Eck was more concerned about his own reputation as debater, than about the truth. He twisted and turned like an eel, and always escaped his opponents by turns of sophistry. On the 4th of June, Eck discussed with Luther the 13 theses, concerning the papal power. He defended the *divine* authority of the papacy; and this in such a manner as to bring all who denied it into repute of heresy. L. asserted that Christ was the sole head of the Church, and at once brought Eck into a difficulty by demanding of him the passage of Scripture in which Peter had appointed a successor. The primacy of the Pope was derived from Matt.

16:16, and the Fathers, especially Cyprian. But as these grounds are very weak, denunciations were resorted to, and L. decried as an enemy of the Church and friend of the heretical Bohemians. The discussion grew constantly more violent and bitter. July 8, the doctrine of *purgatory* was discussed: from the 11th onward the doctrine of indulgences and penitence. On the 14th the discussion on free will was resumed between Eck and Carlstadt, but without leading to any material result.—The general impression made by the discussion was rather favorable to Eck. His assurance, his skill in discussion, and his bold reference to tradition and the papal power, was imposing to the masses. He had also done everything in order to intimidate his opponents, and demanded that the matter should be referred to the Pope, or to some Universities favorable to him. Having the truth little at heart, he also made constant concessions, in order to be able to boast that he had drawn his opponents to his side. His chief aim at Leipsic was to appear as defender of the papal power; and he is said to have expressed himself willing to concede everything else to L., if the latter would only have withdrawn his 13th thesis. He boasted that he had defeated L.; and he had really succeeded in impressing upon L. the stamp of heresy: for whilst Eck was feted, L. and Carlstadt were treated coldly and uncourtously. Eck preached also during the Leipsic discussion, and used every effort to inflame the crowd against Luther: the latter was forbidden to preach. Eck, being the special favorite of the authorities, had always the last word. Having no perception of the reformatory movement of the mind, which no art could restrain, he regarded the entire matter as a monkish or scholastic quarrel, and declared openly that if the indulgence mongers had praised their wares more moderately, L.'s name would never have been heard. How impartial participants in the discussion thought of Eck, may be seen from a letter of P. Mosellanus to J. v. Pflug. Eck is described as tall and broad, of a coarse voice, thick and strong loins, suited well for an actor or auctioneer: his face such as would indicate a butcher or soldier, rather than a theologian: of strong memory, but weak judgment: bringing forward a "pile of stuff" to captivate his hearers: of boundless impudence; often by a sophistic turn representing the views of his opponents as his own, and then claiming the victory. L., perhaps, judged him not too harshly when he said that "Eck was suited for theology as an ass to the harp."—After the close of the discussion Eck, of course, tried all means to reap the fruit of his pretended victory, and to trumpet it to the world. Of Luther and Carlstadt he spoke most disparagingly. In a letter of July 23, to the Elector of Saxony, he tried to excite L.'s patron against him, by stigmatizing him as a heretic, who denied the authority of the Pope. An odious and embittered controversy followed, in which *Melanchthon* also, who, in a letter to *Æcolampadius* (July 19), had ranged himself upon the side of L., was involved. Eck attacked M. with the utmost insolence, but he was soon forced to forsake the offensive for the defensive. Luther, in the pre-

face to his "*Resolutionen*," had reminded Eck that he had admitted concerning free will, that, without grace, it could do only evil; Eck, in his "*expurgati*," had recourse again to defamation. The more impotent he felt himself compared with Luther, the more the number of his opponents increased, who excited his anger by their ridicule, the more he became determined to ruin his antagonist. His anger broke forth already in his "*responsio pro H. Emser contra MALESANAM Luth. VENATIONEM ad J. de Schleinitz*," etc. After having in vain requested the Elector of Saxony to burn L.'s works, he prepared to burn them publicly at Ingolstadt, but was prevented by J. Reuchlin. He succeeded, however, in obtaining the condemnation of L. by the theol. faculties of Cologne and Louvain, and especially in exciting the aged Hochstranten against him. After having, in 1520, finished a work "*de primatu Petri*," it seemed to him that the time had arrived for a decisive blow. He went to Rome in order to present his book to the Pope, and to obtain weapons against the Wittenberg "heretic." — Rome being much displeased with L., Eck's insinuations were readily accepted by the papal court. Luther's condemnation was determined upon, and on the 15th of June, the notorious "*bull of Eck*" (see Sattler's *Gesch. des Herzogth. Würtemb.*, II., Beil. Nr., 92, p. 216) was issued, in which 41 articles from the works of L. were designated as "heretical, erroneous, seductive, and offensive." On the 3d of May Eck had written vauntingly, that the publication and execution of the bull in Germany had been entrusted to him. This fatal mistake of the Pope, which made the bitter enemy of L. the executor of the bull, turned the course of affairs in L.'s favor. On his return to Germany, in Aug., 1520, Eck met with a very cool reception. Although he had the bull posted in public in Meissen, Merseburg, and Brandenburg, yet the Bishops hesitated to publish it. Even Duke George, Eck's great patron, prohibited the publication, except by special permission of the B. of Merseburg. At Erfurt the students burned the bull before the eyes of Eck, and he found himself compelled to flee to Freiburg for safety. But although the bull had thus proved a failure, Eck had nevertheless succeeded in bringing about the breach between L. and the Pope, and thus *permanently establishing the schism in the western Church*.¹ — From this time on, Eck spent all his energy in combating the Reformation; and it is a characteristic sign of the times that he succeeded in acquiring the distinction of being one of the chief pillars and champions of the Rom. Church, though his character was not such as to inspire with respect even his co-religionists. After several other journeys to Rome in the employ of the Duke of Bavaria, he took part, in 1524, in the Convention of Ratisbon, the result of which, however, only excited the ridicule of the people. His journey through England, also, added little to his fame. To recover his waning reputation, and also to support the tottering Church of Switzerland, he offered his services at the colloquy of Baden, to be held

in May 1526. Here, too, his defence of the Romish doctrines was very unskilful, although outwardly the colloquy ended favorably to him. — A similar disputation he held in 1527, at Augsburg, with Urb. Rhegius. At the Diet of Augsburg, in 1530, he was particularly active, being one of the authors of the refutation of the Augsb. Conf. — Somewhat later he attended the colloquies of Worms and Ratisbon, and died in 1553. — He was a prolific author, and showed extensive erudition: he published no work, however, which gained for him a permanent place in literature, or really advanced the cause which he treated. His knowledge of Hebrew and Greek was limited, his Latinity defective, his theology the scholasticism of the 16th cent., without, however, the subtle distinctions and spirit of the former scholastics. His works, written before his controversies with the Reformers, have already been mentioned. Very numerous are those written against the Reformation. His German translation of the Scriptures (1537), published to supplant that of Luther, was a total failure (see Art. *Bibelübersetzungen*). In a special work he defended the burning of Huss and Jerome, of Prague, by the Council of Constance. Other works are: *De non tollend. Christ. et SS. imaginib.*, 1522. — *De pœnit. et confess.*, 1523. *De init. pœnitentiae seu contritione*, 1523. *De satisfactione*, 1523. *Enchirid. locorum comm. Adv. Lutheranos*, 1525. One of his most celebrated works is his "*de sacrificio missæ*," 1526. A Defence of Purgatory, 1530. Explanations of the Gospels, and other collections of sermons. A collection of his works was undertaken by himself, 1530–35.

DR. SCHENKEL. — *Reinecke*.

Eckart, a deeply speculative Dominican, and one of the most remarkable thinkers of the middle ages, perhaps of any age. He is claimed by speculative philosophers and orthodox theologians, by Protestants and Romanists. Of his works, only several sermons, appended to Tauler's sermons, Basle, 1521, are generally accessible. A collection of them is soon to be published by Prof. Fr. Pfeiffer. It will contain 110 sermons, 18 treatises, 70 theses, and the *Liber positionum* mentioned by *Trithemius*. — He lived in the 14th century. The exact time and place of his birth are unknown. He appears for the first time at Paris, as Dominican and teacher in the Collego of St. James. Having been made D. D. at Rome, he was elected as provincial of Saxony. In 1304 a chapter of his order held at Toulouse renewed this election. Three years later a chapter held at Strasburg appointed him Vicar-general of Bohemia, with power to reform the monasteries of this country. Soon after we meet him at Strasburg, where he probably became acquainted with the Brethren of the free spirit. He was next called to Frankfort on the M. as prior of his order. Here the first accusation was made against him, viz.: that of standing in suspicious connections. He was, however, acquitted. At this time, however, the attention of the Church was directed more and more to the Br. of the free spirit; and as E. preached shortly after at Cologne, where Archb. Henry had, at a provincial Synod, in 1322, condemned the doctrines of the Beghards, he could

¹ Thus far the labor of Dr. Schenkel, whom sickness prevented from finishing it. The remainder is by Dr. Herzog.

no longer escape ecclesiastical censure. At a chapter held at Venice, in 1325, serious charges were brought against brethren, who, in Germany, were preaching things in the vernacular, which could only mislead the ignorant. In the following year a chapter held at Paris deposed the provincial prior of Germany, who, perhaps, was none other than Eckart. His doctrines having gained many adherents among the Dominicans of Cologne, the whole order was accused, in 1326, by the Archb., as suspected of heresy, whereupon the Pope, John XXII., commissioned a brother, Nicholas, of Strasburg, to visit the monasteries of Germany. Nicholas, meantime, appealed to the Pope against the Archbishop, who, Jan., 1327, had summoned E. before the inquisition. Eckart, convinced that he taught nothing which conflicted with the doctrines of the Church, declared himself willing to submit to the tribunal, and also to retract whatever was proven to be heretical in his doctrine. The inquisitors demanded an unconditional recantation; and as E. was unwilling to make this, he was condemned as a heretic. Having appealed to the Pope, he was summoned to Avignon, where 28 doctrinal points were laid before him, which he admitted to be his own, and which are also found in his printed sermons; 17 of them are condemned as heretical, the rest as suspicious; E. himself was censured, and his works prohibited. The bull of condemnation was published March 27, 1329. Eckart had in the meantime died. The bull says that E. had recanted everything; this means, perhaps, only that he had rejected the heretical interpretation which might be given to doctrines which he regarded as agreeing with orthodoxy. Notwithstanding the condemnation of his doctrines, his disciples continued to hold him in high honor. Henry Suso, in his autobiography, calls him the holy master Eckart, and commends his sweet doctrine. His sermons were copied in numerous monasteries of Germany, Switzerland, the Tyrol, and Bohemia. Card. Nicholas de Cusa mentions Eckart's works as the chief fountain of his philosophy.—The doctrine of E. is the pantheism which we find among the Brethren of the free spirit, but we do not find in his works the practical aberrations of this sect; nor those views conflicting with the rites of the Church and with the moral law, which were objected to the Beghards. Though his own exalted mind saved him from these consequences, they may nevertheless be deduced from the spirit of his system. This system corresponds entirely with Hegel's philosophy of religion. Indeed, we must regard E. as the father of modern pantheism.

See the article on E. in the "theol. Stud. u. Kritik., 1839, No. 3; also *Etud. sur le mysticisme allem. au XIV., Siecle* in the *Memoir. de l'Acad. des Sciences mor. et polit.*: Par., 1847. MARTENSEN, Meister Eckart, eine theol. Studie: Hamb., 1842. C. SCHMIDT.—Reinecke.

Eden (עֵדֶן, *pleasure, delight*, according to the Masorets; not גֶּן, *garden* in general) or "the garden of Eden," is the Scripture name of the abode of Adam and Eve before the fall (Gen. 2: 8, 15, &c.). The LXX., following the

Chaldee, calls it "Paradise," a *park, pleasure-garden* (Neh. 2: 8; Cant. 4: 13; Eccles. 2: 5; XEN., *Cyrop.* 1, 3, 12). Moses, describing its locality from his position, says it lay in the East, and mentions its geographical boundaries; but his account is so indefinite for modern inquiries, that its actual locality is still undetermined, though numerous hypotheses have been advocated. Some have attributed the difficulties besetting this matter to the effects of the flood upon the physical conformation of the earth; others to the presumption that the account of Moses does not pretend to strict historical accuracy.—According to Gen. 2: 10–14 the place was watered by a river which issued from Eden, and then parted into four streams. Of these one, *Pison*, flowed around (or *through*, as the original may mean; see Is. 23: 16; Cant. 3: 3; 1 Sam. 7: 16) the land of *Havilah*, where the best gold, bdellium, and the onyx stone, were found. The second, *Gihon*, (the forth-rushing), ran around the land of Cush; the third, *Hiddekel*, was east of Assyria; the fourth, was the *Euphrates*. Of these the two last alone (*Hiddekel* being unquestionably the *Tigris*—see PLINY, II. N., 6, 27; CURT., 4, 9, 16; RITTER'S *Erdk.* II., 128; PAULY'S *Realencl.* VI., 2, 1923, &c.), can now be certainly identified, which though not exactly flowing from one head, take their rise near enough together, in the Armenian mountains, to allow Latin poets, also, to ascribe to them one source. Concerning the first two divers opinions exist. If we cling to the district traversed by the last two, *Pison* might be taken to be the same as the *Phasis*, which has its head in the Moschican mts.; in this case *Havilah* (*Chavilah*) would be *Colchis* (RELAND, *diss. miscell.*, and CALMET). The *Gihon* would then be the *Araxes*, which takes its rise near the head of the *Euphrates* (PLUT., *Pompej.*, 33), and is called its "brother" (STEPH. BYZ., s. v. *Εἰσπαρίς*), and *Cush* would be the land of the *Cossæi* in northern Susiana (*Khusistan*, see STRABO, XI., 524; XVI., p. 744; PAULY'S *Realencl.*, II., 729; KNOBEL, *Völkertafel*, &c., 250). But in the Bible *Havilah* always designates a southern country (Gen. 10: 7, 29; 1 Sam. 15: 7) as South Arabia, Abyssinia, India (KNOBEL, *l. c.*, 186, &c., 260, &c.), whither the products here named refer; and *Cush* is constantly used of Ethiopia, S. Arabia, and the S. countries inhabited by people of dark color (KNOBEL, *l. c.*, 247, &c.). But to suppose, for this reason, that the *Nile* is meant (Jos. *Antt.*, I., 1, 3, and other ancients), the sources of which are sometimes associated with the *Euphrates* (PAUSAN., 2, 5, 2), sometimes with India (ARRIAN., *Anab.*, 6, 1; PAULY, *l. c.*, V., 643 n.) will not do, for the Hebrews were too well acquainted with the *Nile* to connect it with two Asiatic rivers.—EWALD (*Gesch. Isr.*, I., 331, 1st ed.) supposes that in the course of tradition the names of the rivers changed their forms, and that the author of Genesis mentioned such known streams as bore names most resembling those current in tradition. In like manner LASSEN ("Indische Alterth." I., 528, &c.), and KNOBEL (Gen. 27, &c.) suppose that *Gihon* is the *Oxus*, which really is called *Gihon* by ancient and modern Oriental scholars (thus J. D. Michaelis), *Pison* the *Indus*,

which also means "streams" (*Gesenius*); then *Cush* would designate the dark colored people W. of the Indus (*Knobel*, *Völkert.*, 248, 270, &c.), and *Havila*, its products corresponding, *India*, or the land of the *Darada* called *Kampila* in *Ælian.*, *nat. anim.*, III., 4. — But whatever these hints and hypotheses may be worth, it must be admitted that no certain locality can be fixed by the boundaries of Moses, with our present means of ascertaining their import. — Traditions agreeing more or less with the Mosaic account, are found among all Asiatic nations (see *Bähr*, *mos. Cult.*, I., 168, &c.; *Gesen.* on *Is.*, II., 316, &c.; *Bohlen*, *d. alte Indien*, I., 12; II., 210; *Kleuker*, *Zend avesta*, I., 82; II., 222, 277, 299, &c.; III., 91, 96; *Duncker*, *Gesch. d. Alterth.*, II., 371, &c. *Comp. Vendid.*, VII., 37–40; *Burnouf*, *comment.*, 239, 395, &c., 441). — For the literature of the whole subject see the *Comm. on Genesis* by *Tuch*, and that by *Knobel*; *Lenzgerke*, *Ken.* I., 20; *Winer's Lex.* The garden of Eden is referred to in *Ezek.* 28 : 13; (31 : 9, 16); 36 : 35; *Joel* 2 : 3. See also *Adam and Sin.*

Another Eden, mentioned in *Amos* 1 : 5, was near Damascus. It is either the village Ehden on Lebanon (*Burke*, *Reisen* I., 66; *Pauly*, *l. c.*, 1159), or the modern Beit el Dschanne (*house of paradise*). — A third Eden, taken from the Assyrians (2 *Kings* 19 : 12; *Is.* 37 : 12), is mentioned in *Ezek.* 27 : 23 in connection with Haran and Kalneh; situated, therefore, in N. Mesopotamia, towards the Tigris; it may be the *Maadon* named by *Assemann*, *bibl. or.*, II., 224.

RÜTERSCH.*

Edessa (called *Edesia* by the Armenians, *Urhoi* by the Syrians, *er-Rohā* by the Arabs, *Orfa* by Christians and Turks), a city of N. W. Mesopotamia, in lat. 37° 9', long. 56° 40', on the borders of the arable land, and the stony desert, having in the N. W. back-ground steep rocky cliffs, about 60 miles E. of the Euphrates. Tradition refers its origin to the remotest antiquity. The targums of Pseudo-Jonathan, of Jeruschalmi, of Jerome, and Ephraem S., make it the *Erech* of Gen. 10 : 10, a chief city of Nimrod's empire (see *Chaldea*). *Michaelis* (*Spicil.*, I., 220–25), *Buttmann* (*Mythologus*, I., 235, &c.) and v. *Bohlen* (*Die Genesis*, 129) still adopted this tradition. But as the land of Shinar hardly extended so far N., others (*Salmas.*, *ad. Solin.*, 841; *A. Bochart.*, *Phaleg.*, IV., 16; *Gesen.*, *Thes.*, 151) identify *Erech* with 'Apezza (*Ptolem.*, VI., 3, 4; *Amian. Marcell.*, XXIII., 6, 26) on the Tigris, on the borders of Babyl. and Susiana, or with 'Opxon (*Ptolem.*, V., 20, 7) S. of Bab., near the lakes formed by branches of the Euphrates (*Rosenmüller*, *bibl. Alterthumsk.*, I., 2, 25, &c.; *Tuch*, *Komm. über d. Gen.*, 235; *Knobel*, *Völkert.*, &c., 341. *Winer*, *R. W. B.*) Another tradition of the resident Arabs and Jews makes Edessa the Ur of Gen. 11 : 28 (see *Ritter*, *Geogr.*, XI., 295, 333). Historically we know nothing of Edessa as a city before the age of the Macedonians and the Seleucids. According to *Cedrenus*, *Hist. Comp. ed. Imm. Bekker*, I., 293; and *Joann. Malalas*, *Chronogr.* XVII., ed. *Dindorf.*, p. 418, *Sel. Nicator* founded it, and called it *Antiochia Mirobarbara*. *Pliny*, H. N., V., 21, and *Steph. Byzant.*, under

'Αρτιόχεια (p. 45, 2 ed. *Westerm.*; *Comp. Ritter*, *l. c.*, 335) agree with this view. Another name of it was *Kalirrhoe* (hence *Urhoi*, *Roha*, *Orfa*), derived from its many streams (*Goli.*, *ad. Alfergan.*, p. 244; *Michael.*, *l. c.*, p. 221; *Buttmann*, *l. c.*, 235, &c.). The name *Edessa* speedily supplanted that of *Antiochia*, and soon after the Seleucids established their rule, the city became the centre of an independent government, called *Osrhoenic*, after the native name of the city (*Urhoi*, *Orhoi*, *Osrhoë*. See *Assem.*, *Biblioth. Orient.*, I., 470), whose first King was *Orhoi* (or *Osrhoë*) *Bar Chevyo*, c. 136, B. C. It consisted of a Greek-Macedonian colony, and formed an aristocratic elective monarchy, the King being selected from the adjacent nations. The eighth of these rulers, *Abgar Bar Abgar* served in the army of *Tigranes* against *Lucullus*, but after the victory of the Romans he joined them. The fifteenth is said to be the *Abgar Uchomo*, (A. D. 8–45) concerning whom tradition reports an exchange of epistles with Christ (see *Abgarus*; *Ritter*, *l. c.*, 341–343). The twenty-second king, *Ma'nu Bar Aizat* (*Dio Cass.*, *Hist. Rom.*, LXVIII, 17–21), also *Abgar*, was dethroned by *Trajan*, and Edessa was overthrown. The last of the independent *Osrhoenic* princes was *Abgar Bar Ma'nu* (A. D. 200–217) whom *Caracalla* took captive by treachery in 217. The kingdom was then converted into a Roman Province. Edessa was then called *Colonia*, was made a metropolis by *Macrinus*, and thenceforth shared the fortunes of the Romans in Mesopotamia until the Arabs took it, c. 637, 641. The Mohammedans held it (excepting from 1097–1144, when the Crusaders under *Baldwin* ruled there) until *Nureddin*, 1146, destroyed it. (See *Ersch* and *Gruber*, *Encycl.*, XXXI., 70, &c.: *Wilken*, *Gesch. d. Kreuzz.*)

Edessa possesses importance for the history of the Oriental Chr. Church, as an Episcopal See, and the chief seat of Syrian learning. Though the account of *Abgar Uchomo* may be legendary, it is certain that Christianity was early spread in that region. The 26th *Osrhoenic* King (152–187), if not himself a Christian, was not averse to Christianity, and is said to have thought much of the Gnostic *Bardanes*. (*Epiph.*, *Hær.* LVI.; *Assem.*, *l. c.*, 389, 423). In 202 there was a Chr. Church there, which was destroyed by a flood in the *Daizan* (the *Ξειρος* of the Greeks, a winter-stream on the N. side of the city. See *Assem.*, *l. c.*, 391). In 313 B. Cono laid the corner-stone of a church edifice which his successor *Saades* finished. It was afterwards enlarged on the S. side by B. *Aitallaha*, and a grave-yard added. About 350 B. *Abraham* built the Church of the Confessors, and in 371 the great baptistery was erected. The Emperor *Julian*, upon the insulting pretence of making their way to heaven easier by impoverishing the Christians of E., ordered them to divide their Church treasures among his soldiers, threatening their city with fire and the sword if they refused. His death (363) frustrated his malice. — E. could not escape the internal strifes of the Eastern Church during that period. As early as *Julian's* reign the Arian party had used sanguinary measures against the *Valentinians*, and expelled their opponents

from Edessa in 373. But in 378 the orthodox party returned again to E., and for the next hundred years displayed great zeal in building churches, monasteries, and hospitals (ASSEM. l. c., 424; II., *Dissert. de Monophys.*). Edessa had also the first schools of the country, which developed Nestorianism and reared advocates of it, who served as teachers in the Persian schools which flourished there, c. 440. When the orthodox Emperors expelled Nestorian teachers and their pupils from the empire, the Persians welcomed them, among whom, thenceforth, Nestorianism rapidly spread, and the Syrian language and literature were diligently cultivated (ASSEM. l. c., I., 203, 351, 353; II., 402; IV., 70, &c., 428, &c., 744, 924, &c. LINGERKE, *de Ephraem S. arte hermen.*, 85, &c.).

The modern *Roha* or *Orfa*, *Urfa*, became better known through NIEBUHR (1766, *Reisebeschr.*, II., 406, &c.): OLIVIER (1804, *Voyage dans l'empire Ottoman*, &c.: Paris an XII., Vol. II., 331, &c.); AINSWORTH (*Researches in Assyria*, &c.: London, 1836, p. 261, &c.; *Travels*, &c., in *Asia Minor*, &c.: Lond., 1842, II., 106, &c.); BUCKINGHAM (*Travels in Mesopot.*, p. 51, &c.) have furnished much additional information. It is situated upon two hills, and the intervening valley, in the S. W. corner of a broad plain, *Edne*, at the foot of mountains which there inclose the plain. Its form is that of an irregular isocles triangle, having its base towards the S. and its rounded cone towards the N. A white limestone wall surrounds it. On a summit in the S. W. corner is a castle which, a large hall excepted, occupied by the sentinel soldiers, was in ruins when Olivier visited the place. Back of this lay other ruins, called Nimrod's tower or palace. The castle, surrounded by a trench cut in the rocks, is said by PROCOP., *de edific. Justin.*, II., 7, p. 228, *ed. Dind.*, to have been built by Justinian. Several fountains issue from the base of the castle hill, which richly supply the town with water. Below two of these, large reservoirs are formed, full of carp and barbel, held to be sacred to Abraham. Mohammedan tradition says Orfa was the place where Nimrod intended to kill Abraham, and that these two fountains sprang forth from the spot where Abraham knelt, and prayed God to deliver him. The great mosque in the northern part of the city also takes its name, *Chalil er-rachmân* or *Makâm Ibrâhîm*, from this tradition. The inhabitants of Orfa (according to Olivier, 20-24,000; Buckingham, 50,000) are chiefly Kurds, Arabs, Armenians (Niebuhr says 500 families) who have a few churches, and some Jews. Niebuhr found the congregation of Jacobite Christians with 150 houses and one church. The principal language is Turkish; the Arabic, Kurdish, and Armenian are also spoken. Edessa is famed in the East for its manufactures of fine cotton goods and yellow morocco leather. — (See besides the works named: TH. L. BAYERI, *Hist. Osrh. et Edess. ex nummis illustr.*: Petropol., 1734, 4to. ISSACHRI, *Buch d. Länder*, transl. by Mordtmann, p. 47. ABULFEDA, *Geogr. ed. Reinaud.*, Text., p. 276. EDRISI, *trad. p. Jaubert*, II., 136. *Lex. Geogr. ed. Juynboll.*, I., 293). ARNOLD.*

Edmund, 1) King and martyr. In 855 Offa, desirous of ending his days in Rome, resigned the kingdom of East Angles to his son Edmund, then in his 15th year. E. ruled in meekness, a protector of the weak, of widows and orphans. He committed the Psalter to memory. His whole life was a preparation for martyrdom. About 870 hosts of heathen Danes arrived, slew the clergy, violated the nuns, and burned churches and dwellings. E. at first resisted, rejected the conditions of peace proposed by the Danes, as injurious to his subjects and to religion, and was taken captive. He still refused the terms of his liberation, being unwilling to offend his God. He was then flayed with rods, and, whilst patiently engaged in prayer, made the target of their arrows. Finally on Nov. 20 (his anniversary) he was beheaded. His relics were deposited at his estate, Edmundsbury, and became the reputed source of miracles. A rude sanctuary of logs was put up over the place, for which Canute substituted (1020) a splendid church and abbey. A National Council at Oxford, 1122, placed his anniversary among the English holidays. The Kings of England specially honored him as their patron saint, but Henry VIII. destroyed the abbey, although his sister Catharine, widow of Louis XII., of France, was buried there.—(See his Life, by ABBO, then a monk in Canterbury, according to Dunstan's account; and do. by JOHN LYDGATE. These authors collected the accounts of his miracles). —2) *Edmund*, King and Confessor.—3) *Edmund*, canonized, 1247, consecrated as Archb. of Canterbury, 1234, but driven off for his vindication of the claims of the Romish Church. He died in France, Nov. 12, 1242. REUCHLIN.*

Edom, Edomites (עֲדוֹם, עֲדוֹמִי). I. *The Progenitor of the Edomites was Esau* (עֵשָׂו, 'Hœv), the first-born son of Isaac and Rebecca, the twin-brother of Jacob. Before their birth it had been divinely revealed that the struggling of the twins in the womb was a sign of the future enmity of their descendants, and that the elder should serve the younger (Gen. 25 : 23). Esau developed a powerful, unbridled, and wild disposition, which found pleasure only in the rough roaming life of a hunter. Not being accustomed to rule or deny himself in the least, he sold his claims on the privileges and rights of primogeniture to Jacob for a pottage of lentils to satisfy his hunger. From the violent manner in which he then cried out: "Feed me, I pray thee, with that red, with that red," is derived the surname *Edom* (Gen. 25 : 30). Whilst Rebecca loved most the quiet, retired, thoughtful and crafty Jacob, Isaac preferred the bold, firm, and powerful Esau; and when Isaac, being blind and old, made arrangements to transfer to his favorite as the first-born, all the rights, hopes, and promises of his family, the cunning and watchful Rebecca substituted the younger son, and he in reality received the blessing designed for his brother. Esau raved and wept, but Isaac, though he discovered the mistake, could and would not change what had been done. Jacob fled from the murderous anger of Esau to Mesopotamia, and Esau also left his

father's house and settled on the mountains of Seir. When Jacob returned home, after an absence of 20 years, Esau, reconciled and peaceful, went forth to meet him with 400 men. We do not read of hostile collisions between them after this; Esau had, indeed, as much as he could desire, and needed not to envy his brother. We find them both at last at the death-bed and grave of their father as reconciled brothers. — Esau's character has been misapprehended from opposite sides. Whilst Jewish enmity of race has made him to be the perfection of impiety and depravity, rationalistic critics extol him as an amiable, noble, open, upright person, and exalt him above Jacob as regards moral character. It is true, a certain attractive openness, rectitude, and kindness appears in his life, but the leading traits of his character are unbridledness, frivolity, violence, and rudeness; especially does he lack any appreciation of the calling and religious position of his family. In the Epistle to the Hebrews he is designated directly as *καρπός* and *βέβηλος*. Comp. Kurtz Gesch. des alt. Bundes. Bd., I., 2 Aufl. § 69, sq.

II. *The Land of the Edomites* constitutes the southern continuation of the East-Jordan table-land, and extends from the southern extremity of the Dead Sea to the north of the Alanitic gulf. In the O. T. it appears as the land or mountain range *Seir* (שֵׁיר) and it is still called *es-*

Schera; in the time of the Romans it was called after the Edomites (Idumæi) *Idumæa*. It is divided in the north from the land of the Moabites by the ravine el-Ahsa. On the west it is cut off from the barren table-land el-Tih by the wide and sandy valley of *Arabah* (now el-Ghor), out of which it elevates itself almost perpendicularly, while on the east it slopes gradually with a width of three and four miles to the Syrian steppe. Its highest mountain tops rise scarcely to a height of 3000 feet; the best known of these is *Hor*, in the vicinity of Petra, upon which Aaron died. Between the rocky clefts lie valleys with fruitful meadows, fields and vineyards, and forests are not wanting. Generally, however, the mountain range is bare, especially the western portion. The air is pure, and the heat is moderated by the cool wind, and the whole region is therefore very healthy (*Palästina salutaris*). The most important town of the Edomites was *Sela* (שֵׁלָא), called by the Romans

Petra (from which the whole country including the great western desert received the name of Arabia Petraea). The ruins of this ancient city were discovered by *Burckhardt* (II., 703, sq.) east of Mount Hor, in the so-called *Wady Musa*, comp. *Voyage de l'Arabie Pétrée*, *Robinson*, *Paläs.*, III., 128, sq., and *Ritter*, *Erdk.*, XIV., 1103–41. A second city of Edom often mentioned in the O. T., was *Bozra* (בֹּזְרָא, LXX.,

Βοσόρ), probably the same with the present *Besseyra*, an old castle on a mountain north of Petra, with a village of 50 houses, and many ruins in the vicinity. The description in Jer. 49 : 7–22 is very appropriate to this place. It cannot be identical with *Bostra*, often mentioned in the Roman period, because this was not in Edom,

but in Auranitis. That the Edomite conquest extended so far to the north, is very improbable. In no case, however, can the Auranitian *Bostra* be called the representative of Edom, as it is in Isaiah 63, and Jer. 49. Comp. K. v. *Raumer* in *Berghaus*, *Ann. d. Erdk.*, I., 564, sq. A third ancient town of Edom was *Theman*. Mention is already made in Gen. 36 : 34 of a land of *Temani*. According to Jerome this town was distant from Petra five miles; according to Eusebius 10. *Burckhardt* identifies it with the present *Mann*, south of Petra. The *Temani* had the reputation of possessing special wisdom, Jer. 49 : 7; Obadiah 8; Bar. 3 : 22, sq. The two important seaports of the Alanitic gulf, *Elath* (Aila) and *Ezeongeber* (see the Art.) also belong to the province of Edom.

III. *The History of the Edomites*.—The original inhabitants of Edom were the Chorites. They were partly expelled and partly subjugated by Esau. The remainder of the vanquished were blended with the descendants of the conqueror, and already in the time of Moses the province of Edom is a mighty, flourishing kingdom. The original form of government was a

union of tribes under 13 (14) dukes (אֲלֹפִים)

(Gen. 36 : 15, sq.), which must early have centralized into a kingdom, since in Gen. 36 : 31 already 8 succeeding kings are mentioned. As none of these kings was the son of his predecessor, and each of them came from a different city, the kingdom of Edom could not have been hereditary, but elective. The warlike power of the Edomites had a mighty bulwark in their naturally fortified mountain home. Their occupations were hunting, farming, raising cattle, cultivation of vineyards, and trade. The situation of the country was especially adapted to the latter, for this made them to be the transports of the very important trade between the harbors of the Persian and Alanitic gulfs on the one side, and the Phœnician and Philistian seaports on the other.—We know nothing definite about the religion of the Edomites. In 2 Chron. 25 : 14 mention is made of worshipping many gods. The prophecies of Isaac (Gen. 27 : 29; 39 : 40) are remarkably fulfilled in the later history of the Edomites. Already in the time of Moses they conducted themselves very unbrotherly towards Israel, in that they denied to it a free passage through their country (Num. 20 : 15, sq.; 21 : 4; Deut. 2 : 4, sq.). The Israelites were most strictly forbidden to oppose the Edomites (Deut. 2 : 5; 23 : 7). But as their hostility against Israel became more decided, this prohibition was removed. *Saul* already conquered them (1 Sam. 14 : 47), *David* subdued them entirely (2 Sam. 8 : 14), and *Solomon* equipped a considerable fleet in the harbors of Edom (1 Kings 9 : 26). Under *Solomon* *Hadad* attempted, it is true, to liberate his fatherland, but without result (1 Kings 11 : 14, sq.). At the division of the kingdom Edom fell to Judah. When under *Jehoshaphat* of Judah a king of Edom is mentioned, who went with him and *Joram*, of Israel, to war against Moab (2 Kings 3 : 9, 12, 26), and still, on the other hand, we are told (1 Kings 22 : 47, comp. 2 Kings 8 : 20) that in the reign of *Jehoshaphat*, no king, but a deputy-

ruled over Edom, the contradiction is reconciled by the supposition, that the title of king was allowed to the deputy as a vassal prince. Under Jehoshaphat's successor, *Joram*, the Edomites succeeded in throwing off the rule of Judah (2 Kings 8 : 20, sq.). *Amaziah* and *Azariah* attempted to reconquer them with some success: the former conquered the city of Petra, and called it Joktheel, the latter the seaport Elath (2 Kings 14 : 7, 22). But these conquests were not lasting. Under *Ahaz* the Edomites even made a destructive invasion into Judah (2 Chron. 28 : 17), and at the same time *Rezin*, King of Syria, conquered the seaport Elath. The hostility between Edom and Judah reached after that its highest point. The Edomites voluntarily attached themselves to the Chaldean conquerors, and thereby escaped the fate of violent conquest and devastation, although their country suffered much from war (Mal. 1 : 3, sq.). They rejoiced when they beheld their former oppressors succumb to Chaldean power (Lam. 4 : 21; Ezek. 35 : 15; 36 : 5; Obadiah 12), assisted it (Obad. 10), robbed and killed the fugitives, &c. During such hostilities the prophets raised their threatening voices with special emphasis against Edom (Joel 3 : 24; Amos 1 : 11; Isaiah 11 : 14; 34 : 5, sq.; Obad.; Jer. 9 : 25, sq.; 25 : 21; 27 : 2, sq.; 49 : 7, sq.; Ezek. 25 : 12, sq.; 32 : 29; 35 and 36 : 5; Mal. 1 : 2, sq.). When the Jews were carried away captive to Babylon, the Edomites took easy possession of the desolated country south of Palestine, including Hebron (Ezek. 35 : 10; 1 Macc. 5 : 65). Also, during the Syrian supremacy, they manifested their old hatred towards the Jews as much as possible (1 Macc. 5 : 3, 65; 2 Macc. 10 : 15; 12 : 32, sq.), until they were finally subjugated by *John Hyrcanus*, who compelled them to receive circumcision, and incorporated them into the Jewish State (Jos. Ant., 13, 9, 1; 15, 7, 9; bell. Jud., 4, 5, 5). But just these measures paved the way, in a remarkable manner, for a fresh triumph for the descendants of Edom. The crafty Idumean, *Antipater*, ingratiated himself so much with the weak *Hyrcanus II.*, the last king of the Maccabees, that he obtained the reins of government; and when the Romans interfered with the family quarrels of the Maccabees, *Cæsar* made him procurator of Judea, and only gave *Hyrcanus* the high priesthood. In the year 40 *Herod the Great*, the son of *Antipater*, was even proclaimed King of Judea by the Roman Senate. After this, the Jewish kingdom, with a brief interregnum of Roman governors, was under the rule of Herodian princes. After the destruction of Jerusalem, under *Titus*, the names Idumæan and Idumæa disappear from history. The country, from this time, was included in the comprehensive name Arabia. Comp. B. *Michaelis*, de ant. Idumæor. hist.: Hal., 1733; *J. van Iperen*, hist. crit. Edomæor. et Amalek.: Leow., 1768; *Hengstenberg*, Beitr., III., 273, sq.; *Hoffmann* in *Ersch*, u. *Gruber's Encyk.*, § II., Bd., XV., p. 146, sq.; *Winer*, Reallex., 3d ed. I., 292, sq.; *K. v. Raumer*, Paläst. 3, A., p. 240, sq.; *K. Ritter*, Erdk., XV., 1. p. 124, sq.; *G. Baur*, d. Proph. Amos, p. 97.

Kurtz. — Beck.

Edwards, Jonathan, was born Oct. 5, 1703, at East Windsor, in Connecticut, where his father was pastor for more than sixty years. From his childhood he was industrious and thoughtful, and while yet a youth he mastered Locke's metaphysical works, and graduated at Yale College in 1720. He studied theology at the same institution, and in 1722 took charge of a small Presbyterian congregation in New York. He was married in 1723, and begat 10 children. In 1724 he was appointed tutor in Yale College, which office he filled for two years. In February, 1727, he was ordained as colleague of his grandfather, Solomon Stoddard, in the Congregational Church at Northampton, Mass. Here he preached with extraordinary zeal, power, and success until 1750. The boldness and zeal with which he attempted to cause the strictest morality to prevail among his people, but especially the firmness with which he insisted that no one, who was not truly and spiritually born again, should be admitted to the Lord's Supper, gave rise to a warm controversy, which led to his resignation. At this time there was great difference of opinion on this subject existing in New England; and although Edwards lost his situation in this contest, his views prevailed, and since then they have prevailed, at least in theory, in the churches of New England. In 1751 he went as a missionary among the Housatonic Indians in Berkshire county, where some of his most celebrated metaphysical treatises were written. In this laborious field of labor, withdrawn from the eyes of men, he remained contented until 1758, and then with reluctance he accepted the Presidency of Princeton College, N. J., where he died in the same year from small-pox, aged 54 years.

We learn his Christian character from the account of his religious experience, which he himself wrote. "The first instance that I remember of that sort of inward, sweet delight in God and divine things that I have lived much in since, was in reading those words, 1 Tim. 1 : 17, *Now unto the King eternal, immortal, invisible, the only wise God, be honor and glory for ever and ever, Amen.* As I read these words, there came into my soul, and was as it were diffused through it, a sense of the glory of the Divine Being; a new sense, quite different from anything I ever experienced before. Never any words of Scripture seemed to me as these words did. I thought with myself, how excellent a Being that was, and how happy I should be, if I might enjoy that God, and be rapt up to him in heaven, and be as it were swallowed up in him for ever! I kept saying, and as it were singing over these words of Scripture to myself; and went to pray to God that I might enjoy him, and prayed in a manner quite different from what I used to do; with a new sort of affection. But it never came into my thought, that there was anything spiritual, or of a saving nature, in this. From about that time, I began to have a new kind of apprehension and ideas of Christ, and the work of redemption, and the glorious way of salvation by him. An inward sweet sense of these things, at times, came into my heart; and my soul was led away in pleasant views and contemplations of them.

And my mind was greatly engaged to spend my time in reading and meditating on Christ, on the beauty and excellency of his person, and the lovely way of salvation by free grace in him. I found no books so delightful to me as those that treated of these subjects. Those words, Cant. 2 : 1, used to be abundantly with me, *I am the Rose of Sharon, and the Lily of the valleys*. The words seemed to me sweetly to represent the loveliness and beauty of Jesus Christ. The whole book of Canticles used to be pleasant to me, and I used to be much in the habit of reading it, about that time; and found, from time to time, an inward sweetness, that would carry me away, in my contemplations. This I know not how to express otherwise, than by a calm, sweet abstraction of soul from all the concerns of this world; and sometimes a kind of vision, or fixed ideas and imaginations, of being alone in the mountains, or some solitary wilderness, far from all mankind, sweetly conversing with Christ, and rapt and swallowed up in God. The sense I had of divine things, would often of a sudden kindle up, as it were, a sweet burning in my heart; an ardor of soul, that I know not how to express. — Not long after I first began to experience these things, I gave an account to my father of some things that had passed in my mind. I was pretty much affected by the discourse we had together; and when the discourse was ended, I walked abroad alone, in a solitary place in my father's pasture, for contemplation. And as I was walking there, and looking up on the sky and clouds, there came into my mind so sweet a sense of the glorious *majesty* and *grace* of God, that I knew not how to express. I seemed to see them both in a sweet conjunction; majesty and meekness joined together; it was a sweet, and gentle, and holy majesty; and also a majestic meekness; an awful sweetness; a high, and great, and holy gentleness. After this my sense of divine things gradually increased, and became more and more lively. The appearance of everything was altered; there seemed to be, as it were, a calm, sweet cast, or appearance of divine glory, in almost everything. God's excellency, his wisdom, his purity and love, seemed to appear in everything; in the sun, and moon, and stars; in the clouds, and blue sky; in the grass, flowers, and trees; in the water, and all nature; which used greatly to fix my mind. I had vehement longings of soul after God and Christ, and after more holiness, wherewith my heart seemed to be full, and ready to break; which often brought to my mind the words of the Psalmist, Ps. cxix. 20, 'My soul breaketh for the longing it hath.' I often felt a mourning and lamenting in my heart, that I had not turned to God sooner, that I might have had more time to grow in grace.—The soul of a true Christian, as I then wrote my meditations, appeared like such a little white flower as we see in the spring of the year; low and humble on the ground, opening its bosom to receive the pleasant beams of the sun's glory; rejoicing as it were in a calm rapture; diffusing around a sweet fragrance; standing peacefully and lovingly, in the midst of other flowers round about; all in like manner opening their bosoms, to drink in the light of the sun. There was no

part of creature holiness, that I had so great a sense of its loveliness, as humility, brokenness of heart and poverty of spirit; and there was nothing that I so earnestly longed for. My heart panted after this, to lie low before God, as in the dust; that I might be nothing, and that God might be *all*, that I might become as a little child." (Edwards' Works, Worcester's edition, Vol. I., pp. 34, 35, 36–38).

The vigor with which he cultivated a holy life, may be inferred from the following of his seventy resolutions, which he formed early in life, and faithfully observed, reading them through every week, that he might never forget them. 1. "Resolved, That *I will do whatsoever* I think to be most to God's glory and my own good, profit, and pleasure *on the whole*; without any consideration of the time, whether now, or never so many myriads of ages hence; to do whatever I think to be my *duty*, and most for the good and advantage of mankind in general—whatever *difficulties* I may meet with, how many and how great soever. 11. Resolved, when I think of any theorem in divinity to be solved, immediately to do what I can towards solving it, if circumstances do not hinder. 13. Resolved, to be endeavoring to find out fit objects of charity and liberality. 17. Resolved, that I will live so as I shall wish I had done when I come to die. 18. Resolved, to live so at all times, as I think it best in my devout frames, and when I have clearest notions of the gospel and another world. 24. Resolved, whenever I do any evil action, to trace it back, till I come to the original cause; and then both carefully endeavor to do so no more, and to fight and pray with all my might against the original of it. 34. Resolved, never to speak in narratives anything but the pure and simple verity. 36. Resolved, never to speak evil of any person, except some particular good call for it." (Edwards' Works, &c., pp. 14, 15, 16, 17).

The fruits of his laborious studies, which generally occupied from 12 to 16 hours daily, are his posthumous manuscripts, written with his own hand, numbering more than 1400. They were written with great care and neatness, and arranged with the most careful exactness. Below we give a list of some of his principal works, with the date of their first publication.

1736, *A Narrative of the work of God in the conversion of many hundred souls in Northampton*—a modest account of the wonderful effect of his preaching and that of other ministers, at that time. 1742, *Thoughts on the Revival of Religion in New England in 1740*—a work called forth by the opposition made to the labors of the distinguished George Whitefield, whose warm friend and able defender Edwards was. 1746, *A Treatise concerning Religious Affections*—a very able and acute work, which was calculated to sift the errors, abuses, and excrescences of the revival of 1740 and the previous year. 1749, *Life of Rev. David Brainerd*—a very zealous missionary among the Indians, and a pupil of Edwards. 1749, *Humble Inquiry concerning the Qualifications for membership in the visible Christian Church*. 1752, *A Reply to S. Williams' Answer*. These last two treatises belong to the Northampton Controversy. 1754, *A Treatise on*

the Freedom of the Will. 1758, *A Treatise on Original Sin.* These two able and celebrated treatises were written against the Armenian theology, which had commenced to spread in New England, and in them the author develops some of his peculiar views, which constitute the foundation of the so-called Edwards' theology. The last treatise was in print, when the author died. Both were written in the depths of the forest, during the time he was missionary among the Indians. — After his death was published: 1774, *The History of Redemption*—one of the most characteristic and interesting works—the introduction to the comprehensive theological system, which he had projected, but which he did not live to complete. 1788, *On the Nature of Virtue.* 1788, *God's last end in Creation.* From 1731 to 1796 there were published also several volumes of sermons and miscellaneous writings; and yet the manuscript treasures of this untiring author are not by a great deal exhausted. Within the last few years a large volume "*On Charity*," never before published, was issued from the press, from his manuscripts.

The following are the more or less complete editions of his collected works: *Jonathan Edwards' Works*—1) published by S. Austin, D. D., 6 vols. 8vo.: Worcester, Mass., 1808–09; 2) published by Williams and Parsons, 8 vols. 8vo.: London, 1817; 3) published by S. E. Dwight, D. D., 10 vols. 8vo.: New York, 1829–30; 4) with preface by Henry Rogers, 2 vols., large 8vo.: London, 1834; 5) published by Leavitt & Co., 4 vols. 8vo.: New York, 1852.

Fault has been found with all these editions, that they are not only incomplete by omitting many important treatises existing in MS., but that they depart considerably from the original text in many places. To remedy all these deficiencies, and to restore a complete and exact edition, a new one, to consist of about 14 vols., is to be published by Johnson and Hunter, in Edinburgh, Scotland, as the third contribution of their periodical edition of "*Standard Divines*."

Edwards was a thinker of power, boldness and originality, never satisfied with walking in the steps of his predecessors. The opinion exists, that the Calvinistic system of theology received several important modifications from him, and especially from him in connection with his immediate pupils. According to the statement of his son, Dr. Edwards, of Connecticut, the important improvements of the Calvinistic theology, made by his father, relate mainly to the following 10 points: 1) God's last end in Creation; 2) Freedom and necessity; 3) The nature of true virtue; 4) The origin of moral evil; 5) The doctrine of the atonement; 6) The imputation of Adam's sin and Christ's righteousness; 7) The state of the unregenerate and their use of the means of grace; 8) The nature of experimental religion; 9) The doctrine of disinterested willing to do good; 10) The doctrine of regeneration.

All these doctrines are largely discussed in his published works; and among his MSS. is a carefully prepared treatise on the doctrine of the Trinity, which is written with great independence of thought, boldness and power. What he really contributed towards advancing the

theological science of his time, may be embraced in the following propositions: 1) All virtue proceeds from the will, taking this term in its widest sense, not from the pathological feelings, nor from the natural disposition of the body, or of the mind. 2) True virtue consist in voluntary love for beings in general, and can, therefore, be embraced in the preference given to God above all other beings, and to the interests of the collective Universe above individual interests. 3) All human inability to do good, is sin, i. e., there is no blameless inability, which lies back of all sin, and which is the cause of sin, but all our inability is our sinful not willing to do good. This is called *moral inability*, and is distinguished from *natural inability*, which, so far as it exists, absolves from all moral blame. 4) Man never lost anything of his freedom; he now possesses all the freedom, which he had before the fall, and all that he can have. (See Edwards' Works, Dwight's edition, Vol. 2, p. 293, sq.).

The Theological School of Edwards.—Samuel Hopkins belongs to the earliest and ablest pupils of Edwards. He was born in Waterbury, Connecticut, 1721, studied theology with Edwards, and received a call to a small colony of only 30 families, in the wilderness of Housatonic, Mass., where, during 26 years, he studied, investigated, preached and wrote, after which time he was dismissed for want of money. He then received a call to Newport, Rhode Island, to a small church, where he remained until 1803, and died aged 82 years. He was by no means inferior to Edwards, in true Christian simplicity and piety, in power and independence of thought. One of the most upright and fearless of men, he was among the first who boldly and decidedly opposed slavery and the slave trade, whose nature but few at that time understood. He possessed no graceful ornaments of style, and his delivery was almost as bad as it could be, so that he was never an acceptable preacher; but, notwithstanding these disadvantages, he exercised almost as much influence as Edwards himself, by the naked force of his thoughts. His principal work, besides his numerous miscellaneous writings and sermons, was a thoroughly prepared system of Divinity, in two large vols., 8vo., published in Boston, 1791, and again, 1811. The most complete edition of his works was issued in Boston, 1852, by the Publication Committee of the Congregationalists, in 3 vols., 8vo., with a very interesting memoir by Prof. Park, of Andover.

Some of his leading views are as follows: 1) God is the producing cause of all activities of the human will, be they good or bad. 2) Adam alone was burdened with the guilt of original sin, and total moral depravity consists in the opposition of the will or heart of man to do that which it is truly and fully able to do. This is called *moral inability*, in distinction from that which is disposition of temperament or natural disposition. 3) Holiness in a moral being consists exclusively in a disinterested will to do good. 4) Sin consists exclusively in a selfish moral exercise. 5) Atonement and redemption are in their nature and results different; the former opens the door of grace, the latter brings the

blessing of salvation to the individual. 6) Effectual calling consists in this, that God produces a willingness in the hearts of sinners to be saved. 7) Although the righteousness of Christ is the only ground of the justification of sinners, still his righteousness is not transferred to them. Neither sin nor holiness can be transferred, whether from Adam to his posterity, or from Christ to his people. 8) Repentance precedes faith; love comprehends in its nature all the Christian virtues.

Jonathan Edwards, the younger, who died in 1801, aged 56 years, was an able expounder and defender of the theology of his father, and published much that was the result of his own thinking. The best and most complete edition of his works was published at Andover, in 1842, in 2 vols., 8vo.

Joseph Bellamy, of Connecticut, died 1790, aged 71 years, an eloquent preacher and zealous, influential theologian, was another of the most distinguished of Edwards' pupils. The best and most complete edition of his works was published in Boston, 1850, by the Congregational Board of Publication, in 6 vols., 8vo.

Nathaniel Emmons died at Franklin, Mass., aged 95 years, after being pastor almost 70 years of a small country church of Congregationalists, in that small retired village. He was an earnest, untiring thinker, faithful preacher, and fruitful author. His style is clear, direct, simple, and powerful. His publications consist chiefly of sermons, which were originally preached in his congregation, of which many volumes were printed during his life. After his death, his son-in-law, Dr. Ide, published at Boston, 1842, in 8 octavo vols., a complete uniform edition of his works, with a memoir, mainly an autobiography. The most important doctrinal points, which Emmons especially developed, are: 1) Moral attributes belong alone to "exercise." 2) Every moral exercise, be it good or bad, although perfectly free, is the result of direct divine influence. 3) Every exercise of a moral nature is either perfectly good or perfectly bad. —The first two propositions he held in common with Hopkins, the last was peculiar to him and his special school.

Timothy Dwight, the grandson of Edwards, was born in Northampton, Mass., 1752, and died as President of Yale College, 1817. He was pre-eminent among N. England theologians for extensive and varied learning, and fertility as a writer. He was chaplain in the army of the Revolution; he composed patriotic songs, which were very popular in their day; he composed music; wrote religious hymns, epic poems, and travels; he was a very successful preacher; an extraordinarily able and careful academical teacher; a farmer, politician, and theologian; and prominent in all these departments. His writings are very numerous, and are generally distinguished by good taste, a flowing and pure style, and vigorous common sense. He rejected Hopkins' and Emmons' idea of divine causality in the production of the evil deeds of men, also the so-called "exercise" theory; and contributed more than any other theologian to the development and systematization of the theology of the Edwards' school. His principal work in this

department is: "Theology, explained and defended in a series of sermons," first published at Middletown, Conn., in 5 vols., 8vo., 1818, afterwards in New York, in 4 vols., 8vo., and often reprinted. Dwight was inferior to Edwards, or Hopkins, or Emmons, in originality and innate power of thinking, but excelled them in literary culture, in the extent and manifoldness of his knowledge, in taste, tact, and versatility as an author.

The most prominent among the living representatives of the theology of Edwards, are *Leonard Woods*, for almost 40 years professor of theology at Andover, and *Lyman Beecher*, formerly professor of theology at Cincinnati, the former belonging to the so-called *Old School* party, the latter to the *New*. Woods' works appeared, from 1849–50, at Andover, in 5 vols. 8vo., and Beecher's works are at present (1855) passing through the press at Boston, — three vols. have appeared, and the whole are to be completed in 5 or 6 vols.

Many other authors of this school might be mentioned, for it is still, as it ever was, active and fruitful; meanwhile, those we have named will furnish a complete and suitable insight into the theology of this school and its tendencies. To this theological school New England was largely indebted for the preservation of its characteristic intellectual power, and for that spirit of love and progress in the practico-religious sphere, by which it has been so honorably distinguished. DR. STOWE. — Beck.

Egbert, St., a Northumbrian of noble descent, was born in the 7th cent. He early joined the monastery of Rathmelsing, and distinguished himself in the mission among the Frieslanders. In 644 he was seized with the plague, and vowed, should he recover, to quit his country and go abroad to preach the gospel. He started for Germany, but a storm drove him back, and he went to the monks upon the island of Hii, but without abandoning his purpose to labor among the Germans. He, however, did not go among them himself, but sent the learned monk *Wigbert*, who, after two years' fruitless efforts among the Frieslanders, returned. Next he sent out twelve Anglo-Saxons, and thus roused that missionary spirit which eventually reaped such glorious fruits among the Germans. Egbert succeeded, by mild means, in introducing (716) the Roman Easter and tonsure into Hii. He died in 729.—(See *BEDE, H. E. Angl.*, III., 27; V., 10, 11, 23). HERZOG.*

Egbert (Ecgbert), Archb. of York, the pupil and friend of Bede, noted for his efforts to build up the Anglo-Saxon Church, and as a teacher. Before he was chosen B. he taught at the cathedral school of York, and by his extensive learning (he was considered *armarium omnium liberalium artium*), his earnestness, and his hold upon the minds of his pupils, exerted a powerful influence. *Alcuin* and *Ælbert* were pupils of his school. After he took the episcopal chair of York (731) it was made an archbishopric. At his consecration as B., Bede, in an epistle to Egbert, suggested the propriety of dividing the see of York into several bishoprics, over which the B. of York should have metropolitan supervision. Approving of the suggestion, E., encouraged by

King Ceolwulf, of Northumbria, went to Rome, 735, and obtained the pallium and metropolitan authority over all the English Sees N. of the Humber. Thenceforth he redoubled his zeal in the discharge of his duties. Alcuin, in his poem upon the Bishops and saints of York, highly lauds him. He partly continued his labors in the cathedral-school. At his death, 767, he appointed Alcuin the librarian of his rich and choice collection of books, and instructor at the church he rendered so renowned. E. wrote: 1) A collection of canonical decisions *de jure sacerdotali*, of which only fragments remain, in MANSI, XII., 411-431; 2) A small dialogue upon eccl. institutions, MANSI, XII., 482-488. The tract: *de remediis peccatorum*, MANSI, XIII., 489, &c., is probably an abstract from the first by another author. In reference to the *penitentiaries* ascribed to him see Art. *Penitentiaries*.

HERZOG.*

Egede, Hans, of Norway, born Jan. 31, 1686, was appointed preacher in Vangen, in the diocese of Nordland, in 1707. During the next year he read some old Norman Chronicles, and was seized with a desire to learn the condition of his countrymen in Greenland. From persons who had visited the country he learned that it was inhabited by wild heathen. The thought that those were degenerate Normans kindled in him an ardent longing to preach the Gospel to them. For a time his wife opposed him; but at length she yielded to what seemed the plain indications of Providence. E. had made known his desires to two Bishops, and requested them to lay the matter before the King. But they had not thought it advisable to press it then, as the King was engaged with the affairs of the war. E. then resolved to see the King himself, and as no one would take his post at Vangen, and allow him a portion of the revenues, he resigned it in 1717, without regard to support, and in 1718 went to Bergen. There he tried to persuade some merchants to employ him on a mission to Greenland, but having failed in that also, he was compelled to appeal to the King. Frederick IV. approved of his plan, and by promising assistance, induced several Bergen merchants to get up an expedition. He also appointed E. missionary to the heathen, with an annual salary of 300 thalers. On May 3, 1721, E., with his wife and children, set sail from Bergen with three ships. They landed in Baals Revier, on an island, on the W. coast of Greenland, on July 3d. Egede soon discovered that he had to do with a branch of the Esquimaux, the exterminators of his countrymen, not with Normans. This presented unexpected difficulties. A strange race of people, with a language totally different from all European dialects, had to be mastered. The work could, therefore, proceed but slowly, and it required all E.'s energy, patience, and faith in his mission, to persevere. But he bore his trials with heroic fortitude, feeling himself rewarded in the growing affections of the Esquimaux, and their increasing regard for the gospel, despite the opposition of their priests, although there were but few actual conversions. With the approbation of some fellow-laborers who had been sent to his help, however, he baptized the children of such as con-

sented to the rite, and promised not to dissuade them from Christianity. The death of Frederick IV., Oct. 12, 1730, inflicted a blow upon the mission; for his successor, Christian VI., dissolved the settlement in Greenland, the expenses of which had for some time been borne by the King, and the European colonists there were commanded to return home, excepting that a year's provision might be retained for E., and any others that chose to remain with him, if they would then defray their own expenses home. E. with his wife and ten others resolved to stay. The following year he received orders to remain where he then was, as the work seemed to be prospering, and in 1732 the prospect of continuing traffic there revived. Meanwhile an Esquimaux, who had visited Copenhagen, brought back the small-pox to Greenland, and the disease proved fatal to large numbers. Unpleasant relations arose, also, with some Moravian missionaries who had arrived. E. now as ardently desired to quit the field, as he had longed to enter it. He was accordingly recalled in 1735; but before his departure his wife died. Physically and spiritually depressed, he preached his farewell-sermon, upon Isa. 49: 4, on July 29, 1734, and started for home with his children, and the body of his wife. On his return he was appointed principal of a seminary for missionaries to Greenland, and in 1740 superintendent of the Greenland mission. He filled this office until 1747, when he resigned it because the Greenland mission was made simply a stepping stone into the Danish State-Church. He spent the last 11 years of his life at Stubbekjøbing, where he died Nov. 5, 1758.—(See Diary of E.; J. H. BRAUER'S, *Hans. E.*, in Brauer's contributions to the history of heathen missions. Dr. A. G. RUDELBACH'S, *Christl. Biogr.*, 6. Lief.).

BRAUER.*

Eginhart (*Agenhard*, *Ainhard*), a member of the court of Charlemagne. His origin is unknown, but he was probably of noble descent, and born c. 765-75. Charlemagne always regarded him with favor, and he enjoyed the friendship of his sons. Louis made him tutor of Lothaire. But no nearer relationship to the imperial family can be shown. E.'s wife (though styled *noblissima puella*, hence of noble birth) was certainly not Charlemagne's daughter, for C. had no daughter Emma, and cotemporaneous authorities make no allusion to such a relationship. Neither is there any proof that E. had children. It is known he had none in 817. From c. 826, or 827, he and his wife seem to have lived separate *quoad thorum*, for in a letter to Abbot Lupus, of Ferrières, written 836, and full of lamentations over Emma's death, he says: *Dolor, quem ex morte olim fidellissimæ conjugis, jam nunc carissimæ sororis ac sociæ, gravissimum cepi*; though he may merely allude to her removal to another world, and in that case they would have maintained the connubial relation to her death, even whilst he was abbot, and even the spiritual abbot of Seligenstadt. In providing for E. Charlemagne departed (as he did in the case of Alcuin and other friends who followed his court) from his rule not to accumulate benefices, and bestowed several upon him. During C.'s life he also had the post of overseer of

the royal buildings at Aix la Chapelle. Louis gave him an estate in Odenwald, of which Michelstadt was the chief place, where mainly he spent his last years. There, 826, he was consecrated presbyter, and in 827 became abbot of the monastery of Seligenstadt, which he founded on his estate. — Charlemagne often employed him in State matters. — He wrote a biography of C. which furnishes the basis of his history, and during the middle-ages became a model for other similar works. The best ed. is that of PERTZ, 1829, in the 2d vol. of the *Monum. Germanicæ historicae*. Following this is IDELER's "Leben u. Wandel K. d. Gr.," &c. &c.: Hamb. u. Gotha, 1839, 8vo. E.'s annals for 741–88 are based upon the older annals of Lorsch; but those for 788–829 were wholly composed by E., and are valuable sources of information for that period. (See PERTZ, *l. c.*, Vol. I.). E. also wrote a *hist. translationis St. Marcellini et Petri*, relics of whom he brought from Rome to his abbey in Seligenstadt at its establishment. (See it in the *Act. SS.*, for June 2). A number of his letters are still extant. His *libellus de adoranda cruce* is lost. LEO.*

Eglon.—1) The residence of one of the five Amorite Kings, taken by Joshua (Josh. 10 : 3, 34), and assigned to Judah (15 : 39). It is difficult to fix its location. Eusebius (in his *Onomast.*) says: *Eglon, quæ et Odollam*; but this conflicts with Josh. 12 : 12, 15, and 15 : 35, 39. And yet Eglon seems to have been near to Odollam, though a little further west (following the order of the names in Josh. 15). This would agree with Eusebius' calculation (10 or 12 miles W. of Eleutherop.), and Robinson's (II., 49) identification of the place with the modern 'Ajlân on the way from Gaza to Hebron.—2) A king of the Moabites (Judges 3 : 12–30), who tyrannized over Israel for 18 years, and was assassinated by Ehud. PRESSER.*

Egypt, ancient.—The name Αἴγυπτος is used in Homer, both of the river and the adjacent country. Some have derived the word from a Shemitic root עָנַן, *clausit*, (Sickler, Geogr., II., 586); others from a Sanscrit *âgupta*, for *gupta*, *custoditus*, *tutus*. But since it is found only among the Greeks and those nations who obtained it from them, its Greek origin seems to be certain. The Coptic name, both Theban and Memphitic, is *Keme*, and with the hieroglyphic designation, means *black*. The country was called black, not from the color of its inhabitants, which was red; but from that of its soil, which formed a strong contrast with the adjacent countries. Herodotus (2, 12) and Plutarch (de Is. c. 33) connects the name with this quality of the soil. The native name of Egypt has often been derived from the Hebrew name of *Ham*, the son of Noah, and ancestor of the Hamites. The Hebrew root of עָנַן, *calidus*, עָנַן, *incaluit*, which is undoubtedly the root of *Ham* (Αἴγυπτος, Αἴγυπτος, Αἴγυπτος), corresponds more closely with the Egyptian *Ḫem* (Memphitic) or *Ḫem* (Theban), *calidus esse*, which has no direct connection with *Ḫem*, *niger*. In *Cham*, the general idea of the warm south, as in the Greek

Αἴγυπτος, seems rather to have been retained. The proper name of Egypt was among the Hebrews מִצְרַיִם, *Masor*, (Is. 19, 6), more often in the dual מִצְרַיִם, *Misraim*, in Greek *Μίσηρ* or *Μισραϊμ* (Jos. Ant., 1, 6, 2). Perhaps it was originally used not of the country, but of the chief city, and afterwards spread as a proper name further northward. The Arabian name is *masr*, *urbs*, *urbs magna*; and Cairo, the present capital *El Masr*, and the country *barr Masr*, the land of *Masr*. The dual *Misraim* can only refer to its division into Upper and Lower Egypt, and not to the two shores of the river: for Egypt was in all times regarded by its inhabitants as a kingdom consisting of two parts, and it is thus described in hieroglyphics. Nor was this division a mere political one, but rested on an original difference of religion, language and customs of their population. That *Masr* was in Asia generally the name of Egypt, is now evident from the cuneiform inscriptions. In the Persian (Rawlinson, Jour. of the R. As. Soc., Vol. X., p. 130) it was *Mudrâya*, or *Mudarâya*; in the Median, *Mutsariga*; the Babylonian, *Misir*; the Assyrian, *Musri* (Vol. XIV., P. I, p. 18).—Egypt proper comprises the valley of the Nile from the first cataract to the Mediterranean, from 24° 6' to 31° 36' N. L., and from 27° 30' to 30° 40' E. L., from Paris. The course of the stream deviates but little from a northern direction. The valley is generally about 9 miles broad, only exceptionally about 24 miles. At 30° N. L., the sides of the valley bend towards the east and the west, and the Nile divides into several arms, forming the fruitful Delta, of a width of nearly 3 degrees. Bounded on the north by the sea, and on the other sides by extensive deserts, the narrow strip of inhabited land seems like a lengthened oasis, whose secluded and nearly inaccessible position has exerted the most decided influence upon the development of the Egyptian people and their relations to the neighboring nations. The two sides of the valley are not, as is generally supposed, two ridges of mountains; but the declivities of the rocky plateau of the desert, through which the Nile has drawn its deep furrow. Only at a distance of several days' journey the level of the desert is broken by a ridge, which rises at times into peaks above 6000 feet high, and follows the course of the Red Sea. This section, between the Nile and the Red Sea, has always been regarded as belonging to Egypt in its wider sense: so also those oases of the western desert which are accessible from the valley. The first cataract, between the islands of Elephantine and Philæ, was, in ancient times, already a boundary of nations and languages between the Æthiopians and Egyptians, as it is at present between the Nubians and Egyptians. The Lybian nations of N. Africa dwelt to the west of the Delta. The latter was from the earliest time the chief point of arrival from the sea. The principal connection between Egypt and the civilized nations of the North, was from Palestine along the coast of the sea towards Pelusium. Along this road, the "river of Egypt" (Numb. 34 : 5; Jos. 15 : 4, 47; Diod. 1 : 60) forms the boundary between Egypt and Palestine. For a

long period, however, the Pharaohs also ruled over a large part of Æthiopia and the peninsula of Sinai. — The climate of the country varies. In the lower country rain is not at all unfrequent, whilst in the Thebais scarcely a cloud is to be seen during the entire year. At Alexandria the average temperature is 16° R., at Thebes, 23°. The productiveness of the country depends entirely upon the inundations of the Nile, which, from the earliest period, were carefully directed by canals. In the southern part of the country the inundation, from changes in the bed of the river, no longer reaches the height of the banks; hence the water is there raised by wheels. The annual rise of the river is caused by the rains in the tropical highlands. The floods reach E. about the middle of June; the Delta at the end of June. The waters continue to rise for three months. Between the 20th and 25th of Aug., the dams in U. Egypt are cut in order to lead the water over the fields; and about a month later in L. Egypt. Near the end of September the water retires. During October the country dries, the fields are sown, and soon covered with vegetation. The harvest takes place at the end of March. From the above peculiarities the Egyptian year was divided into three seasons of 4 months each. The first, or water season, lasted from the end of June to the end of September; 2, the garden season lasted to the end of January; 3, the harvest season to the beginning of the new year. — From the earliest period, E. has been celebrated for its great fertility. It was the granary (*claustra annonæ*, *Tac. hist.*, 3, 8) of all neighboring states. It was this which led Abraham (Gen. 12: 10), and afterwards the sons of Jacob (Gen. 42: 1) to Egypt. But the country was also rich in other productions. The Israelites longed for the flesh-pots of Egypt (Ex. 16: 3); for its fish, cucumbers, melons, leeks, onions, and garlic (Numb. 11: 5). The wealth of Egypt in cattle, sheep, goats, and hogs, in fish and game, also in wine, figs, melons, and a great variety of other fruits and vegetables, has become evident from its ancient monuments. In a grave near the pyramid of Memphis (Lepsius, *Denkmäler aus Aeg. u. Æth.*, II., 9), 835 cattle, 220 calves, 760 asses, 974 sheep, and 2235 goats, are mentioned as the property of its occupant. Among plants the *papyrus* and lotus deserve mention, of which the former, however, is no longer found in Egypt. On the other hand, the *date-palm*, which at present is of so much importance, seems to have been of less importance anciently; though it was not entirely wanting, as appears from the monuments. Strabo says, that throughout E. the palm was of a poor quality; its fruits in the Delta could scarcely be eaten; in the Thebais it was somewhat better. It was remarkable, too, that the *camel*, which at present is among the most useful animals of the country, appears so seldom among the ancients, that it is never represented in hieroglyphics or otherwise. It cannot have been unknown, since it was much used among neighboring people (Gen. 24: 10; 30: 43; Job 1: 3), especially in their commercial journeys to E. (Gen. 37: 25). In Gen. 12: 16, Pharaoh even gives camels to Abraham. It seems, however, that in the inte-

rior the camel was wholly unused. Herodotus and Diodorus say nothing of Egyptian camels; Strabo (p. 815) says that the Egyptians travelled on camels through the desert of Coptos to Berenice. The *horse*, too, seems to have been introduced from Asia: at least its presence in the old kingdom, before the irruption of the Hyksos, has not yet been proven from the monuments, and at the beginning of the new it appears for the first time in a procession of Asiatic strangers, who brought them in the 16th cent., B. C., with other Asiatic animals as a present to Tuthmosis III. (Wilkinson, *Mann. and Cust.*, Vol. 1, end). Under the kings of the succeeding 19th dynasty, horses were used in great numbers in battles, but only for drawing war-chariots, not for riding; though in Gen. 50: 9; Exod. 14: 9, 23, riders also are mentioned. As in the East generally, the ass was commonly used for riding, and for carrying burdens. The *wild ass* (*ὄνυξ*) is still found in large herds in Nubia. That under the Leviathan, Job 40: 25, the *crocodile*, and under Behemoth (40: 25), the hippopotamus was meant, is now admitted. Formerly the latter was found in the lower Nile; at present it is no longer found in Egypt. In the Eg. *hades* the female hippopotamus represents the adversary (Book of the Dead, c. 125), and is called *Amām*, the devourer of *hades*. In Thebes the goddess *Ap*, or, with the article, *Tap*, represented as having the head of a hippopotamus was highly honored. E. was rich in *mineral* also, especially in building-stones. In the greater part of the country the banks of the river consist of limestone, the fine and compact texture of which is still admired in the pyramids and extensive necropolises of Memphis, and the beautifully-sculptured grottoes of Thebes. Near El Kab the sandstone region begins, in which the quarries of Selseleh are celebrated. At the cataracts the primitive rocks appear in a rich variety of beautifully-colored granite and syenite. Still greater was the variety of minerals in the more remote regions of the Nile, and among the Arabian mountains. Here were found the celebrated honey-colored alabaster, porphyry, and breccia. Gold also was found in the mountains east of Syene, smaragd in the mines of Berenice, and copper in the peninsula of Sinai. The nature of the country thus described, added to a pure sky, a warm though eminently healthful climate, a loam well adapted for burned and unburned brick, as also an abundance of all kinds of material for architectural, sculptural, and written monuments, and a wonderfully conservative atmosphere, lending permanency to everything, guarded against violence; these were the circumstances which qualified the Egyptians to be the first *historical* people of the earth. They undoubtedly aided in unfolding that early tendency of constructing monuments, especially architectural ones; and of making them the more eloquent by ornamental and pictorial designs. No nation has followed this tendency so extensively. This their historical sense soon led them to describe events in the order of annals; by which, again, the want of a more accurate calculation and division of time was awakened, which required close astronomical observations. These latter were rendered easy by

the unclouded sky of the country. In fact, we find upon the monuments of the first great historical period indisputable proofs of a knowledge of astronomical periods, from which a long and close observation of the stars must be inferred. — All conditions were thus present, by which the higher civilization, belonging to the three chief branches of the family of Noah, could be developed in Egypt earlier and more readily, than in any other country. It is now an admitted fact, that the old Egyptian kingdom had a historical existence in the fourth thousand of years, B. C., and had reached a national prosperity which needed a long antecedent period of development: but that the broad Lethe of Hyksos barbarism had prevented any knowledge of it from reaching the nations of the north, so that until recently the beginning of its history was placed at a period in which this kingdom had already reached its decline.

Our chronological data of the ancient Egyptian kingdom are derived wholly from the history of Manetho, written in Greek by command of Ptolemy Philadelphus, and compiled from the historical annals in the archives of the temples. The extracts from it in Josephus, Africanus, and Eusebius, have become strictly historical only since the deciphering of the hieroglyphics has enabled us to test, correct and complete his statements.—Champollion already had succeeded in this way in going back to the beginning of the new kingdom, or 18th dynasty. At present the former part of the Manethonian dynasty is just as little doubted. The immense number of chronologically determinable monuments, offers us a nearly uninterrupted series of kings down to the 4th dynasty. The drawings of the Prussian expedition embrace no less than some hundreds of designs from the ancient kingdom (*Denkmäl. aus Egypt. u. Æthiop. Abth., II., pp. 1–153*).—Concerning the historical beginning of Eg. history, according to Manetho, there are two different opinions. The one, urged by Böckh (*Maneth. u. d. Hundsternperiode: Berl., 1845*) regards the 30 dynasties as consecutive, at least in the opinion of the Egyptians. According to him, the first year of the first king, Menes, was 5702, B. C. The other view, making the dynasties of Manetho to be, in part at least, contemporaneous, is advanced by Bunsen (*Eg. Stelle in d. Welt-Gesch.: Hamb., 1845*), and Lepsius (*Chronol. d. Eg., Theil. I.: Berl., 1848*). The former, preferring the numerical data of a fragment of Eratosthenes to those of Manetho's, places the beginning of the Eg. kingdom in 3643; whilst the latter, following a fixed Manethonian datum, comprehending the entire compass of Eg. history, with which the numbers of the separate dynasties correspond, gives the first year of Menes as 3892, A. C.—The Eg. accepted three dynasties of the gods ruling previous to their human dynasties. The first of them consisted of their seven supreme gods, viz.: the supreme national god, Ra or the sun-god, and the divine family of Osiris, the local god of the oldest royal residence. This, in Upper Egypt. Next followed a dynasty of 12 gods, headed by Thoth, the moon-god. The third consisted of 30 demigods (*Lepsius, Ub. d. erst. egypt. Gött.-Kreis, 1849*). The connecting link between

these and their first historical king, was a dynasty of so-called Manes (μάνες) whose royal seat was This, the native city of Menes (*Chronol., Vol. 1, p. 474, 482, 501*).—Menes, the Thinite, went to L. Egypt, where he founded Memphis and the first historical dynasty. The Up. Eg. royal line continued, however, to reign as the second Thinite dynasty, but soon became extinct. The 1st dynasty was immediately followed by the 3d and 4th, which, however, are called Memphitic. During the latter the kingdom reached its first eminence. At this time the two largest pyramids, of Cheops and Chephren, and the smaller one of Mykerinos, were built; whilst under the 3d dynasty the two pyramids near the modern Daschur had been built. The sculptured graves around these pyramids give us a surprisingly complete view of the life of the Egyptians, of their arts and trades, their possessions and daily occupations, their offices and dignities, their relationships, worship of the gods and the dead, etc., at a time, the second half of the fourth thousand of years, B. C., when all the rest of mankind is still silent for us, and continues thus for ten centuries to come.—The 5th dynasty, also Memphitic, follows immediately the 4th. The names of its kings are found in the graves of Memphis. Contemporaneously with it reigned in Up. Eg. the six from Elephantine; hence, from the Ethiopian boundary. Here the Ethiopians first appear in Eg. history. Their kings, however, so far as they appear on their monuments, found only in Up. Egypt, differ in nothing from the Eg. kings. This seems to indicate their near relationship, unless we suppose that in Eg. they became Egyptians.—Under the succeeding dynasties, down to the 11th, the prosperity of the country diminished, as we can judge from the absence of monuments. The 11th was the 1st Theban. It made itself independent in Up. Eg., and founded the power and fame of Thebes, previously unknown, and of its god Ammon. The 12th, or 2d Theban dynasty became a general one, and raised the country to a second prosperity, which, like the former, is indicated by a series of the stately monuments, especially by its wonderful graves cut into the rock. The greatness of this period appears also from its gigantic enterprises to promote the general welfare. Such was the canal of Joseph, leading into the sea of Moeris, by which a hitherto desert country was converted into a most fertile one, and which, in the dry season, watered also the country around Memphis. This system of irrigation, which embraced the entire country, was executed during a reign of 42 years by Amenemha III. He also built near the sea his pyramid, as also the temple which subsequently became the centre of the celebrated labyrinth.—But five years after his death, however, the kingdom was suddenly hurled from the height of its prosperity. About 2100, B. C., the Hyksos, a warlike shepherd race, entered Eg. from the east, overpowered the country, occupied Memphis as their residence, laid a tribute on the upper and lower country, and fortified the N.-E. pass, which they had found open, in order to repel other races pressing on after them. Only after 511 years, the native kings, who had maintained their independence

partly in Up. Eg. and partly in Ethiopia, succeeded in expelling the Hyksos from Avaris, the later Pelusium, their last stronghold. This was a powerful, and, perhaps, the first great resistance from the South to the vast streams of nations issuing from Asia; a resistance which modified materially all existing relations of the world. An entire people, numbering hundreds of thousands, who in the highly cultivated cities of Eg. had gained at least as much civilization as they had destroyed, were compelled to seek a new home in Palestine. This, no doubt, led to new expulsions and emigrations; perhaps also to a separation of the expelled Hyksos into different directions. Hence it is easy to understand how this world-event could produce a general movement among the nations, and leave a deep impression upon the future.—The time of this new era was the 16th to the 14th cent., B. C., and it is worthy of remark, that the roots of all the historical and historic-mythological traditions of all other nations of antiquity can be traced back to about this time, but not further back.—The expulsion of the Hyksos has from an early age been connected with the *Exodus of the Israelites*, and the two have been declared to be one and the same event. The view was advanced by Josephus, who wished in this way to vindicate for his people a higher antiquity and an early power. For this assertion he knew no authority but the history of Manethô, by whom, however, according to his own extracts, he is most decidedly contradicted. In fact an impartial examination of the account of Manethô can leave not the least doubt, that the Egyptians themselves regarded and reported the two events as wholly distinct. The expulsion of the Hyksos is placed under Thutmosis, i. e., Tuthmosis III. The Exodus of the Israelites, which is described as an expulsion of leprous and rebellious people, led on by a Heliopolitan priest named Osarsiph, who afterwards called himself Moses, took place, according to Manethô, during the reign of a king who, being the son of a Ramses and father of a Sethô, can only have been the Menaphtes or Menephtes of the Manethonian lists, son of Ramses II., and father of Sethos II. Both kings, Tuthmosis III. and Menephtes, forming the beginning and the end of the period of Egypt's highest prosperity, are thoroughly known to us from monuments, and are separated by about 250 years. So far, from Eg. accounts, the two events also were separated.—These things being now reduced to certainty, the only remaining question is, whether the O. Test. accounts contradict the Egyptian, and this in such a manner as to require us to consider the latter as false. It appears, however, that the Eg. accounts are confirmed most positively by those of the Hebrews, if we admit an error, a later addition, in the calculation of the period between the Exodus and the building of the temple; which, according to 1 Kings, 6: 1, amounted to 480 years; a number, however, which does not agree with the numbers in the Book of Judges, with the Septuagint, with Acts 13: 20, nor with Josephus (Ant. 8, 3, 1; c. Ap. 2, 2). Whilst these calculations would lead to a much higher number of years, an impartial examination of the

genealogies, especially the Levitical ones, as being most reliable, gives us precisely the number which is required, if the Egyptian tradition concerning the epoch of the Exodus is correct. This is not the place to show that the numbers of the Book of Judges, or the Rabbinical chronology, do not contradict this view (Chron. d. Æg. I. p. 360, 377). The most weighty confirmation of it lies in the fact, that in the Mosaic account a circumstance is mentioned, which designates the time most decisively; we mean the building of Pithom and Ramses by the Jews under the predecessor of the Pharaoh of the Exodus, or Ramses II. We know from other evidence that this most powerful Pharaoh dug many canals and built new cities; and especially that he dug the canal through Goshen, and built Pithom (Patumos) at its western terminus and Ramses at the eastern. Among the ruins of the latter is still found a granite group of two deities, and of the deified Ramses II., sitting on a throne in the midst between them.—In consequence of this erroneous identification of the withdrawal of the Hyksos and the Israelites, the advent of Abraham and Jacob in Egypt was also placed too early, viz.: in the reign of the Hyksos. This is contradicted by every notice in the Hebrew narrative of the reigning family; and from this narrative alone no one would have formed the conclusion that an Arabian dynasty, cognate to the Hebrews, had at that time reigned in Egypt. That Jacob came to a purely Egyptian court, is manifest from the title of the king, of Joseph, and of the royal officers: also that Joseph spoke with his brethren through an interpreter, and that the Egyptians would not eat bread with them. The arrival of the Hebrews in Egypt, then, took place after the expulsion of the Hyksos. How could this greatest event of the age have remained unmentioned in the O. T., if it had taken place during the sojourn of the Israelites in Goshen, in the times of the father or grandfather of Moses? Add to this, that the institutions, so important to Egypt, which the O. T. (Gen. 47: 20–26) ascribes to Joseph, are found also in their essential features in Herodotus (2, 108, 37) and Diodorus; and are ascribed to Sesostris or Sesoosis, i. e., Sethos I., whose reign falls in the middle of the 15th century, B. C. With this epoch the data of the genealogies coincide precisely. We must, therefore, ascribe to these genealogies a more reliable historical character, than to the separate data, which conflict with them.—We know in Eg. history, therefore, the Pharaoh under whom Joseph came to Egypt, viz.: Sethos I.; also the one at whose court Moses was educated, Ramses II.; and the one of the Exodus, Menephtes. Of these three kings of the 19th dynasty, Ramses II., surnamed Miamun, was undoubtedly the greatest; and under him the Eg. kingdom reached its highest pinnacle of power and splendor. Under this king, Moses, the great man of God was born; and under his successor, whom Herodotus (2, 111) names Pherôs and describes as violent and wicked, and therefore punished with blindness, he led his people out of E., and founded at Mt. Sinai the first, the Jewish theocracy; as 1300 years later, under Augustus, the greatest emperor of the Greek-Roman world,

Christ was born, and by his death under Tiberius, the Roman Pherôs, founded the second, the Christian theocracy.—Under the later kings of the 19th dynasty, and under the following dynasties, the kingdom gradually declined. Only the first king of the 20th dynasty, Ramses III., the rich Rampsinitus of Herodotus, is described on the monuments as having undertaken several expeditions into Asia. The next memorable contact of Eg. with Israelite history falls in the 22d Manethonian dynasty, in which Sheshenk (Σέσωγχις), the Shishak of the Bible, advanced, about 970, against Rehoboam, and conquered Jerusalem (1 Kings 14:25). This event, also, seems to have left a memorial upon the monuments of Egypt.—It was about this time, or a little earlier, that the most important of documents concerning the ancient nations, the *genealogy of nations in Genesis*, seems to have been composed. Of late many learned and subtle investigations of that invaluable report have been made, and its importance and reliability brought more and more to light. We only mention here what refers to Eg. and its designated relation to other nations (see *Movers, Phönizier*, Vol. I., 1841. Especially *Bertheau, zur Gesch. der Israel.*, 1842; also *Knobel, die Völker-tafel*, 1850; and *Stark, Gaza, u. d. Philist. Küste.*, 1852). Ham had four sons, *Cush, Mizraim, Phut*, and *Canaan*. These corresponded in general with the nations which the Greeks called Ethiopians, Egyptians, Libyans, and Phœnicians. The term *Ethiopia* had a wider and a narrower sense. In the former it included all the dark colored inhabitants of the South; in the latter, the dwellers on the shores of the Nile south of Egypt, whose metropolis was Meroë. This people had no relationship to the negro. *Phut* denotes the tribes dwelling in N. Africa, west of Egypt. *Mizraim*, Egypt, is the third African member of the family of Ham. Its primitive language is now fully supplanted by the Arabian, just as its people also, by a long-continued intermixture, and by a subjection of nearly 1200 years under a second Arabian Hyksos dominion, has become almost entirely Semitic. We still know the Eg. language, however, through the Coptic, and the hieroglyphic literature. Thus we are now warranted in the assertion that there existed on African soil only three great people, which from their languages are proven to be Noachian.—The people of *Canaan* are found on Asiatic soil. Without the positive information of the *genealogy*, scarcely any one would have regarded the Canaanites as cognate to the Egyptians; and yet an oversight or hasty assertion of the author of the *genealogy* would here be utterly inconceivable, since he himself lived in Canaan. The view of Bertheau is no doubt in every material point the true one, when he finds the reason of this order in the southern origin of the Phœnicians, compared with that of the other Semitic nations, who came from the northeast. And yet the view which he rejects, that they were connected with the expelled Hyksos, may harmonize very well with his own. The Hyksos were by the Egyptians called *Arabians* or *Phœnicians*. When they overran Egypt, they had scarcely yet settled the coast of Palestine; it is very possible, however, that they did

so at the time of their expulsion from Egypt. But what became of the large people, of expelled Phœnician shepherds, if it did not, as we are told, settle among their kindred in Syria? If this was the case, it is readily understood how the Egypticized Phœnicians could retain so many Hamite elements, traces of which are found in their worship and myths; so that a genealogical connection with Eg. and Ethiopia of these southerners, originating both from Arabia and Eg., seemed to be warranted.—The view lately advanced by Stark, that the Hyksos were from Lower Eg., and hence of genuine Hamite origin; that in the old kingdom they had already come forward as the Heracleopolitan dynasty; and that after their expulsion they had settled, chiefly under the name of Philistines, the coast adjacent to Egypt, we pass over as too little plausible.—After the 21st dynasty the Theban royal families were set aside by those of Tanis, Bubastis, and Sais; and near the end of the 8th cent. the country was subjugated by the Æthiopian conqueror, Shabak, the Sabakon, of Herodotus, and So of the Bible. Manethôs mentions him, with his successors, Shabatek and Tuharka, the Tirhakah of the O. T., as the 25th dynasty. The last of these kings afterwards voluntarily retired to Ethiopia. After the Ethiopians had withdrawn from Egypt, there followed a period of commotion and dissolution, called by Herodotus the dodecarchy, but not mentioned by Manethôs, who records only the legitimate kings: After a short time Psammetichus ascended the throne. Under him and his successors of the 26th dynasty, the country once more reached a high prosperity, owing to the fact that he opened the country to strangers. He had gained his power with the help of Ionian and Carian soldiers, and rewarded them with honors and lands. The Greek population of the country soon increased. Amasis granted them the entire city of Naukratis, which soon became one of the most important ports. Egypt was opened to foreign commerce; and even in the victorious times of the 18th and 19th dynasties, the wealth of the country was less than at this time. The number of cities under Amasis rose to 20,000.—But the defensive force of the country did not grow in an equal degree, and at the end of this dynasty it yielded to the Persians, and remained a province from 525 to 504. Under the 29th and 30th dynasties it again became for a short time independent, until in 340 it was conquered once more by the Persians, and in 332 by Alexander.—The Macedonian supremacy was continued in the Ptolemies, under whom Egypt, having now fulfilled its mission in history, rapidly declined. Of sole importance in this age is the fact that the Greeks commenced now, in this land of primeval philosophy and learning, to take possession of oriental literature and science, the heritage bequeathed to them by the expiring Orient. Alexandria became the centre of Greek researches. Soon large libraries of several hundred thousand scrolls were formed. The most celebrated and important works, both of the Egyptians and of other Eastern nations, were translated into Greek; others, as that of Manethôs, were written in the Greek by native scholars versed in Greek literature. Among

translations, that of the Pentateuch, under Ptolemy Philadelphus, must be especially mentioned. — With Cleopatra VI. and her son, Ptolemy XVI., called Cæsar after his father, ended Egypt's last period of independence. Through the battle of Actium it became incorporated with the Roman empire. — In the 1st cent. after Christ Christianity was brought to Eg. and was rapidly spread. We find, however, hieroglyphic inscriptions on Egyptian temples belonging to the middle of the 3d century; and at Philæ the worship of Isis was forbidden by Justinian not before the middle of the 6th century.

Lepsius. — Reinecke.

Egypt, Modern. — The transition from ancient to modern Egypt is marked politically by its conversion into a Roman province by Octavianus Augustus, and spiritually by the introduction of Christianity. — The founding of the Church may be traced back to the earliest times (Acts 2: 10; 6: 9; 18: 24). According to a tradition preserved by Eusebius, of Cæsarea (Ch. Hist., 2, 16), Mark, the evangelist went, after the death of Peter at Rome, from the latter city to Egypt, preached the gospel there, and became the first Bishop of Alexandria, where he at once founded several congregations, as many, both men and women, were converted. Whether these really adopted forthwith a strict asceticism, as Eusebius asserts, remains very doubtful; since Eusebius adduces the authority of Philo, a contemporary, who portrayed this life in his works (Ch. II., 2, 17). But Philo does not speak of the Christians, but of the Jewish sect of *Therapeutics* (de vit. contempl., p. 889; comp. Neander K.-Gesch., I., 1, p. 78. Dähne jüd.-alex. Relig. Philos., I., 443. Gfrörer, Philo u. d. Alexandr. Theosoph., II., 280, where the literature is given), and states that they lived not in Alexandria, but at Lake Moeris. Eusebius gives also the succession of Alex. bishops (2, 24; 3, 21; 4, 1; 4, 10, 19; 5, 9; 22; 6, 26; 35; 8, 13), or specifies at least prominent ones (6, 46; 7, 21; 8, 9; 13); shows that Christianity had spread in Upper Egypt in the 2d century already (6, 1, comp. Blumhardt, Miss. Gesch. d. K. Chr., II., 194), and describes the sufferings and triumph of the Eg. Church during the Decian, Valerian, and Diocletian persecutions (6, 41; 7, 11; 8, 8). He also portrays the great teachers of the Alex. *Catechetical school*. Pantænus, Clemens, Origen, and Heracles, and shows that this school was important not only for the maintenance and development of the truth in the Church, but also for the spread of the gospel. — Just as before Christ Eg. had been the land of wonders, from which everything remarkable, deeply significant and primitive passed over the civilized nations; so also after Christ it became the home of all higher speculation, which sought to blend with revelation all views and ideas kindred to it, which were found in heathen religion and philosophy. Hence arose a Christian syncretism, similar to the Jewish-platonic one of Philo, which aided much in the development of the inward ideas of Christianity, but also to the corruption of doctrine. At Alexandria, therefore, there were two tendencies of this kind, a more genuine, and a heretical one. On the one side are found men

like Origen and Clemens, as the good Gnostics. The former, also, with Bish. Dionysius, was the leader in biblical criticism. But of the greatest influence on subsequent times was Athanasius, the great patriarch of Alexandria and author of the Nicene Creed. In Cyrill we afterwards find again on the same soil the germ of an idealistic christology, undervaluing the human in Christ in favor of the divine, leading indeed to orthodoxy, but also in its excess to *Eutychianism* or *Monophysitism*. On the heretical side the false *Gnosticism* was so fully developed in Eg., that formerly the Eg. false gnosis was regarded as distinct from the Syrian (Neander, K. Gesch., I., 2, p. 642). The Gnostics, Basilides, Valentinus, Heracleon, Ptolomæus, and Carpocrates, were Egyptians: the phantastic *Ophites*, and many Gnostic variations, as also *docetism*, *Sabellianism*, and *Arianism*, were products of Egypt. Nor has the Eg. Church even lost its false idealism. — On practical ground also it took part in the one-sided asceticism (*Pachonius*, *Anthony*) of monasticism and its fondness for legendary wonders. Indeed, its influence upon the theory and practice of Christianity can scarcely be calculated. But just in this inward antagonism, in its doctrinal controversies and exaggerations, its forces were wasted; and the *Monophysites*, though condemned as heretics, gained the ascendancy and chose their own patriarch, whilst Alexandria remained the seat of the orthodox patriarch, who was appointed by the Byzantine court. The real (heretical) Church of Eg. now assumed the name of *Coptic* (from Αἰγύπτος, Gupotos), whilst the Greeks were derisively styled *Melchites* (from Melech, King) or emperor-Christians (Neander, C. Hist., III., 88, &c.). The court-church oppressed this heretical community as much as possible; and the original life of the Church was so entirely lost in this odious quarrel, that the Mohammedan conquest (641, p. 6) was facilitated by the Coptics, who preferred at any price to be rid of the ecclesiastical supervision of Constantinople. — The Arabian historian of the Coptic Church (Makrizi, hist. Copt. christ. ed. Wetzer: Sulzb., 1828), and the learned work of Renaudot (hist. patriarch. Alexandr., 2 vols. 4to.), show that at that time there were only 300,000 Greeks or *Melchites*, whilst the millions were *Jacobites* or *Monophysites*. Their hatred of each other was such, that they murdered each other on any occasion. The Mohammedans on the other hand, especially Amru ben Elâas their leader, had sufficient tact to declare themselves the protectors of the oppressed, and to impose upon them at first only a small tribute. — Soon, however, oppression commenced. Under the Fatimide Califs, as also under the Mameluke Sultans, the condition of the Copts was the same. The most odious cruelties were employed against them; and they sunk both in inward life and numbers so deeply, as to excite the pity of even their Mohammedan historian, Makrizi. The intercourse between Egypt and the West through the commerce of Venice and the crusaders was of no account to them, since the R. Church thought them heretics. The Osman turks, who, since 1517, were their masters, could not break the power of the Mameluke Beys, and were cer-

mainly despotic to Christians; so that it may well be said that for 1200 years Egyptian Christendom has severely atoned for its sins. At present its insignificance alone protects it. The number of Coptic Christians in Eg. has sunk from about 2,000,000 to 200,000, of whom about 10,000 (according to others, 60,000) live in Cairo, but the greater number in Up. Egypt. They are most numerous in *El Fajum*. The Patriarch estimates the number of his congregations at 600; but others say there are only 150. The Patr. of Alexandria, who lives, however, at Cairo, stands at their head. His jurisdiction includes Nubia and Abyssinia, in which latter country he chooses and ordains the patriarch (Abuna). He himself is chosen from among the monks: the Bishops and Archpriests apply to the abbot of St. Anthony's, who selects 6 or 8 monks, from whom the Patriarch is chosen by lot. Next to him in rank is the Patriarch of Jerusalem, who also lives at Cairo, visiting the Holy Land annually at Easter only, but at other times acting as deputy of the Eg. Patriarch. — Next to these dignitaries are twelve actual or titular Bishops, under whom are the Archpriests and priests, whose duty is to read mass, not to preach; preaching is unknown among the Copts. Next follow archdeacons, deacons, sub-deacons, lectors, cantors, and exorcists; the latter, however, have no special duties. Ordination is administered by the Patriarch and Bishops; but with holy oil, which, by a permanent miracle of St. Mark, never fails. Apostolical succession by imposition of hands is almost wholly unknown. — The clergy belong to the lowest classes, and are poor, ignorant, and coarse. Their education embraces only the reading of the liturgy and the other ceremonial. Their beggarly living is derived from husbandry and the perquisites allowed for baptisms, marriages, and funerals. — The regular monasteries belong to the orders of *St. Macarius*, *Anthony*, and *Paul*; at Alexandria there is also a monastery of *St. Marc*. These institutions have a strict rule, some of them that of Pachonius. They are seven in number; two in the eastern desert, four in the Natron valley, and one at Dschebel Coscan. There are also some secular monasteries to which females are admitted. — In doctrine the Coptic Church accepts only the three œcumenical symbols of Nice, Constantinople, and Ephesus: the few sentences of the fathers, which are still known to them: the three liturgies ascribed to St. Basil, Gregory, and Cyrill: and also the apostolical constitutions. It has seven sacraments. Baptism is administered with trine immersion, holy oil, and sign of the cross; to boys 40, and to girls 80 days after birth. Circumcision, also, is a standing rite. Confirmation with holy oil is administered immediately after baptism. The Lord's Supper is merely the sacrifice of the mass; its doctrine is *transubstantiation*, *confession* and *absolution*, *orders*, *marriage*, and *extreme unction*, the latter administered to the healthy, also, after great sins, completes the number. Faith, fasting, and prayer, are also sometimes called sacraments. Fasts are very frequent and severe; the prayers so frequent, that the patriarch is awakened in the night every quarter of an hour for a short prayer.

Faith is merely the rehearsal of the creed. A description of the church and its worship is found in *J. Wilson, The Lands of the Bible*: Edinb., 1847, Vol. 2, p. 526. — There are also in Eg. several thousands of Armenians, and a larger number of orthodox Greeks. At Alexandria there is a Latin monastery. — The sad condition of the Coptic Church induced the *English Church Missionary Society* to send Rev. *Lieder* and *Kruse* to Cairo, in order to reawaken a more active Christian life in this ancient Church. They have succeeded in making the priests better acquainted with the Scriptures, in gathering several hundreds of Coptic children into Christian schools, and in founding a seminary for the education of priests, of which the present Abuna of Abyssinia was a pupil. The Patriarch favors their labors. The latest information concerning the Eg. Church is found in the travels of *Jowett*, *J. Wilson*, *W. R. Wilson*, *Sir G. Wilkinson*, *Fisk*, *Bowring*, *Lane*; in the reports of *Lieder* and *Kruse* (*Ch. Miss. Rec.*, 1827–1852), and in the *Rus. Miss. Magaz.* of the same year. W. HOFFMANN. — *Rcinecke*.

Ehud (LXX.-'אֲחָז) was one of the earliest "Judges," or heroes of Israel, who flourished between the time of Joshua's death and the establishment of a monarchy. He was of the tribe of Benjamin, and the family of Gera (1 Chron. 7 : 10 ; 8 : 5, &c. ; Gen. 46 : 21), and, like others of that tribe, was left-handed (Judges 3 : 15). On one occasion, after paying over the tribute levied by Eglon upon a portion of Israel whom he had conquered, and held in bondage, Ehud went homeward with his companions as far as Gilgal, but then returned alone to Eglon's abode, and having obtained a private interview with the King, under pretence of communicating a matter of importance to him, assassinated him, and then made his escape to the desert of Jericho. There he summoned Ephraim to arms; took possession of the fords of the Jordan; 10,000 Moabites were slain. Then Israel had rest for eighty years (Judges 3 : 12, &c.).

RUEBSCHL.*

Eichhorn, John Godfrey, born Oct. 16, 1752, at Dörrenzimmern, Hohenlohe-Oehringen, where his father then preached, was among the most distinguished and popular German theologians of his day. After due preparation he entered the University of Göttingen in 1770, and attended the lectures of J. D. Michaelis, Walch, Miller, Schlötzer, and Heyne. In 1774 he was appointed rector of the Gymnasium at Ohrdruff, Gotha, and in 1775 Prof. of Oriental languages at Jena. In 1788 he was called to Göttingen, as the successor of J. D. Michaelis in the chair of Philosophy, where he remained until his death, June 27, 1827. He was a man of varied and extensive requirements, but chiefly excelled in the department of O. T. Biblical Criticism. His labors were immense, and his fertility as an author surprising. But his works were more remarkable for attractive fluency of style than for depth and research. Although exceedingly popular at the time, they possess comparatively little substantial value. As an exegetical writer he endeavored to defend the Bible against the assaults of skepticism, by conceding too much to the ruling ideas of the age, and solving criti-

cal difficulties by the principle of accommodation.—His chief works were: *Progr. de Cuschæis verisimilia*: Arnstadt, 1774, 4to. *Monumenta antiq. hist. Arabum post Alb. Schultensium, &c.*: Arnst., 1775, 8vo. *De rei numariæ apud Arabis initiis*: Jena, 1776, 4to. *Poëseos Asiaticæ comm. libri VI., cum appendice, auct. Guil. Jones, recudi curavit*: Lips., 1777, 8vo. Articles in his *Repertorium for Bibl. and Orient. Literature*, 18 vols., Lpz., 1777–1786. *Einleitung in's A. T.*: Lpz., 1781–83, 3 Theile; 4 Ausg., in 5 B., 1825–26. *Bibliothek d. bibl. Literat.*, 10 Bände: Lpz., 1787–1803. *Comm. in Apoc. Joannis 2 B.*, 1791. *Einl. in's N. T.*, 1804–14. *Die hebräischen Propheten*, 3 B., 1816–19. *Die metrische Uebers. d. Buchs Hiob*, 2: Ausg., 1824. *Die franz. Revolution, &c.*, 2 B., 1797. *Die allg. Geschichte d. Kult. u. Literatur d. neueren Europa*, 1796, &c. *Gesch. d. Literatur v. ihrem Anfang, &c.*, 5 B., 1805, &c. — Sources: *Gesch. d. Univers. Göttingen*, von SAALFELD u. OESTERLEY. EICHSTAEDT, *oratio de J. G. Eichhorn, &c.*: Jena, 1827. THOM. CHR. TYCHSEN, *Memoria J. G. Eichhorn (commentl. soc. scient. Götting.)*, Vol. VI. EWALD, *Jahrb. d. bibl. Wissensch.*, I., 1849. BERTHEAU.*

Ekron, 'Azzáron, was the most north-eastern of the five chief cities of Philistia, and its frontier protection there against the Israelites (Josh. 13: 3). It was first assigned to the tribe of Judah (15: 45), and taken by that tribe (Judges 1: 18, &c.), then transferred to Dan (Josh. 19: 43); but the Philistines soon regained it (15: 11; 1 Sam. 5: 10; 6: 17; 7: 14). Hence the judgments pronounced against it (Amos 1: 8; Zeph. 2: 4; Zach. 9: 5, 7; Jer. 25: 20). It was the seat of a peculiar worship, and of the famous oracle of Baal-zebub (2 Kings 1: 2, &c., 16). Alexander Balas gave it to Jonathan Macc. (1 Macc. 10: 89). At the time of Eusebius, yet, it was a large place, inhabited by Jews. It is mentioned during the Crusaders, but afterwards was lost sight of, from the absence of ruins. Robinson again discovered it (II., 227–29) in the large village Akir, situated in a fertile plain, c. 3 miles W. of Jamnia, and 4½ miles S. of Ramlah. The Sheikh of Akir informed Robinson that cisterns, the stones of handmills, and other relics were often discovered in the adjacent fields. — (See RELAND, *Palest.*, p. 745, &c.; RITTER, *Erdk.*, XVI., 122, &c.).

RÜETSCHL.*

Elam (LXX. Αἶλαμ, *Apoc.* Ελυμαίς, *Vulg.* *Ælam*) occurs ten times in the canon, and twice in the Apocr. Scriptures. In Gen. 10: 22 it also occurs as the name of the first-mentioned, and perhaps the first-born descendant of Shem. The people thus designated may, therefore, have belonged to the Semitic family. Accordingly the tradition reported by Jos. *Ant.* 1, 6, 4, that the Persians were descended from the Elamites must be erroneous, as the language of the P. is not Semitic. (See *Persians*). Elam appears as an independent kingdom, with a King who is prominent in the war against Sodom (Gen. 14: 1, 9). In Is. 21: 2; Jer. 25: 25 (comp. *Herodot.*, 1, 102) it is associated with Media; in Ezek. 32: 24, with Assyria; and in Is. 22: 6, it is represented as a part of the Assyrian empire.

These data enable us with certainty to fix its geographical position, which must have been along the E. side of the Tigris (so *Strabo*, 16, 1, 17). *Pliny* says, still more definitely, that the Ulai (Dan. 8: 2) separated it from Susiana. *Strabo*, 15, 3, 12, speaks of a war between the Elamites and Susiannites; whence we conclude that the two nations occupied originally distinct and independent countries. Yet from their proximity to each other, and the more intimate relations which arose between them, Greek writers often, in a general way, include both under the name Susiana, and Hebrew writers under that of Elam. But there is no sufficient ground for including Persia under Elam, as *Vitranga*, *Gese-nius*, *Winer*, and *Hengstenberg* do. For the summons of Elam and Media against Babylon (Is. 21: 2) only proves that this prophecy was earlier than any knowledge of the Persians, who were as unimportant, nationally, as they were unknown, until Cyrus brought them into notice; and *Isaiah* (like Jer. 27: 7) merely wishes to say, that destruction awaits the Babylonians from nations living in the E. and N.-E., of whom he names Elam and Media. Is. 22: 6 refers to an earlier union of Elam with tribes living along the river Kir. in the siege of Jerusalem under *Hezekiel*. — From Jer. 25: 25 (cf. 49: 34–39) it may be inferred that Elam formed, at times an independent state; and from Ezek. 32: 24, &c., that it possessed some importance during the ante-exile period. Both in the Bible (Is. 21: 2; Jer. 25: 25) and classic writers (*Strabo*, 11, 11, 4; 12, 6; 15, 3, 12; 16, 1, 17) the Elamites are represented as a warlike people skilled in archery. *Strabo*, 11, 12, 6, and *Polyb.*, 5, 44, add that they were predatory and barbarous. According to *Strabo*, 16, 1, 18, their country was divided into smaller provinces, and productive, especially in rice, cotton, and sugar-cane. — Under the dominion of the Greeks, and the Romans, several Elamite tribes, of such as escaped from the overthrow of the Asiatic nations, and settled among the mountains of Media, and near the Caspian Sea, attracted notice as predatory hordes (*Strabo*, 11, 15, 16; *Plut. Pomp.*, 36; *Justin.*, 36; *Tac. ann.*, 6, 44). Some Elamites forced, no doubt, to yield to the Assyrians, were transplanted to Palestine after the removal of the ten tribes (Ezra 4: 9; Is. 11: 11. Cf. *Ewald*, *Isr. Gesch.*, III., 319, 375, &c.), and the Israelites banished to Elam. According to *Judith* 1: 6 the Elamite Kings maintained their independence even under Nebuchadnezzar (cf. Jer. 25: 25, &c.; 49: 34–39). First under Cyrus their country seems to have been reduced to a mere province, and united with Susiana (see Ezek. 32: 24; Dan. 8: 2). — In 1 Macc. 6: 1, a Persian city, Elymais, is mentioned, the temple of which Antiochus Epiph. attempted to plunder. But there was no such city; and whilst *Polyn.*, 31, 11; *Jos. Ant.*, 12, 9, 1 (who calls it the temple of Diana), *APPIAN Syr.* 66 (who says it was one of Venus's, probably Anubis, or the Nanea of 2 Macc. 1: 13), *STRABO*, 16, 1, and *DIONOR.*, 19, attest the fact of such a plundering, none of them mentions the place where it was perpetrated. But as 1 Macc. was originally written in Aramaic-Hebrew (*EUSEB.*, *H. E.*, 6, 25;

EROME, *prol. gal.*), the translator may have taken **עִיר** in the modern sense of city, not in the older (see Dan. 8 : 2) sense of province.

VAHINGER.*

Elath (Deut. 2 : 8 ; 2 Kings 14 : 22 ; 16 : 6, &c. ; LXX. Αἶλας, Αἶλας ; Jos. *Ant.*, 8, 6, 4, Αἶλας ; STRABO, 16, 4, 4, Αἶλας ; VULG. *Elath* ; PLIN. *I. N.*, 5, 12 ; 6, 32, *Aelana* ; Hieron. *onom. lila* ; PTOL., 5, 17, 1, 'Ελαάνα), the city of terebinthas, was a renowned seaport at the head of the eastern inlet of the Arabian gulf (*sinus Maniticus*), near Eziongeber. It terminates the valley, now called Elghor, which runs from the lake of Gennesareth past the Dead Sea across Palestine and Arabia Petrea. Its history is intimately associated with that of the Edomites and of the kingdom of Judah. The Israelites passed it on their way from Sinai through Edom (Deut. 2 : 8). When David subjugated Edom, Elath was assigned to Ephraim and Manasseh (2 Sam. 8 : 14). Solomon prepared a commercial fleet for Ophir, in Eziongeber ; 1 Kings 9 : 26 ; 2 Chron. 8 : 17 ; the Arabic translator renders the first of these passages : "he built ships in the forest Val, near Elath." From that time the Israelites seem to have settled there for the sake of trade (2 Kings 16 : 6). Jehoshaphat endeavored to revive this traffic with India (*Jerome* on Deut. 2 : 8. See 1 Kings 22 : 49). But under Jehoram Edom finally revolted from Judah (2 Kings 8 : 20, &c. Cf. Gen. 27 : 4). Amaziah sought to recover the lost province (2 Kings 14 : 7 ; 2 Chron. 25 : 11), but only succeeded in retaining control of the port, which Uzziah, his son, rebuilt (2 Kings 14 : 22), or strengthened. For during the war the Jews may have garrisoned Elath ; which is the more likely, if there was then already a citadel upon the island Jesirat Faron. But under Ahaz even Elath was lost, Pekah having contrived to put the Edomites into possession of it again (2 Kings 16 : 6). For although the common reading says the *Syrians* obtained that port, this is contradicted by the fact that Rezin could not even take Jerusalem (2 Kings 16 : 5 ; Is. 7 : 1), and that Tiglath-Pileser, at Ahaz' request, entered Syria six years afterwards (Is. 7 : 8), slew Rezin, and conquered Syria. It is incomprehensible, also, how Syria should still have retained Elath as long as the common reading implies, even if it had taken the city, especially as this is nowhere else affirmed. The usual reading therefore must be an error. Such an error might readily occur, as Resh and Daleth could easily be confounded in copying. — Subsequently Elath disappears from history, no doubt because it lost its commercial importance. But the Romans again fortified it with a strong garrison (EDRISI 1, 328, 332 ; *Jerome Onom.*), and reckoned it with Palest. tertia. During the first centuries after Christ it was the seat of a Bishop (THEOD. *puest.*, 44 *ad lib.* 4 ; *Regum. in Jerem.*, 49 ; PHILOST. 3, 6 ; PROCOPIUS *de bello pers.* 1, 19), and acquired new commercial importance. After Mohammed it declined ; Abulfeda mentions it only as a fortress. Only a castle now remains, called *Alaba* (see Robinson, I., 163, 169–71 ; Schüb. 2, 379). Rüppel (Reisen, 248, &c.) found some ruins of Elath, called *Galena*.

VAHINGER.*

VOL. II. — 12.

Elders among the Israelites.—Among all nations which are in that stage of political development in which the relation between the state and the family is still apparent, age is highly respected, and the youth defer to the ripper experience of years. Hence the reverence paid to the aged in eastern countries ; hence the fact that there elders are at the head of every corporate body. Thus in the Bible we read of the elders of the Egyptians (Gen. 50 : 7), of the Midianites (Numb. 22 : 4, 7), of the Gibeonites (Josh. 9 : 11). They are found among the Israelites in the earliest times, as the representatives of the congregation. Moses consulted them concerning the affairs of the nation (Exod. 3 : 16, &c.), and was attended by them to the King of Egypt (Exod. 3 : 18). They represented the people on public occasions, at festivals and sacrifices (Exod. 18 : 12 ; 24 : 1, 9 ; Levit. 4 : 15 ; 9 : 1), and as their witnesses (Exod. 17 : 5, 6 ; Deut. 31 : 28). Moses, by God's command, appointed seventy of them to assist him in his administration of the government (Numb. 11 : 16, 24 ; 16 : 25 ; Deut. 27 : 1). So Joshua (7 : 6 ; 8 : 10). After the settlement of Israel in Canaan we read of elders of single cities (Succoth, Josh. 8 : 14, 16 ; Gilead, 11 : 5–11), and of the entire nation, acting as judges, and sitting in the gates of cities to decide cases, both personal, municipal, and national (Deut. 19 : 22 ; Josh. 20 : 4 ; Ruth 4 : 11), and hence they are mentioned along with leaders, judges, chiefs, and Levites (Deut. 29 : 10 ; 31 : 9, 28, &c.). At the introduction of kings they plead with Samuel in the name of the people (1 Sam. 8 : 4, &c.), and afterwards they took an active part in the election and inauguration of kings (2 Sam. 3 : 17 ; 5 : 3, &c.). Under the kings they seem to have constituted a special college to counsel and aid the king (1 Sam. 15 : 30 ; 2 Sam. 19 : 11 ; 1 Kings 20 : 7, &c.). On festival occasions they were prominent (1 Kings 8 : 1 ; 1 Chron. 15 (16) : 25). The prophets seem to have sought their co-operation (2 Kings 6 : 32 ; Jer. 19 : 1 ; 26 : 17, &c. &c.). Their efficiency did not cease during the exile, or after it. In Jer. 29 : 1, "the residue of the elders that were carried away captive to Babylon" are named ; and under Ezra (10 : 8, 14) they again exercised judicial prerogatives. —In like manner the elders were the chief representatives of the people in the age of the Maccabees, acting with the rulers and priests for the best interests of the nation (1 Macc. 1 : 26 ; 7 : 33, &c.). And in 1 Macc. 12 : 6, a *γερουσία*, a counsel of the aged is mentioned ; the term here, as in 2 Macc. 1 : 10 ; 4 : 44, being evidently synonymous with *πρεσβύτερος*, although in 3 Macc. 1 : 8, ἡ *γερουσία* and *πρεσβ.* are both mentioned. How the *sanhedrim* grew out of the *γερουσία* will be shown in the article *Sanhedrim*.

ARNOLD.*

Eleazer (LXX. Ἐλεάζαρος, abbrev. Ἀζαρος). 1) The third son of Aaron (Exod. 6 : 23, &c. ; Numb. 3 : 2) who had charge of the officiating Levites (Numb. 3 : 32) and succeeded his father as High-priest (20 : 25, &c. ; Deut. 10 : 6). The dignity entailed upon his family, with a brief interruption from the time of Eli to Solomon, until the time of Onias and Simon Macc. (1 Macc. 14 : 35, 41. EWALD, *Gesch. Isr.*, II.,

417, &c.; v. Lengerke, Ken., 572, 654). According to Josh. 24 : 33 Eleazar died about the same time with Joshua, and was buried at Gibeah on Mt. Ephraim (1 Chron. 5 : 29, &c.; 18 : 16; 24 : 1, &c.—2) *Eleazar ben Abinadab*, keeper of the ark when it was brought back from the Philistines and placed in the house of his father at Kirjath-jearim (1 Sam. 7 : 1).—3) *Eleazar ben Dodai*, the Shehite, (and probably a Benjamite, 1 Chron. 8 : 4) was one of David's "three mighties," and distinguished himself in the barley-field at Pasdammim, by successfully resisting the Philistines when the Israelites had fled (2 Sam. 23 : 9, &c.; 1 Chron. 11 : 12, &c.; 27 : 4). Whether the feat recorded in 2 Sam. 23 : 14–16, was performed by the same trio is uncertain, as the article is wanting before the numeral.—4) *Eleazar* the fourth, son of MATHATHIAS, surnamed *ὁ Αἰνάρης* (1 Macc. 2 : 5) or *Αἰνάρης*, Jos. Ant. 12, 6, 1, (from a Syrian word meaning *confodit feram*, or from one signifying *elephant-skin*) because he forced his way through the ranks of the Syrians, in the campaign against Antiochus Eupator, and stabbed the elephant on which he supposed the King rode, so that it fell upon and crushed him. The Jews lost the battle (B. C. 163; 1 Macc. 6 : 43, &c.).—5) *Eleazar*, a scribe who was put to death in his 90th year, during the persecution of Antiochus Epiph., for fidelity to his religion in refusing to eat swine's flesh, and spurning an evasion which was offered to him (2 Macc. 6 : 18, &c.).—Others of this name are mentioned by Jos. B. J., 5, 1, 2, &c.; 7, 8. —(See EWALD, *l. c.*, 545, 601, &c.; III., 2, p. 364, 341). RÜRSCHL.*

Elephant, the, was early used in war in India and Persia, but was not thus employed in western Asia or Europe until under Alexander M. (*Pausan.* 1, 12, 4). The Hebrews first became better acquainted with it in their wars with the Seleucidæ (1 Macc. 1 : 17; 3 : 34, &c.). In battle elephants bore a small tower fastened to their backs, containing from three to five soldiers (*ÆLIAN. hist. anim.*, 13 : 9. *PLINY, H. N.*, 8, 7; *LIVY*, 37, 40. The number 32, given in 1 Macc. 6 : 3, must be an error of a copyist or translator). Before battle they were excited by intoxicating drinks either given, or shown to them, to provoke them (*ÆLIAN. l. c.*, 13, 8; 1 Macc. 6 : 34; 3 Macc. 5 : 2). In the assault they were scattered along the whole line, and served to break the ranks of the enemy, and especially to frighten the horses. The commander of the war-elephants was called *ἐλεφαντοπόρος*, but the driver of each one *ὁ ἰνδός*, from their native country (1 Macc. 6 : 35, 37. *DIOD.* 2, 16; *ÆLIAN. l. c.*, 16, 15, &c.). They are often simply called *τὰ θηρία*; by the Romans *bellua*. The Seleucidæ continued to keep them, though forbidden to do so by the Romans; but the number, 80, given in 2 Macc. 11 : 4, is probably an exaggeration (cf. *LIVY*, 37, 39; *POLYB.*, 5, 53, 4).—*Ivory* was known in Palestine and Europe much earlier than elephants. The Hebrew name for it betrays an Indian derivation. In the time of Solomon it was brought by sea from Ophir (India), or it was obtained from Tyrians, who bought it of Arabian merchants (1 Kings 10 : 22; Ezek. 27 : 15). It was used, ornamentally, upon furniture, buildings, sacred vessels,

&c. (Am. 6 : 4; 1 Kings 10 : 18; 22 : 39; Ps. 45 : 9; Ezek. 27 : 6. See also: BOCHART, *hierozoic.*, I., 233, &c.; LASSEN, ind. *Alterthumsk.*, I., 303, &c.; PAULY's Real-encycl., III., 79, &c.). RÜRSCHL.*

Eleutheropolis.—This once renowned episcopal See is first mentioned in the *Itiner. Anton.*, and upon coins of the age of Sept. Severus, as a city of S. Palestine, on the way between Jerusalem and Gaza. But *Ammian. Marcell.*, 14, 8, says that it was older than Cæsarea Palest., and must previously have had another name; not Hebron, however, as *Georg. Cedren.*, *hist.*, I., 58, and *SYNKELL.*, *chronogr.*, p. 192, ed. Bonn, supposed, at a time when ancient E. had long disappeared. Robinson succeeded in discovering its true locality, and establishing its identity with Baitogabra (*PROLEX.*, 5, 16), the modern *Beit-Djibrin* (Palest., II., 19, 27, 53, 57–66; III., 194). The place, now a village, lies between low olive hills. Ruins, belonging to different periods, are still found there, and are more massive and varied than those of any other locality in Palestine, including those of a powerful fortress of Roman-Byzantine structure, those of churches, masses of stones and fallen walls not yet fully examined.—Ancient E. (like the present village) was the chief town of the district, and an episcopal See. Eusebius and Jerome refer to it as a central point in southern Palestine, in designating the locality of other towns (*RELAND, Pal.*, 408–411). It may have received its name from special privileges conferred by the Romans; but the Jewish legends concerning it are not worthy of credit. Its identity with the more ancient Baitogabra was first proven by RÖDIGER from an old Syrian notice in ASSEMANI (*allg. Lit.-Zeitg.*, 1842, Nr. 72, p. 571. Cf. *RELAND, l. c.* 220, 227). The signatures of Councils show five Bishops of E., from 325 to 536. Epiphanius, born in its vicinity, often mentions it (*hær.* 40, 1); and B. Anton. Mart. seems to have visited it c. 600. In 796, according to a notice of the monk Stephan of Mar Saba, it was overthrown by the Saracens, and never regained its former importance. Thenceforth its Greek name disappears, and those who settled there revived the original native name, but Arabicized it. At the time of the Crusades the place lay in ruins, with "insurmountable remnants of walls" (*Will. Tyr.* 14, 22), of which King Fulco built a fortress, 1134, the keeping of which he assigned to the Hospitallers. After the battle of Hattin, Saladin seized it, and thenceforth the Moslem held it. Near it are remarkable caves, partly used for sepulchres, as though they had been a troglodite town (possibly of the primitive Horites). The extensive ruins above ground, and subterranean, leave no doubt that it must have been the centre of a large population, whose history is lost.—(See *SOZOM.*, *H. E.*, 6, 32; 7, 29; 9, 17. *EUNAP.*, 115. *GLYC.*, *Ann.*, 509, ed. Bonn. *RELAND, l. c.*, 72, 186, 215, 305, 307, 372, 627, &c., 749, &c., 957. *PAULY's R.-encycl.* III., 110. *RITTER's Erdk.*, XVI., 134, &c.). RÜRSCHL.*

Eleutherus, a Greek by birth, for a time deacon of Anicet, was elevated to the bishopric of Rome c. 177, and occupied it until near 193.

Two interesting incidents occurred under his episcopate. The churches of Lyons and Vienne sent the Presb. (afterwards B.) Irenæus to him with the acts of the martyrs who had suffered here (EUSEB., *H. E.*, V., 4). Next, a tradition reserved by Bede (*H. E.*, III., 25) reports that the British King Lucius, wrote to E. declaring his willingness to embrace Christianity, and requesting teachers in its doctrines. E. complied with the request. The origin of this tradition may readily be accounted for by the effort of Romish Bishops, both in Italy and Great Britain to prove that the Roman Catholic was the primitive form of Christianity in Great Britain, and thus secure its ascendancy there. Hence the adoption of the tradition by Bede, and other English writers of the Rom. Church, and by the *Liber Pontificalis*. But even this shows its unreasonableness; for the form of Christianity which Augustine and his Benedictines found in England was certainly not Romish. How much truth there may be in the tradition it is hard to determine.

HERZOG.*

Eli (LXX. 'Heli, Vulg., *Heli*), 1) Priest (obviously High-priest) at Shiloh. His sons, Hophni and Phineas, assisted him, but soon, by their gross misconduct, drew upon themselves and their posterity the ill-will of the people and the judgment of God (1 Sam. 1 : 3, 9; 2 : 11, 12, etc.). Eli judged Israel for 40 years (1 Sam. 4 : 18. The LXX. says 20), but nothing special is said of his rule (see *Samuel*). The tidings of the defeat of the Israelitish army, and the capture of the ark, so overwhelmed him that he fell from his seat and broke his neck (1 Sam. 4 : 13-18). Eli was of the sacerdotal line of Ithamar (1 Chron. 24 : 6). His family was not excluded from the priestly dignity, but the curse resting upon it still showed itself in Abiathar (1 Kings 1 : 27). — 2) Eli, the father of Joseph, the reputed father of our Lord (Luke 3 : 23).

PRESSEL.*

Elias Levita (אֱלִיָּהוּ הַלֵּוִי), one of the most distinguished Jewish grammarians of the 16th cent., the son of Rabbi Ascher Levita, was born at Neustadt, not far from Nürnberg, in 1472. He was educated at his birth-place; and applied himself with such zeal to grammatical studies in the Hebrew language, that he received the surname of הַמְּרַקֵּק, or "the Grammarian, the teacher of languages." When, after the death of the margrave of Neustadt, he was expelled from Neustadt with other Jews, he went to Italy, lived there at different places as teacher of Hebrew, and especially, from 1504, at Padua, where he taught the Hebrew grammar of Rabbi Moses Kimchi, and wrote a commentary on it, which was afterwards published with a Latin translation by Sebas. Münster (Basle, 1531). He remained here until 1509, when, after losing his wealth by the plundering of Padua, he went to Venice and (1512) to Rome, where he was very kindly received by Cardinal Aegidius, of Viterbo. About this time he was already married. A warm friendship sprang up between him and Aegidius, who took him and his family into his house and richly provided for them. Elias instructed his friend

in the Hebrew for a number of years, who, in turn, taught him the classic languages. During the time of his residence at Rome (1518) he wrote his grammatical works הַפְּחָד and

הַהֲרַבָּה. His residence at Rome, his intimate relations with Cardinal Aegidius, his connections with other cardinals and bishops, the praise which he received from them and other educated Christians, etc., raised the suspicion among his Jewish brethren, that he was a secret Christian. At the sacking of Rome under Charles V. (1527) he again lost all his property. He now went again to Venice, where he remained until 1540, and published his book טוֹכ טַעַם, on the Hebrew accent, and his book מְסוֹרֶת חֲמִסוֹרֶת, on the criticism of the Old Test., Venice, 1538; the last named work was published in German by Semler, 1772. In the preface to the latter book, he defends himself against the suspicion of having apostatized from Judaism. He left Venice in 1540 and followed the call of Paul Fagius to Isny, in Swabia, to assist him in establishing a Hebrew publication house, and in publishing Hebrew books. He remained there until 1547, wrote several new works, especially his Chaldaic rabbinical dictionary, פִּתְחוֹרֵמָן, Jan., 1541, whilst Fagius published another lexicon in Latin by Elina, called תִּשְׁבִּי. Fabius left Isny in 1547, and

Elias went again to Venice, where, two years afterwards, 1549, he died. Comp. Jo. CHRISTOPHORI WOLFII, *Biblioth. Hebr. Hamb. et Lips.*, 1715. Vol. I., p. 153-161; Vol. III., *ibid.*, 1727, p. 97-102; Vol. IV., Hamb., 1733, p. 782. JOH. FRIEDR. HIRT's *Oriental. u. Exeget. Biblioth.*, VII. Th.: Jena, 1755, p. 50, sq. De Rossi, *Histor. Woerterb. d. jüdischen Schriftst. u. ihrer Werke*, aus d. Ital. übersetzt von C. H. Hammerberger: Lpz., 1839. NEUDECKER.—Beck.

Eligius was born about the year 588, at Chatelat, near Limoges. He was early apprenticed to Abbo, a skilful goldsmith in Limoges. He learnt the trade of his master, and distinguished himself among other things, by a proper use of the language and by godly zeal. About the year 610 he went to Paris, where he soon gained the notice and favor of the King, Clotaire II., by making for him a chair of gold and precious stone, and, in a short time, he became wealthy. About this time a great religious awakening was produced throughout France, by the labors of Columban. Eligius was seized by it, truly repented, and began to lead an ascetic life, although he continued at his trade in Paris. He now sought to win others to his views, and succeeded among high and low, when Clotaire died, and was followed by his son, Dagobert. Eligius soon found great favor with Dagobert, both on account of his skill and of his piety. He became the King's counsellor in the most important affairs of the State, and was sent to Britannia to make a treaty of peace with Judicahill. His favor with the King aroused the envy of the nobles, which, however, he overcame, by using his influence and the King's favor in behalf of the poor and the Church. His benevolence was unbounded. Many captives, espe-

cially Saxons, were brought at that time to Paris, and sold as slaves. Eligius bought 20, 30, 50, and 100 at a time, and gave them either the privilege to return home or become monks, or remain with him as friends. He increased the number of the monks in every way; influenced many persons of both sexes to enter this state, and founded and extravagantly supported many monasteries and nunneries. His greatest establishments are Solignac near Limoges (632) where 150 monks were soon collected, and the nunnery at Paris, which numbered 300 inmates. He also founded and adorned many churches in Paris, and contributed largely to the adornment of the graves of the saints. His unlimited benevolence, reputed wonders, which he sometimes declared were natural, sometimes attributed to the saints, at last always to the Saviour, his piety and abstinence, made him a great name among the people. By degrees he began to realize his spiritual calling, laid aside his splendid court garments, girded his rough coat with a rope, and became already a saint in the eyes of the people. The influence and holy life of Eligius became a burden to the court after the death of Dagobert, 638, and in 640 Herchenwald, who was major-domus during the minority of Clovis II., appointed Eligius Bishop of Noyon, to get rid of him at Paris. He was forced into the priesthood against his will, and after a brief delay, was consecrated Bishop. He devoted himself to his office, as Bishop, with great zeal; travelled through all the towns of his diocese, and preached almost daily. The religious condition of the Franks at this time was very low, and Eligius had to contend with much opposition and persecution, in his efforts to elevate them. In addition to his labors in his own diocese, he took a leading part in the government of the Church of France. He, together with his friend Audoenus, Bishop of Rouen, controlled the synods of Chalon (644) and Clichy (652); and they also succeeded in influencing the Gallican Bishop to condemn and persecute the Monothelitic heresy. — After long estrangement from the royal court, Eligius was again restored to favor, which he preserved until his death, which occurred at Noyon, Nov. 30, 658, or 659. He was buried, by order of Queen Bathilde, with great pomp, at Noyon in the church of St. Lupus, afterwards called St. Eligius. Soon after his death, miracles were said to have been performed at his grave, healing power was attributed to his relics, and he was honored as a saint. — The only source of information is the *Vita S. Eligii*, which attributes itself to Audoenus, but which could not have proceeded from him in the form it now has. See *d'Achery, Spicilegium*. 2d ed., T. II., pp. 76–123. In this biography there are extracts of his sermons, which also exist as a tract under the title *de rectitudine catholice conversationis*, which, however, the publishers of the works of Augustine (T. VI., Append., p. 745) have proven to be taken verbatim from the sermons of Cæsarius of Arles. The 16 sermons, which are besides attributed to him (Bibl. max. patr., T. XII., Lugd., 1677, pp. 300–322) are probably from the time of the Carolingians. An Epistle of Eligius to Desederius, Bishop

of Cahors, is found in *Canisii, Antiqu. Lection.* ed. Basnage, T. I., p. 646.

ALBRECHT VOGEL. — Beck.

Elijah (עֲלִיָּהוּ אֵלִיָּהוּ 'Hajás) born at Tishbeh, in Gilead, labored as prophet under Ahab and Ahaziah about 400 years B. C., against the general apostasy of Israel to the service of Baal (1 Kings 17—2 Kings 2). He appears suddenly in the midst of the idolatrous commotion into which Jezebel (see the Art.) enticed the court and the entire people. Perhaps he had withdrawn from the idolatry of the people into the wilderness, and was there called and prepared as a prophet, and was now summoned forth to his work. He appears, at last, suddenly before Ahab with the words, "As the Lord God of Israel liveth, before whom I stand, there shall not be dew nor rain these years, *but according to my word.*" During the time within which this prophecy was to be fulfilled, he does not again appear in Israel. He first concealed himself, according to divine direction, at the brook *Cherith*, where he drank of the brook and was fed by the ravens. When the brook was dried up, the Lord directed him to Zarephath in Phœnicia (in the province of *Ethbaal*, the father of Jezebel), where a widow—perhaps a heathen or proselyte—whose barrel of meal and cruse of oil did not fail, and whose son he raised from the dead, provided for him. After an absence of three years, he returned to Ahab. He commissioned Obadiah to announce his arrival to the King. Ahab went to meet him. According to the request of the prophet, all the people were assembled on Mount Carmel. He said unto them, "How long halt ye between two opinions? If the Lord be God, follow him; but if Baal, then follow him." Then he proved against the 450 priests of Baal (the 400 priests of Ashera were absent), by fire from heaven, which consumed his sacrifice before the King and people, that the Lord is God, and at his command the people killed the priests of Baal at the brook Kishon. Then, although the sky was cloudless, he foretold approaching rain. He spoke the word, but sent his servant six times to the top of Carmel; yet he saw nowhere the smallest cloud. But at the seventh time, the servant brought the intelligence, that a small cloud, as large as a man's hand, arose out of the sea, which soon covered the heavens. Ahab hastened home, and Elijah ran beside his chariot. The prophet again fled from the vindictive Jezebel to the wilderness of Judah. He was greatly disheartened, and, beneath a juniper-tree, he prayed for a speedy death. But an angel came with food, and comforted him, and in the strength of this food he went forty days and nights to *Horeb*. Here he complained to the Lord about the apostasy of His people. A strong wind, which rent the mountains, passed by; but the Lord was not in the wind. After the wind came an earthquake; but the Lord was not in it, neither in the fire which followed. But after the fire, there came a still small voice: Elijah covered his face, for the presence of the Lord was sensible. Now the Lord announced to him, that there were still 7000 in Israel, who had not bowed the knee to Baal, and commanded

him to anoint Hazael to be King over Syria, and Jehu King over Israel, and to consecrate Elisha to be his successor. The latter he did himself, the first two commissions were fulfilled by Elisha in his name. — The event on Carmel caused a reaction in Israel, and the 7000 worked as leaven among the whole people. For their sake the Lord again acknowledged Israel, and gave Ahab victory over Benhadad. After this Elijah worked more in retirement, appearing only twice in public. When *Ahab* forcibly appropriated the vineyard of *Naboth* (see the Art.), the prophet announced the ignominious destruction of his house; — and when Ahab's son, *Ahaziah*, being sick, consulted Baal-zebub, Elijah met the messenger, and said, "Is it because there is no God in Israel, that ye go to inquire of Baal-zebub, the god of Ekron?" and announced to him the near death of his master. The messenger did not know him, but Ahaziah knew the man with the hairy mantle and leather girdle. He ordered him to be arrested. Twice was a captain with 50, who attempted to arrest the "man of God," as they contemptuously called him, consumed by fire. He accompanied the third, and told the king, face to face, his condemnation. — Meanwhile the close of the prophet's labors was approaching. Elijah, accompanied with Elisha, went to Jericho. His mantle opened a way across the Jordan. Then Elijah was carried to heaven in a fiery chariot and horses. Elisha cried after him, "My father, my father, the chariot of Israel and the horsemen thereof." With reluctance Elisha allowed the sons of the prophets in Jericho, who supposed that the Spirit of the Lord had concealed him somewhere, to send out 50 men to seek him. These efforts were naturally in vain.

Thus do the Scriptures relate the life and labors of the most powerful and energetic of all the prophets from Moses to John the Baptist. Sirach (48:7) characterizes him strikingly: "Elijah appeared, a prophet like fire, and his words burned like a torch." He was filled with fiery zeal, and he was unsparing, either to himself or others. He is like a man cut out of the rocks of Sinai, and baptized with its fire. It is true, he manifested human weakness in the wilderness of Judah beneath the juniper-tree; and in his private life with the widow of Zarephath he showed, that a heart also beat in his breast, which could sympathize and be merciful. But absolute representation of the law characterized his official life. The horizon of his prophetic vision is bounded on the one side by Sinai, and on the other by the high mountain of crime, which the apostasy of his nation had raised. His words are like a hammer, and he has no balsam for wounded spirits. To understand this one-sided, hopeless, and promiseless position of the prophet, it must be remembered, that he labored in the kingdom of Israel, and not in that of Judah. Only in the former, and not in the latter, is the appearance of a prophet like Elijah comprehensible. Judah was true in its allegiance to God and diligent in worshipping him. This would have modified his legal inflexibility and acerbity. But in the kingdom of Ephraim, which had separated from

the Davidical tradition, had broken the continuity of the past and present with the messianic future, a prophet with the character of Elijah was directed to the period anterior to David for hope, comfort, and healing, and in it it was the covenant in the wilderness and the giving of the law on Sinai, which enchained his vision. But the rocks of Sinai, the sound of the trumpets, the smoke, and lightning, and thunder could not teach him mildness and mercy, they could only steel his soul for conflict. — In Elijah and his school is represented the acme of the one-sided legal prophetic position, the greatest, the most powerful and exalted, which it produced. But here also culminates its one-sidedness, and its insufficiency, its inability to conduct the development of the history of salvation to its final successful issue, was manifested. Here it must turn around, and open a way for that new direction of prophecy, which soon after began to unfold its glory in Hosea and Isaiah. A commencement of this change already appears in Elisha.

When we contemplate the life and labors of Elijah in their particulars, an unusually large number of miracles appear, which rationalistic criticism attempts partly to convert into quiet natural events, and partly to transfer to the region of myth. It must be admitted that these miracles, at least in part, have a strange character on account of their externality, and if we were justified in allowing mythical embellishments anywhere in the biblical history, it would be here (and in the history of Elisha). But if we view the history of Elijah as a living, organic link of the great chain of divine wonders, which extends from Sinai to Golgotha and the Mount of Olives, and consider also the peculiarity of the position and surroundings of Elijah, then the appearance of any miracle in itself, as well as the multitude of them which he wrought, and their imputed externality, will appear in a different light. Elijah and Elisha cannot be compared in this respect with Hosea and Micah, Isaiah and Jeremiah. Their prophetic position was an advanced stadium of development; their standpoint was much more inward, spiritual and ideal. Neither can Elijah and Elisha be compared to the contemporaneous and earlier prophets in the kingdom of Judah. These had the temple and its worship, the enduring theocracy, the Davidical royalty and tradition; those would have had no foundation, could have begun nothing without very striking, i. e., external miracles. The objection made (by Winer for example) that the miracles of Elijah are wanting in moral contents, is based as well on a denial of the prophetic position of Elijah, through which he was an organ of divine judgments and a representative of divine holiness, as on a confusion of the Old and New Testament standpoints.

Among the miracles in the life of Elijah, those especially which were wrought upon him (rather than those wrought by him) have the appearance of mythical embellishment. This relation will not be found inexplicable, if we remember the high, isolated position of Elijah among all the prophets of the O. T. This applies especially to

the feeding by the ravens at the commencement, and his ascension to heaven at the end of his career. With regard to the first of these, the rationalistic discoveries, which, with the ravens, would explain away also the miracle (ex. gr. the **עֲרָבִים** were the inhabitants of a neighboring town Oreb or Orbo, or they were Arabs, or wandering merchants), have long ago been condemned by criticism. Still more absurd, if possible, is the opinion of *J. D. Michaelis*, who thinks of carrion crows (*Corvus corax* L.) from whom Elijah took their booty. Even the latest interpretation (*J. v. Gumpach*, *Alttest. Studien.*: Heidl., 1852, p. 200, sq.), which makes the ravens themselves to be meat and bread for the prophet, can only lay claim to a philological invention.—With regard to the ascension of Elijah, its historical apprehension is a necessity at least to those who hesitate to regard the gospel history as a collection of myths, for the transfiguration of Christ, Matt. 17, is only tenable as a fact if 2 Kings 2 is a fact, the one account stands and falls with the other. The dogmatical difficulty connected with the ascension of Elias (as also that of Enoch), least of all authorizes us to transfer the matter out of the province of history into that of myth, for there are many dogmatical questions, which are yet to be answered.—It is true, an effort has been made to find a proof in 2 Chron. 21:12, sq., that the tradition which the author of the Chronicles had before him, said nothing of the ascension of the prophet—for, Winer thinks, the prophet surely did not write the letter in heaven. This will certainly be granted to him; and it is not necessary to suppose that Elijah wrote the letter during his life, and gave it to one of his pupils, who should afterwards give it to the king. Elijah could easily have lived to the commencement of the reign of Joram (comp. *KEIL*, *apolog. Versuch. über die BB. d. Chronik*: Berlin, 1833, p. 310, sq.).—In general comp. the Commentaries on the Books of Kings by *Fr. Keil* (Mosk., 1846) and *O. Thenius* (Leipz., 1849); besides also the homiletical treatment of the material by *Gottfr. Menken* (2 Aufl. Bremen, 1823) and *F. W. Krummacher* (2 Aufl. Elbf., 1835).

KURTZ.—Beck.

Eliot, John, was born, 1603 or 1604, in England. After completing his studies at Cambridge and teaching for a time, he went to New England in 1631, under the promise to become the pastor of a number of Independents, who were shortly to follow him to the New World. During the intervening time, he supplied the place of a clergyman who had returned to England, and on the arrival of his friends he went with them to Roxbury. Here he labored zealously with great success, although under great difficulties, and notwithstanding that his strength was heavily taxed by the duties of his office, he was not satisfied until he came to the conclusion to preach the gospel also to the Indians in the neighborhood. Having resolved upon this he at once commenced to prepare himself for this work by studying the Indian language, continuing at the same time to serve his congregation. On the 28th of Oct., 1646, accompanied with a few friends, he went to preach the gospel to the nearest tribe. His first effort made a

powerful impression; this was strengthened by repetition; in December a number of children were offered for instruction, and adults desired his pastoral labors. He soon discovered that in order to promote Christianity, it was absolutely necessary to wean them from their wandering mode of life, and collect them in established colonies; and although he knew and weighed the difficulties which were in the way of the Indians, he was not deterred by them from vigorously undertaking it. A place of residence was selected, and houses were rapidly built under his personal direction. The first settlement was called Nonanetum-wonne. He labored on, unwearied by the severe toils and undiscouraged by the great difficulties, until, in 1674, there were 14 smaller or larger communities under his care. In connection with all the labor attending the care of these, he still continued to serve his congregation at Roxbury, which would not dismiss him; and at the same time he was preparing a translation of the Bible and other good books. For a long time he bore all the expenses connected with his labors from his own means, but later he received assistance, especially from England, so that he was able to publish his translation of the New Test. in 1661. In 1674 a great calamity befell him. The chief of an unconverted tribe, a sworn enemy of Christianity and of the English colonists, broke in upon the settlements of Eliot with fire and sword, and entirely destroyed them. The chief, it is true, lost his life in this attack, and thereby peace was made, but still the Indians were not only scattered, but many of them also apostatized, and when Eliot counselled his Indians not to assist the English when they were attacked, because he had hoped thereby to protect his people from the blood-thirsty chief, they regarded him as a traitor. But heavily as Eliot was afflicted, he did not succumb, and although an old man, he cheerfully applied his remaining strength to repairing the injury sustained, and he succeeded in a great measure. He finally received his dismissal from Roxbury, in order that he might devote all of his remaining strength to the Indians. The death of his wife in 1686, who was of like mind and spirit with himself, greatly affected him. By degrees it came so far, that he was compelled to keep his house and bed, but even then he could not rest, but obtained a blind negro boy, the son of a slave, whom he instructed in the way of salvation, repenting to him texts of Scripture until he remembered them. After a severe death-struggle he died at the beginning of 1690.—Source: "*The life and death of the renowned Mr. John Eliot, who was the first preacher of the Gospel to the Indians in America, written by Colton Mather*, 1691. *Johann Eliot und die Familie Mayhew, die Apostel der Indianer, von Joh. Hartwig Brauer, in dessen Beiträgen zur Geschichte der Heidenbekehrung. Erster Beitrag. 2 Aufl., 1847.*

BRAUER.—Beck.

Elisabeth, (*she who swears by God, the true worshipper of God*). 1) The wife of Aaron, Ex. 6:23. 2) The wife of Zacharias and mother of John the Baptist, Luke 1:5, 7, 13, 24, 40, 41, 57. She was truly pious, and is rightly counted among the holy women of the Bible.

In Luke 1 : 36 she is called the cousin of the Virgin Mary. This may have been in several ways. The supposition of the Manichean, Faustus, that M. was of the tribe of Levi is expressly contradicted by the angel in v. 32, where he speaks of her father David. Since marriage between members of different tribes was only forbidden, when, in default of sons, the daughters took possession of the inheritance, we may either suppose that the mother of E. (for her father was certainly a priest, Luke 1 : 5) was of the house of David, or that the mother of M. was of the house of Aaron. The former view is the best supported (see *Hess, Leben Jesu*, 1, 17). With genuine piety she united great worldly wisdom, and hence the younger Mary turned to her for counsel in her peculiar condition. She was also the first person who clearly saw the dawn of the new dispensation and greeted Mary as the mother of our Lord, Luke 1 : 43.

VAIHINGER. — *Porter*.

Elisabeth, St. a daughter of Andrew II., of Hungary, and Gertrude of Meran, born at Presburg in 1207, was betrothed, in her fourth year, to Louis of Thuringia, then in his tenth, and brought up with him in the Wartburg at Eisenach, under the eyes of the landgrave, Hermann I., and his wife, Sophia of Bavaria. There were early developed those traits of devoted piety which have crowned her life with a halo of glory. This religious bias was aided no little by the tidings of the murder of her still youthful mother in her distant home. She knelt frequently at the altar of the castle-chapel, laid the golden crown she usually wore before the image of the Crucified, distributed all the money given her, and all the food she could obtain among the poor and hungry, mingled with the common people, regardless of the displeasure of the landgravine, or the sneers of the courtiers. The young landgrave remained faithful to her, and their marriage was celebrated in the Wartburg, in 1221 (some say 1220). E. is described in the chronicles and songs of the time as "beautiful in person, with black hair and slender form, earnest in her conversation, and chaste in her manners." To her husband she was tenderly obedient in all things, without being hindered by him in her spiritual exercises. Often during the night she arose from their common couch to pray. Daily she grew more rigorous in her personal piety; she wore a haircloth under-garment, inflicted stripes upon her bare back, and ate coarse food. Along with this she was active in deeds of mercy to the poor, the sick, babes, the dying. On the slope of the Wartburg she built a hospital, with the landgrave's consent, for lepers, whom she herself attended. During the famine of 1226 she redoubled her charitable efforts, and founded an asylum for neglected children. In all this she was under the counsel of her father-confessor, the renowned persecutor of heretics, Conrad of Marburg, who gave her twelve rules of discipline, and often struck her with his own hands. She continued thus in wedlock until 1227, when landgrave Lewis died in Lower Italy, in the crusade of Frederick II. During her widowhood she suffered a series of unmerited wrongs, and self-imposed penances. She died Nov. 19, 1231. She and her four

children, including one son, were expelled from the Wartburg by Henry Raspe, the barbarous brother of Lewis, who even forbid the inhabitants of Eisenach to harbor them. After wandering about for some time the B. of Bamberg gave her a home in the castle Botenstein. Subsequently Henry regretted his course, and invited her back to the Wartburg. She returned, but soon exchanged an abode there for a humbler dwelling near the village Wehrda, where she was untiring in her charities. She erected a hospital and poor-house there, and presented it to the adjacent chapel of the Franciscans. There she ended her days. It cannot be proven that she ever joined the order of St. Francis. She was canonized by Gregory in 1235. In the same year landgrave Conrad, of Thuringia, laid the foundation of a splendid church, bearing her name, and inclosing her tomb, in the valley near Marburg.—(See *Ersch u. Gruber* under St. Elisabeth III. BÖHRINGER's *K.-gesch.* in Biogr. II., 2. JUSTI, *Elis. d. Heil.*, 2 Aufl. MONTALEMBERT, *Hist. de Sainte Elis. de Hongrie*, 2 parts. MERZ, *E. v. Ungarn*, in the first part of his *Christl. Frauenbilder*. BÖHRINGER, *l. c.*, Simon, Ludw. IV., &c. GRÜNEISEN.*

Elisæus (properly *Egisæ*), a distinguished Armenian historian and theologian of the 5th cent., studied under Sahak (Isaac) and Misrop, and then became secretary of Vartan, the prince of the Mamikunir, and subsequently was appointed Bishop of Amatunik. As secretary of Vartan he wrote an able history of the war of the Persians, under Yessedschird II., against the Christians (publ. in Armenian, Constant., 1764, and 1823; Moscow, 1787; Venice, 1828; in English, transl. by C. F. Neumann, London, 1830, 4to.; in Italian by Capeletti, Venice, 1840; in French, Paris, 1844). As B. he attended the celebrated Synod of Artaschat, 449, which discussed the dangers threatened by Parsism. He also wrote several exegetical, homiletical, and ascetic works; Comm. on Joshua, the Judges (that on Genesis seems to be lost), and the Lord's Prayer; discourses upon the Life of Christ, on his second coming, the Judgment, the Apostles, and an address to Monks (see hist. of Varten, Ven., 1828); also a book of *Canons*. See all these in his complete works: Ven., 1838 (in which, however, two, spurious, discourses ascribed to him are omitted). Still unpubl. is his incomplete MS. discourse upon the souls of men, or on Spirits. His chief merit is as a historian. GOSCHÉ.*

Elisha (Ἐλισαῖος, *Elisæus*), a prophet of Israel from 896 B. C., under Jehoram, until 840 B. C., under Joash. He was the son of Shaphat of Abel-meholah, and was called from the plow to the prophetic office by Elijah's throwing his mantle over him (1 Kings 19 : 16, 19). Before obeying the call he begged permission to bid farewell to his father and mother. After making a parting feast, to the preparation of which he devoted his oxen and agricultural implements, he followed Elijah. Before Elijah's translation, Elisha besought that a double portion of his master's spirit might rest upon him, as his first-born son. The mantle of Elijah, which fell upon Elisha in his master's flight, was a pledge of the granting of the request. By means of it

E. opened a dry path over the Jordan, and the young prophets at Jericho willingly acknowledge him as their new master. In his future course E. wrought more miracles than his predecessor (2 Kings 2-13). At Jericho he caused a bitter fountain to become sweet. Near Bethel he pronounced a curse upon forty-two boys who had reviled him, and they were forthwith devoured by two bears. During a war of Jehoshaphat and Jehoram against Moab, he called up a shower of rain, which revived the fainting hosts of Israel and Judah. He relieved a poor widow pressed by creditors, by multiplying her little store of oil. To a hospitable Shunamite he promised a son, and afterwards restored him to life. During a famine he made some poisonous gourds nutritious by pouring upon them a handful of meal, and fed a multitude with twenty barley-loaves. He cured Naaman, the Syrian general, of leprosy, and transferred the plague to Gehazi, in punishment of his covetousness. He caused an axe, which one of the young prophets had let fall into the Jordan, to float on the surface. He informed Jehoram of Benhadad's secret schemes; the latter sent a company to Dothan to take Elijah. E.'s servant was alarmed. But in answer to the prophet's prayer God showed the youth that Elijah was encompassed by a mighty host sent to protect him. His enemies were then smitten with blindness, and E. himself led them back towards Samaria, fed them, and let them go in peace. Nevertheless Benhadad besieged Samaria. A fearful famine soon prevailed in the city, Jehoram, blaming E. as the cause of the siege, gave command that he should be slain, but forthwith relented. E. foretold that on the next day food should abound in the city. One of the lords of Jehoram ridiculed the prophecy. E. told him he would see, but not enjoy its fulfilment. That night the Syrians, smitten by the Lord with fear of the Egyptians, abandoned the siege and left behind vast booty. Samaria was relieved, but the mocking lord perished in the crowd that thronged its gates.—E. next told *Hazeal*, the Syrian general, that he would soon be made king, and as such inflict fearful woes upon Israel; and then anointed *Jehu* as king, and executor of God's vengeance upon the house of Ahab. Under Jehu's reign E. seems to have labored in retirement among his pupils. *Joash* of Israel, without renouncing the worship of the calf, attached himself closely to E., who died under his reign, after having, on his death-bed, symbolically foretold Joash's three victories over the Syrians (2 Kings 13: 14-19). After E.'s burial, a dead body which happened to be laid beside his corpse, was restored to life.—Concerning the number of E.'s miracles see what is said of Elijah's.—They are mainly distinguished from his master's by their *merciful* character, whilst in their outward form those of both often resemble each other. They seem to stand related to each other somewhat as Moses and Joshua, or David and Solomon. The close similarity between two of their miracles (the multiplication of the oil, and restoration of the dead to life) is designed to exhibit Elisha as continuing the efficiency of Elijah,—as a second

Elijah. The actual course of history is not without analogous, significant, repetitions.

KURTZ.*

Elvira, the Council of (Conc. *Eliberitanum*, or *Illiberitanum*). Illiberis, or Iliberi, Liberini was a town of the Spanish province Bætica (Andalusia) near Granada, in which there is still a gate called *de Elbira*. It was long ago destroyed. Illiberis in *Gallia Narbonensis* cannot be the place where the Council in question was held. It was the earliest synod in Spain, held c. 303, 305, or 309. It is certain that Christianity was not yet triumphant, that Christians were still persecuted, and tempted to apostasy, as many instances prove. The name of Hosius, B. of Cordova, proves that it was not held before the 4th cent. It is an erroneous inference of some Protestant writers, that this Council belongs to a far later period, because it condemned the hanging up of pictures in churches, and the lighting of candles in graveyards, and strictly enjoined celibacy, practices which did not exist so early as 303-309. On the contrary, Romish writers, Baronius *ad a.* 57, and Bellarmine, have opposed the validity of the decrees of Elvira, because they forbid pictures and the restoration of certain offenders. Bellarmine says it was merely a provincial synod.—The decisions of this synod possess special historical value; they inform us of the earnest, severe, and somewhat austere spirit of the Spanish Church, incited by some religious excrescences, and show how far Montanistic-Novatian principles then prevailed, or at least how inviting a field the Western Church opened to that tendency. It would be utterly wrong to interpret the 33d canon as enjoining marriage upon the clergy, as some have done: *placuit in totum prohiberi episcopis, presbyteris et diaconibus, vel omnibus clericis positis in ministerio abstinere se a conjugibus et non generare filios; quicumque vero fecerit, ab honore clericatus exterminetur*. The words might rather mean that marriage was not really forbidden to the clergy (as the word *conjuges* may imply), but that they were to refrain from connubial intercourse during the period of their official service (*positis in ministerio*); implying that in Spain there was an alternation in the performance of ministerial functions, similar to that customary among the Jews. But if the austerity of other canons is considered, it will seem less unlikely that celibacy was enjoined. Celibacy is Montanistic; permanent exclusion from the Church is Montanistic-Novatian.—The 34th c. refers to a superstition, and shows that the assembled fathers themselves were not strangers to superstitious notions: *cereos per diem placuit in cœmeterio non incendi: inquietandi enim spiritus sanctorum non sunt*.—The 36th c. is important as showing that then already the practice of hanging up pictures in churches was arising in the occident, and that it was at once associated with superstitions: *placuit picturas in ecclesia esse non debere, ne quod colitur et adoratur in parietibus depingatur*. Romish writers have unjustly endeavored to invalidate this canon.—Finally, absolute excommunication is enjoined in many cases (Can. 2, 6, 7, 8, 10, 12, 17, 19, 49, 66, 71, 75) with the usual formula: *nec in*

fine dandam communionem.—The Canons of Elvira may be found in MANSI, *Concil. nova et ampliss. collectio* T. II., fol. 2, &c.; ROUTH, *Reliquiæ*, IV., 41–59. The best writer upon the subject is FERD. DE MENDOZA: *de confirmando concilio Illiberitano ad Clem. VIII.* A shorter treatise, by AUBESPIN, B. of Orleans. Both these may be found in *Mansi*, l. c., 58, &c.; 37, &c. HERZOG.*

Elxaites, or *Elkesaites*, a sect among the early Jewish Christians, tainted with Gnosticism. Epiphanius (*Hær.*, LIII., XIX., XXX.) furnishes the fullest notice of them, under the name of *Sampsæans* (Σαμψαῖοι), but his reports are confused and unreliable; Theodoret's are drawn from others; those of Origen (in Euseb., *H. E.*, 6, 38) are too fragmentary; the best source of knowledge is the *Philosophumena* of the Pseudo-Origen (IX., 13, ed. Miller, p. 292), with a cautious use of Epiphanius.

Concerning the name opinions vary. The Fathers and many others derive it from Elxai, their founder. Epiphanius interprets Ἠλξαῖ as “δύναμις πεκαλυμμένη” = יְהוֹשֻׁעַ, and this is the more likely, since he mentions a brother of his, whom he calls Ἰεξίος = יֵשׁוּעַ. But there can be little doubt that neither refers to a person. The δύναμις πεκαλυμμένη is, according to Gieseler's (*Eccl. History*) sagacious interpretation, the Holy Spirit (δύναμις ἁσάρτος Hom. Clem., XVII., 16), and the name is most probably the title of a book, which is the chief authority of the sect; and this is confirmed by the fact, that, according to Epiph., it is said to have held also to a book of the brother Iexeos (*Hær.*, L., III., 3).—At all events, the sect regards as its highest authority a book, which, though he be not its author, owes its introduction to Elxai. This book we find, wherever we meet Gnosticized Christianity among the Jews; Origen (Euseb., l. c.) knew of it; and the Syrian, Alcibiades, carried it from Apamea to Rome (Philos., IX., 13). Epiph. traces its influence in nearly every part of early Jewish Christendom. Hence it must have occupied a central place, and does not belong merely to a small party. According to Origen (l. c.), it is said to have fallen from heaven; according to the more accurate account of the Philos., to have been revealed by an angel, who was the Son of God himself. Elxai obtained it from the Seers in Parthia. This is said to have occurred in the 3d year of Trajan's reign; a period, which the fabulous report of its origin may render suspicious, but which cannot be much too early, since the doctrines of the book form the basis of the Clementine Homilies.

These doctrines exhibit a strong ethnic, naturalistic element mingled with Judaism and Christianity. This shows itself especially in the purifications prescribed. A forgiveness of all sin is proclaimed on the ground of a new baptism; which doubtless consists in oft repeated washings, applied also for the cure of diseases and certainly performed in the name of the Father and the Son (Philos., p. 294, 50), in which seven witnesses appear—the five elements, and, according to Oriental ideas, oil and

salt (bread also), to denote baptism and the Lord's Supper. The same heathen element shows itself in the use of astrology and magic (Philos., 293, 23); even the baptismal days were determined by the stars. The Judaistic element appears in this, that they regarded the law as binding and adhered to the Sabbath and circumcision. On the other hand, they rejected sacrifices (Epiph. XIX., 3), and particular parts of the O. T. Of the N. T. also they rejected much, especially the Epistles of Paul (Origen, l. c.). Their Christology is very ambiguous. Christ, on the one side, seems to be conceived of as a mighty angel; on the other, they taught a frequent, continuous incarnation, although they held fast to his birth of the Virgin. The mediating point between the two views is found in the conception of Christ as μέγας βασιλεύς. As regards religious rites, baptism oscillates between the ceremony once performed and oft repeated purifications, among which circumcision has a place; the eucharist was celebrated with bread and salt; the eating of flesh was forbidden; marriage was highly esteemed, and the denial of their faith in times of persecution permitted.

As to the origin of their system of doctrine, it is extremely probable that it owes much to the Essenes. It arose among the Jewish Christians, who were mingled with this sect on the shores of the Dead Sea and exposed to the influences of Oriental heathenism. In 274, Origen met with one of their apostles at Cæsarea; but before that, under Calixtus (221–226), a certain Alcibiades, of Apamea, had labored in Rome. All those efforts, however, seem to have had little success. At length their doctrinal ideas became merged in the Clementine Homilies (see Art. *Clementines*, and Uhlhorn, *die Homilien*, &c., 398, sqq.). UHLHORN.—Porter.

Emanuel, in its abbreviated form *Manuel*, a Roman corruption of the Hebrew עִמָּנוּאֵל (Immanuel). The LXX. and Matt. have Ἐμμανουῆλ. It means, God with us, and is the name of the child mentioned in Is. ch. 7–9. That these passages are *Messianic*, as Matt. (1: 23) testifies and the whole Christian world has held from the beginning, is disputed by several scholars. Some find difficulty in the expression עִלְמָה, applied to the mother of the prophetic child, though it can mean nothing else than a marriageable virgin, who, in the language of Mary, has “not known a man;” or rather in the prefixed article (הָעִלְמָה), which Luther, with Mary doubtless in view, omitted in his translation, but which they regard as indispensable, referring the term to the *house of David*, because Israel is often likened to a virgin betrothed to the Lord (Is. 54: 1, sq.), whilst at the same time they overlook the fact that in corresponding passages in Amos 5: 1, 2; Jer. 31: 20, 21, &c., יִשְׂרָאֵל is always added, and that Israel is not called עִלְמָה, but בְּתוּלָה. Others find special difficulty in the *time assigned for the fulfilment of the prophecy*, as it appears

partly in the idea of the sign, for which the child should serve, and partly in the 16 v. of ch. 7, and what follows.

That by the appointed sign of the child Immanuel (Is. 8 : 18) we are to understand originally no other than the child of the prophet Isaiah himself, cannot be denied without violence to the text: the **עֲלִמָּה**, the virgin, who, though like Mary, she knew not a man, was to become pregnant, can neither be Mary, nor the house of David, nor some indefinite virgin, but must be "the prophetess" already betrothed to Isaiah, as Mary to Joseph, (hence **הָעֲלִמָּה**, and also in Is. 8 : 3, the article **הַנְּבִיאָה**, which Luther has likewise omitted), to whom the prophet goes in (Is. 8 : 1); her child, who was to be called Immanuel, is the same, whom the prophet, at the command of the Lord, was afterward to name Maher-shalal-chash-buz, to signify that the destruction of Damascus and Samaria was rapidly approaching, — the same child, in whose early infancy, "before he knew to refuse the evil and choose the good" (Is. 7 : 15, 16), the carrying away of the kingdom of Israel and the oppression of the kingdom of Judah should take place (Is. 7 : 17–25). But the child is not only a sign of judgment to the prophet, but also of the communion with God, by which all true Israelites were to be consoled under these afflictions. The sign thus had a negative and a positive side, and hence the child bore by design the two names, Maher-shalal-chash-buz and Immanuel; the one transient, the other enduring; for the prophet looked far forward to the time, when in this same land, in which judgment now first began, light should spring out of darkness; when another child should be born and a Son given, whose peaceful reign on the throne of David should have no end (9 : 6). Isaiah does not expressly call this other child Immanuel, but his own little Immanuel leads his mind onward to the future Messiah; he sees "God with us" first fulfilled in that other child, and the evangelist Matthew and the Christian Church only utter what was typified in the child of Isaiah: *Jesus, the Son of the Virgin Mary, the only-begotten Son of God himself, is the true Immanuel, who was thus foreshadowed.*

PRESSER. — Porter.

Emmaus, a village $7\frac{1}{2}$ miles N.-W. of Jerusalem, whither the two disciples were going, whom the Lord met after his resurrection (Luke 24 : 13) Jos. B. J., VII., 6, 6, speaks of it as the place to which Vespasian sent 800 soldiers as colonists. A tradition of the 14th cent. identifies E. with Kubeibeh, nearly 9 miles N.-E. of Jerusalem (see Robinson, II., 255). In 1 Macc. 3 : 40, 57; 4 : 3; 9 : 50, an Emmaus is named as the place where Judas M. overcame Gorgias, and the same that Bacchides fortified (Jos. Ant. XIII., 1, 3) Cassius conquered it and Gophna (Jos. Ant. XIV., 11, 2; B. J., I., 11, 2). Under the Romans it was a toparchy of Palestine (PLINY, V., 15; Jos. B. J., III., 3, 5; comp. II., 20, 4). It was burned down by Quintilius Varus (Jos. Ant. XVII., 10, 9; B. J., II., 5, 1) and rebuilt under Heliogab. a. 223, with the name

Nicopolis (RELAND, Pal., 759). Eusebius and Jerome suppose this to be the Emmaus of Luke 24 : 13, although it is 175 stadia, nearly 22 miles, from Jerusalem. This confounding of the two places continued to more recent times, when both were sought for in the modern Lâtrôn (the *Castellum boni Latronis*), and also located at Kubeibeh (Robinson, l. c., note 4). Its true locality has only lately been shown to be that of the village 'Amwâs, W. of Ialo, and N. of the road between Jerusalem and Ramleh, hence N. of Lâtrôn (see ARNOLD's Palestine, 178). Reland (l. c., 427, &c., 758, &c.) supposes there were two places of this name, and most modern writers follow him. (See Robinson, l. c.) Rödiger, in a notice of Robinson's work (Hall. Allgem. Lit. Zeit., 1842), remarks that the ancient tradition makes both identical; that upon Luke 24 : 13 the *Cod. K. Cyprius*, N. apr. m. and some others read 160 stadia, and that Jos. VII., 6, 6, may have been altered by Christian copyists to the common reading. Robinson adopts this view in III., 148–150. ARNOLD.*

Emmeram.—Through Radegund and Venantius Fortunatus the idea of Christianizing eastern Germany, became prevalent in Poitiers; and a B. of Poitiers might readily feel impelled to follow Irish missionaries who often passed through France on their way East. Of one such, who, c. 650, succeeded Hilary (but of whom the Frankish Church knows nothing, as he may have belonged to those clergy who, c. 640, withdrew at the instance of St. Eligius, or he may have been inflamed by the example of St. Eligius), Aribo, B. of Freising (about the 2d half of the 8th cent.), and after him Arnold of Vochburg, c. 1036, gives an account. Aribo's account, the only one now extant, probably rests upon a reliable written tradition. And even though Aribo's account was shaped to favor the Church, especially that of Bavaria, it must be substantially true. The legend is as follows.—Haimaram, or Emmeram had scarcely become B. of Poitiers when he resolved to convert the heathen in Pannonia. He placed another man in his chair, and with Vitalis as his interpreter crossed the Rhine for the East. When he reached Radaspona, the residence of Theodo, Duke of Bavaria, Theodo dissuaded him from going further, urging that the newly-converted Bavarians needed his care as much as the Avari. E. remained and spent three years among the Bavarians. Then he resolved to visit Rome, but after three days journey from Ratisbon he was cruelly murdered in Helfendorf. His murder is thus explained. Uta, Theodo's daughter, revealed to E. that she had committed a sin which could no longer be concealed, and begged him to screen her, allowing her to name him as the cause of her shame. He consented and fled. Uta herself was driven off, and her brother Lambert pursued, overtook and slew E. His remains were first placed in a chapel at Aschheim, but in consequence of threatening omens, Theodo had them brought to Ratisbon, and honorably interred in St. George's chapel, thenceforth called St. George and St. Emmeram. This change of sentiment is ascribed to the testimony of one Wulflaich, a clergyman, to whom E., before his death, communicated his secret arrangement

with Uta, and that the true cause of Uta's shame was a certain Siegbald, the son of a knight. But this whole story is very suspicious, and at any rate does not relieve E. of reproach, even though he may thus have secured the martyrdom he had hoped to suffer among the heathen. It is more likely that E. was really guilty with Uta, and sought to escape punishment by flight to Rome. His death would more than atone for his sin in the eyes of the people, who thenceforth made him the hero of their song. The popular feeling in E.'s favor would induce Theodo to receive his remains, which became objects of veneration among the people. — It is not surprising that wonders were said to be wrought at his grave; but it is remarkable that the Jews ascribed them to a scroll of their law which they said E. carried about him. — The legend also says that Lambert died in banishment, and that none of Theodo's sons succeeded to his dukedom. As Arnold, of Vochburg, distinguishes this Duke Theodo from another who divided his duchy, 702, among his sons, he may have lived about 650. Hence the usual date of E.'s death, Sept. 6, 652, may be nearly correct. — Emmeram did not introduce Christianity among the Bavarians, but found priests, churches, and monasteries among them. His only merit consisted in preaching the gospel among them. His successors, Rupert and Corbinian, still found occasion for prosecuting the work. After his death E. acquired more importance for the Bavarian Church than he ever possessed during his life. The veneration in which his body was held gradually gave rise, though without a proper organization, to the monastery of St. Emmeram, at Regensburg, which became the centre of the Church of the Bavarian duchy; the abbot of the monastery was the head of that Church, and had the honor and title of a Bishop, though without consecration. Boniface founded a See of Regensburg, but did not appoint the abbot of St. Emmeram to it. It soon appeared, however, that a B. of Regensburg could not exist without having the influence and authority of an abbot of St. E. The two offices were, therefore, united, and remained so until near a. 1000. Under Otto II., B. Wolfgang called abbot Romuald from Treves to St. E. But the monks of St. E. tried every means of securing exemption from the Bishop; they even forged letters-patent. Finally in 1325, by a decree of John XXII. (subsequently indeed countermanded by a breve of Sixtus V., 1588) exemption was conferred upon St. E.; and it acquired great power. Its abbot became a prince, and belonged to the estates of the Romish German Empire, and retained this position until that Empire fell. The building is now occupied by the prince of Thurn and Taxis. — (See *Acta sanct.*, Sept. VI., p. 454, &c. CANISIUS, *lectiones antiquæ*, III., 1, and in PERTZ, *Mon.*, Vol. 6. Upon the relation of the monastery to the episcopate: P. HANSIZ (against Hemm's work) *Illustratio apolog. prodromi episcop. Ratisb.*, &c.: Vien., 1755, 4to. RETTBERG, *K.-gesch. Deutschl.* II., 189. GFRÖRER, *allgem. K.-gesch.* III., 461. *Ersch u. Gruber, Encycl.* XXXIV., 66). VOGEL.*

Emser, Jerome, born at Ulm, March 26, 1477, of a noble family; in the 16th year of his age

went to Tübingen, where he studied Greek under Dionysius, the brother of John Reuchlin. Erasmus admired his skill in Latin poetry, and John Cochlæus (*Hist. de Actis et Scriptis Mart. Lutheri*) called him, on this account, *virum amœnigenii*. In 1497 he entered the University of Basle, where he studied law and Hebrew. Having travelled in Germany two years as secretary and chaplain of Cardinal Raimund, of Gurk, he finally located (1502) in Erfurt, where he delivered lectures on the humanities. Removed to Leipsig (1504), he lectured on the same subject; honored with the Baccalaureate of Theology (1505), at the expense of Duke George of Saxony, who also made him his secretary, he turned his attention to theology, but soon applied himself to law. On his return from Rome whither he had made an unsuccessful journey (about 1510) to procure the canonization of Benno, Bishop of Meissen, he took sick. His near approach to death determined him, in the event of recovery, to devote himself entirely to the Church. Attributing his restoration to St. Benno, he glorified his patron by writing his biography (*Divi Benonis Misnensis quondam Episcopi Vita*, etc.: Lps., 1512). — With the opening of the Disputation at Leipsig the friendship, which had hitherto obtained between Emser and Luther, was interrupted. In reply to an attack made upon him by E. in a letter to Dr. Zack, administrator of the Catholic Church in Prague, L. published *ad Aegocerotem Emseranum Mart. Lutheri additio*: Witeb., 1519 (in Löschers *Reform.-Acts.* III., p. 668); which elicited in turn *A Venatione Aegocerotis assertio* (Löschers, p. 694). Emser also opened his batteries against Nich. Hausman, Carlstadt, Zwingli, and Willibald Pirckheimer. The malice of his writings induced L. to burn them with the Papal Bull and Decretals, Feb. 10, 1520. The main points in dispute between him and E. were the sacrifice of the mass, the canonization of Benno and the translation of the N. Test. Duke George having forbidden the use of L.'s version, E. issued one by himself, according to the Vulgate, 1527. — E. died Nov. 8, 1527. Jerome Walther, of Nürnberg, marked his resting-place, in the cemetery at Dresden, with a monument of stone. — Besides Seckendorf and Löschers, see "continued collect. of theol. events, old and new, to 1720," pp. 8-27, 187-226; part. George Ernst Waldau records of Jer. Emser, Ansp., 1783.

NEUDECKER. — *Ermentrout*.

Ems, Congress of. — In order to execute the decrees of the Council of Trent, the Papacy had, from the close of the 16th cent., located nuncios in Switzerland, Belgium, and Germany. In the 17th cent. the German Emperor determined to put a stop to their encroachments upon the rights of the State, and Leopold I. (1680), informed Pope Innocent XI. that he had no authority to impose upon the nations nuncios armed with judicial power, and threatened defection if the Pope did not yield. Though Innocent seemed to bend to circumstances, he quietly held on his old course, whilst the hierarchy ridiculed the patience of the Germans. At length the Electoral-Archbishop of Mayence, Franz Lothar, boldly demanded of Innoc. that, as in France, in Venice and Genoa, so in Germany, spiritual matters

should be regulated by its own subjects and laws. This course of action was also pursued by the Elector-Archbishop, John Hugo, of Treves, and cathedral-chapters, whilst the Emperor, Chas. VI., wrote the Pope (1736) that he would no longer countenance a nuncius in Cologne. In consequence of a circular sent (1764) by the Elector of the Palatinate to the Emperor, touching fresh encroachments of Rome on the rights of the German Bishops (see Hist. of Appellat. of Ecclesiast. trib.: Frankft. and Lpz., p. 316; *Moser*, Hist. of Papal Nuncios in Germany: Frankft. and Lpz., 1788), there was formed a Concordat which Pope Clement XIII. recognized in a Brief, Sept. 16, 1764. The influence of Rationalism, however, and the policy of Fred. the Great and Joseph II., soon disturbed the peace, and the German Catholic Church demanded that Rome should not be allowed to curtail the rights of its Bishops. But upon separating the Church in Germany from the See of Rome, John Nich. von Hontheim, under the title Justinus Febronius, issued a treatise *De Statu Ecclesiæ et Legitima potestate Romani Pontificis liber singularis*, etc.: Bullioni, 1763. Others, such as Ickstatt, of Ingolstadt; Barthel, of Würzburg; Eybel, of Vienna; Koller, &c., seconded his designs.

Matters soon came to a crisis. The Elector, Chas. Theodore, of Palatinate-Bavaria, was desirous of having a Papal nuncius at his court. Jerome, Archbishop of Salzburg, gave the alarm. He called upon (1785) Fred. Chas. Joseph, Archbishop of Mayence, as Primate of the German Church, to avert the impending danger. Receiving no encouragement at the hands of the Pope, these dignitaries had recourse to Joseph II. as protector of the German Church, who at once espoused their cause (Oct. 12, 1785, *Polit. Journ.*, 1785, II.: *Hamb.*, 1785, p. 1199), and declared that he would not allow the Archb. and Bishops of the kingdom to be disturbed in their diocesan rights, and that he would recognize the papal nuncios simply in a political capacity, and not permit them the exercise of any spiritual authority. Zoglio, nevertheless, appeared as nuncius at Munich, in March, 1786, exercised his powers, granted indulgences and dispensations, appointed a sub-nuncius in Düsseldorf, and even instituted a new spiritual tribunal in a foreign bishopric. So, also, the nuncius Pacca in Cologne. The King prohibited the exercise of such power, whilst Archbishops interdicted all intercourse between their members and the nuncios.

In order to put a final stop to these papal encroachments, the Archbishops appointed a Congress at Ems. There were present (Aug. 1786) Bishop Heimes, of Mayence, the official Joseph Ludwig Beck, of Trier, from Cologne, the official George Henry v. Tautphäus, and from Salzburg, John Michael Bönike. On Aug. 25, 1786, they framed a platform—called the “Emser Punktion”—composed of 23 chapt. of which the following is the substance:—1) Whilst the Romish Pope is and always remains Primate of the whole Church, all other prerogatives which were not connected with his primacy in the primitive ages, but grew out of the spurious Isidore Decretals, do not belong to his jurisdiction.—2) As

Christ gave the apostles and their successors, the Bishops, unlimited power to bind and loose, all persons living within the ecclesiastical circuit of Bishops, are subject to them, and diocessans, therefore, are forbidden to have recourse to Rome whilst they pass by their immediate spiritual superiors; no exemption from this, those *corporum* excepted who may have obtained permission from the Emperor. The officers of monasteries cannot receive their rules from their General-chapters, nor superiors not resident in Germany.—3) Every Bishop can make laws and give dispensations touching the rules of abstinence and marriage; he can also abolish the obligations incurred by ordination, absolve religious persons from their vows, and change a religious institution into another better calculated to promote the interests of Church and State. No longer necessary, therefore, the so-called *facultates quinquenales* of the Romish court, nor are Romish bulls, briefs, and other papal ordinances binding without the consent of the Bishops, who shall also give authority and value to the decisions and regulations of Romish congregations in Germany.—4) The nuntiatures shall henceforth cease, the nuncios being nothing more than papal ambassadors, without *Actus jurisdictionis* or *contentiosæ*.—5) To the Bishop alone belongs the power of dispensing “in the majority of prebends,” and in the event of “*Capituli de multa*,” he alone shall decide whether such event exists.—6) The *Decreta Basileensia*, as received in 1439, shall be adopted *pro Regula Concordatorum* and the *Jura in Concordia Aschaffenburger* de An., 1448, *pro Exceptione a regula*; and the reservation of the Romish curia against the liberties of Germany, to be regarded as invalid.—7) The hereditary successors in ecclesiastical benefices to be entirely abolished; the coadjutorships, provostships, deaneries, and precedencies distributed at Rome to be without effect in Germany.—8) A German, not to the manor born, cannot be eligible to a benefice.—9) —The *Indultum Administrationis* and the *Clausula in Temporalibus* in the bulls confirmatory of elections, are henceforth inadmissible.—10) The relation sustained by Bishops to their country rendering it impossible for them to keep the oath prescribed by Pope Gregory VII., it cannot in the future be retained.—11) The amount of the “Annats and Palliums” shall be arranged, within two years, either by a national Church-convocation, or by the Emperor and the kingdom.

The Emperor Joseph, whilst promising his support of these Art., in his reply, Nov. 16, 1786, to the four Archbishops who put them in his hands, declared that the execution of the Punctat. depended on a mutual understanding between them and the suffragan-bishops and those countries into which any diocese extended, and that, therefore, a greater concert of action should be effected. The ultramontane party was not inactive. It accused the German Archbishops of a desire to elevate themselves at the expense of the Bishops, and him of Mayence in particular, of a disposition to secure the primacy over all the other Bishops and Archbishops. Pacca issued a circular (Dec. 1786), showing that the Archbishops had received every five

years their dispensatory powers from Rome, and that they could not obtain others than those expressly contained in the Indulta. Archbishop Max. Franz, of Cologne, replied, whilst the Archbishops generally commanded their clergy to return the circular to Pacea, and to receive no papal regulation without the consent of their vicariate.—In the meantime the Pope had effectually gained the favor of Chas. Theodore, the Elector of Bavaria, who supported him and his nuncios. Many Bishops declared against the Congress of Ems, and the Bishop of Spire, who was seconded by the Bishops of Würzburg and Hildesheim, sent in a complaint to the Emperor, that said Congress had been held without the consent of the Bishops, whilst many others preferred the service of an absent chief to that of German Metropolitans. In the *Responsio ad Metropolitanos Mogunt., Trevir., Colon. et Salisb. super Nuntiaturis, Romæ*, 1789, the Pope refuted in detail the Ems Punctat. Self-interest divided the Archbishops, and in the midst of their differences the Pope achieved a signal victory over them, and the German Catholic Church remained a subject of Rome. Comp. Modern hist. of relig. under superintend. of G. I. Plank. I., Lemgo, 1787, p. 337; *E. Münch*, Hist. of Ems Congress and its Punctat.: Carlsr., 1840.

NEUDECKER. — *Ermentrout*.

Encyclopedia, French. — *Encyclopédie ou Dictionnaire raisonné des sciences, des arts et des métiers, par une société de gens de lettres. Mis en ordre et publié par DIDEROT et quant à la partie mathématique par M. d'ALEMBERT*. Thus runs the title of the famous work, which, begun at Paris in the middle of the 18th cent., has made its editors and contributors known over the whole civilized world, as the *Encyclopedists*. At the head of the enterprise stood Diderot, whose scheme it was; but d'Alembert, a member of the Paris Academy, already distinguished in the sphere of mathematics and physics, contributed most to its high scientific reputation.

Jean le Rond d'Alembert, born at Paris, Nov. 16, 1717, was the son of Destouches, a celebrated French playwright, and Mam'selle Tencin, a sister of the cardinal-archbishop of Lyons. He was exposed by his parents at the door of the church of St. Jean le Rond (whence his name), and sent thence to the foundling-hospital, but admission being refused on account of his weakness, he was placed under the care of a glazier's wife. In spite of these unfavorable circumstances, his great mental powers developed themselves in such a rapid and brilliant manner, that he entered the Mazarin College in his 12th year; two of his teachers were zealous adherents of Jansenism, and hoped to raise up in him a defender of their cause, a star of the first magnitude, a second Pascal; but d'A. felt himself drawn more and more to the study of mathematics, and accordingly left the establishment. To gain a livelihood he studied law and then medicine, but in a short time abandoned both in order to devote himself exclusively to his favorite pursuits. To these he owes his fame in the scientific world. In 1741 he was elected a member of the Academy of Paris, and, in 1746, of Berlin. Frederick the Great, attracted by some Latin verses of d'A., opened a correspondence, and

settled on him a pension of 1200 livres. The same monarch wished him to accept the Presidency of the Berlin Academy, and Catherine II., of Russia, the task of educating her son; but although he had incurred the hatred of the Jesuits, and the displeasure of the French government by his writings, he declined both these tempting offers, and died at Paris on the 29th of Oct., 1783. (v. *Fragments d'un mémoire de d'A. sur lui-même*, and *Supplément à ce mém. in the Œuvres posthumes de d'A.*: Paris, 1799, T. 1). In 1805, at Paris, appeared the first complete edition of his works, under the title: *Œuvr. philosoph., historiques et liter. de d'A.*, 18 vols.

Notwithstanding the high scientific reputation of d'A., the influence of *Denis Diderot* on the spirit and character of his age was far greater. He was the son of a cutler of Langres, in Champagne, and born in Oct., 1713. One of his uncles, who was a canon, promised to resign the canonicate in his favor. To fit him for the office, his father placed him, in his 9th year, in the school of Jesuits, who soon discovered the abilities of the boy, and sought by praise and flattery of every sort to win him over, with the design of sending him secretly to one of their Colleges at Paris. His father discovered the plot, and taking him thither at his own request, gave him to the Jesuits of the d'Harcourt College. Here also he soon distinguished himself; but, after the course was finished, resolved to abandon his original project, and, with the consent of his father, entered the office of an attorney-at-law. His literary inclination, however, proved too strong, and he threw himself into the mad vortex of Parisian life, relying on the pen for subsistence. His father withdrew all support, and for 10 long years he was compelled to struggle with bitter poverty. In 1744 he married an amiable, industrious, but poor girl, against the express wish of his father. At first their lot was wretched enough, but his wife made a journey to Langres, and after a stay of some months succeeded in bringing about a reconciliation with his parents. When she returned, the reward of her labors was to find her husband on familiar terms with Madame de Puisieux, who absorbed all the money he was able to earn by his romances and essays, but, proving faithless, he, some years later, during a second absence of his wife at Langres, formed a new connection with another. And yet his daughter, to whom we owe these memoirs, boasts of his morality, because he never associated with actresses, dancers, and persons of like character—a striking example of the condition of French society at that period!

Meanwhile the editing of the Enc. brought him both fame and money, and the hatred of the clergy also, on account of his free philosophical views. An article from the pen of the Abbé de Prades, attracted the attention of the government, and led to the banishment of its author and the imprisonment of D. for some months in the Bastille. Some time after an order was given to the police to search his house for papers of an obnoxious character. Of this he received a hint from the minister, Malesherbes, on the previous day, and not being able to arrange and conceal what might give offence, the minister took them

into his own charge, and D. was saved. In spite of these persecutions he was unanimously elected a member of the Academy, but the King hesitated about ratifying the choice, because of his numerous enemies. The Empress, Catherine II., however, espoused his cause, and bestowed on him many favors. To express his gratitude he made a journey to St. Petersburg in 1773, and remained there a year. The hardships of travel, and the climate of the north, impaired his health for the last 10 years of his life, and brought him to the grave on the 30th of July, 1784. (v. *Mém. pour servir à l'histoire de la vie et des ouvrages de D.*, par Madame de Vandeuil, sa fille; in the *Mém. correspondance et ouvrages inédits de D.*, Paris, 1830).

Besides d'Alembert, the most distinguished contributors to the Enc. were the *Abbé Mallet*, D. D., royal professor of theology at Paris; a great part of the theological articles were from his pen. Numerous articles in the departments of metaphysics, logic, morals, and the history of philosophy were written by the abbés, *Yoon*, *Pestrel* and *De Prades*. Diderot generally confined himself to the task of editing. Several articles on music were furnished by *J. J. Rousseau*. *Daubenton*, member of the Paris Academy, and director of the Museum, was active in the department of natural history; the celebrated *Tous-saint*, in that of jurisprudence; *Le Monnier* and *Malouin*, in physics and chemistry, and *Blondel* in architectonics. Even men like *Baron d'Argenville*, privy-counsellor of the King, and *Count d'Herouville de Claye*, supported the enterprise. The further it progressed, the greater was its success. To the supplements, which soon became necessary, the first literary men of France and Germany contributed, among whom we may name, *Marmontel*, *Condorcet*, *La Lande*, *Adamson*, *Turpin*, *Voltaire*, *Montigny*, *de Sacy*, *Bernoulli*, *Haller*, *Engel*, and *Sulzer*.

In taking a closer view of this important work, we can best learn its spirit and design from the "Discours préliminaire des Éditeurs." This aims at setting forth the universal principles which pervade and bind together all the arts and sciences, and especially the source of all our knowledge. Though projected perhaps by the help of Diderot, it owes its form and contents to d'Alembert. And here the sensationalism of Locke appears at once as the scientific basis of the entire work. D'A. expressly declares: "All our abstract knowledge may be reduced to what we receive through our senses." To him nothing is more certain than the existence of our sensations. To prove that they are the ground of all our knowledge, it is enough to show that they can be. First, through them we learn our own existence; then, the existence of our bodies, and then, of the external objects which we regard as the causes of these sensations. He pretends, indeed, that they are subjective throughout, that there is "no relation between the particular sensation and the object, which occasions it or to which we refer it, and hence that it appears impossible to prove in a scientific way a transition from the one to the other." In the meantime he helps himself out of this difficulty by asserting, that a kind of *instinct*, more certain than reason itself, compels us to leap the broad

chasm. He leaves it to metaphysicians to determine by what means our soul takes the first step beyond itself.—He deals in the same easy manner with the principles of ethics. The idea of injustice, of good and evil, indeed of all moral ideas, are said "to arise from the oppression, which by nature the stronger practises upon the weaker, and the latter bears the more reluctantly, the more violent it is, because he feels that there is no reason why he should submit to it; the evils which befall us through the vices of our fellow-men, lead to the indirect knowledge of antagonistic virtues." Finally, it is these ideas of right and wrong, and hence the moral nature of our actions, by which we are prompted to inquire "what the active principle, or willing substance, in us is." Since it cannot be the body, because the properties which we observe in matter have nothing in common with the power of willing and thinking, it is evident that the substance which we call *Ego* consists of two principles of a diverse nature, both so joined, that a correspondence, which we can neither abolish nor change, rules between the motions of the one and the affections of the other, and keeps them both in a state of mutual dependence. "This bondage in which without our own concurrence we find ourselves, together with the reflections we are forced to make upon the nature of the two principles and their imperfection, raises us to the conception of an Almighty Intelligence, which has made us what we are, and hence demands our reverence. The existence of such an Intelligence requires only our internal perception, in order to be acknowledged; and it is clear, accordingly, that the purely intellectual ideas of vice and virtue, the principle and necessity of law, the immateriality of the soul, the existence of God, as well as our duties toward him,—in short, all the truths of which we stand in most need, are the fruit of the first mental reflections to which our sensations prompt us."

From this brief review, we see how weak the grounds are upon which d'A. declares sensualism to be the only true and tenable philosophy. And yet it is this very *Discours préliminaire*, which, more than all the writings of Locke, Condillac, Helvetius, De la Mettrie, and Holbach, has made that philosophy so popular in all departments of French culture. The Enc., however, ought not to be accused, as is often done, of directly favoring materialism and atheism. On the contrary, the *Discours préliminaire* makes room even for the necessity of a divine revelation. After d'A. has shown how, in the same sensualistic way,—from the effort to maintain our bodies, to protect them from the ills which threaten them, and to cure them of those into which they have fallen—all the necessary arts—agriculture, medicine, the natural sciences, mathematics, &c.—have originated; after he has remarked how, of all the knowledge we have acquired, the idea of our own existence, which leads us to the idea of an Almighty Being, and the axioms of mathematics are alone fully certain; but that between that idea and these axioms a vast space intervenes, where the Highest Intelligence seems to mock at man's desire after knowledge, now shrouding it in thick clouds, and now illuminating it with stray

beams of light, so that human nature, whose only torch is reason, remains an impenetrable mystery to itself,—he concludes: “Nothing, therefore, is more necessary than a revealed religion, which instructs us concerning so many things. Designed for the completion of our natural knowledge, it shows us a portion of what was concealed from us; but confines itself to that which is most needful, whilst all the rest remains forever hidden. A few points of faith, and a small number of practical precepts, is all to which the revealed religion refers; yet, thanks to the light which it communicates to the world! since then the people are more firm and decided concerning a great number of interesting questions, than the philosophers of any school ever were.”

This declaration has been thought ironical; but it certainly is not so, for the complexion of the whole work corresponds with it in substance. All the articles on religious and theological topics are anything but polemical; instead of being tainted with skepticism, they everywhere defend religion against atheism, orthodox Christianity against deism and rationalism, the Church against the sect-system, and are generally written in a thoroughly Catholic spirit. Thus, the article *Dieu* (c. Art. *Réligion*) in a long extract from Clarke sums up the proofs for the existence of God, and endeavors to refute the objections of Bayle against the proof from the agreement of all nations. Then comes the article *Providence*, which, with some ingenuity, if not thoroughness, repels the various attacks upon the divine government of the world. Besides, the existence of God, that of angels and the devil is also expressly acknowledged (s. Art. *Ange*, *Diable*). In the article *Deïstes* it is granted, indeed, that natural religion is very good in itself, but stated at the same time, that it is not sufficient to teach man how to worship God,—just as little as the natural law is able to lead him to happiness. The article *Christianisme* declares, emphatically, that Christianity is the only true revealed religion; that the titles of its divinity are contained in the books of the O. and N. T.: the severest criticism must acknowledge their genuineness, the proudest reason must respect the truth of the facts which they report, and a sound philosophy, supported by that genuineness and this truth, must conclude from the one and the other, that they are inspired: the hand of God is visibly imprinted on the style of the sacred writers, &c. The articles, *Bible*, *Prophétie*, *Révélation*, *Testament*, run in the same channel, inasmuch as they defend the prophecies of the O. and N. T., bring together the criteria of a true revelation, and adduce proofs for the authenticity of the Biblical writings; and the article *Trinité* strives to uphold that fundamental dogma of Christianity against the attacks of the heathen, the Jews, the Socinians, and the deists and atheists of modern times.

A special article, “*Système du philosophe Chrétien*”—a reprint of a rare little work of the Abbé de Gamaches (1646)—even gives the outlines of a kind of philosophy of religion, which by reflections on the physical and intellectual nature of man seeks to confirm the truth of revelation.

In regard to the government and constitution of the Church a certain freedom of opinion appears. The article *Jésuites*, for example, is a scorching philippic, and enumerates in long succession the scandalous deeds and doctrines of the Society and its members; and the article *Pape* gives a historical sketch of the Papacy, in no wise pervaded by an ultramontane spirit, although it openly favors the episcopal system, or the supreme authority of councils, and the so-called liberties of the Gallican Church. On the other hand, in all articles touching Protestantism and the Reformation, every innovation in doctrine and practice is strongly condemned, and these attacks are characterized by a disregard for truth, by a distortion—or if you will—an ignorance of facts. (See Art. *Calvinisme* and *Luthéranisme*).

If now it be asked, whence the injurious influence exerted upon religion and morals by this celebrated work springs, the source of it does not lie, as is generally thought, in open hostility or irreligion, but rather in the mode in which religion and Christianity, justice and morals, are defended. This defence falls back everywhere upon a eudæmonism, so gross and unconcealed that we may say, it bases religion, right and morality, upon the principle of all immorality. Thus, in the article *Christianisme*, Christianity is regarded as a new divinely inspired promulgation of the law, and the difference between Christ and other lawgivers is made to consist in this, that, although these likewise had the useful in view, and hence based their laws upon religion, they committed the mistake of wishing the useful without the truth, whilst the lawgiver of the Christians began by sweeping away prevailing errors in order to make his religion more useful. “Though he set forth, as its first object, the happiness of another life, he also meant it to render us happy in this world.” Hence he restored the natural law, which human passions had obscured, to its original glory, revealed a higher morality than was ever before known, etc. In other passages morality is put before faith, “because he who does good and makes himself useful to the world is in a better condition through morality without faith, than through faith without morality.” (Art. *Morale*, comp. Art. *Foi*). So, also, theism is to be preferred to atheism, because “it is more advantageous” for nations, princes, and individuals “to admit the existence of God than to reject it.” (Art. *Théisme*). On the same ground it is asserted, that faith and reason durst not be separated, since faith rests upon reason, and reason—which, in fact, alone assures us of the truthfulness of God and of his revelation—must lead to faith. For if reason has nothing at all to do in matters of religion, there must proceed from faith all those superstitious fancies and opinions, which play such a melancholy part in the history of religion; but superstition, put into practice, is nothing else than fanaticism, and this is more pernicious to human society than atheism itself. (Art. *Foi*, *Raison*, *Théologie*; comp. Art. *Superstition*). Monastic life, or the existence of too large a number of monasteries, is condemned, only because the land is thus robbed of its population, to the in-

jury of a nation's power and prosperity (Art. *Monastère*); of the true philosopher, who is gifted with all virtues and held up as a perfect model, it is expressly said, that it does not belong to his nature to be content with a bare sufficiency, but unlike "a Cynic or a Stoic, he endeavors, whilst making himself useful to mankind, to enjoy life and its richest pleasures." (Art. *Philosophe*).

From these remarks it is plain, that great stress is laid upon the value of reason even in matters of religion, and faith is placed below reason and morality. It is said, in so many words, that faith durst not contradict the clear perceptions and evident axioms of reason, that revelation has value only, where reason and our natural powers fail to give us a clear insight or enable us to decide concerning the true and the false (Art. *Raison*). Passages also are not wanting, in which natural religion (so-called) is placed on the same level with the revealed; indeed, in the art. *R. naturelle*, the knowledge of God is so far extended, that revelation seems to be unnecessary. But yet such passages are rare and very few in number; and hence it is chiefly the prevailing sensualistic and realistic view of the world, and the fierce hostility against all and every kind of idealism, which rendered the work an ally of the irreligion, unchurchliness, and so-called illumination of the 18th century. As surely as Christianity is pervaded by the highest and noblest moral, as well as metaphysical, idealism, so surely is every attack upon idealism, at the same time, an attack upon Christianity itself. Indirect polemics are much more dangerous than the keenest direct assaults. The low, sensualistic realism of our work appears not only in the view of the origin and nature of science, contained in the *Discours préliminaire*, but still more in the superficiality of nearly all the articles that treat of the higher interests of the Spirit. This is particularly evident in its conception of the nature and end of art, that last and strongest bulwark of idealism. At the head of the article *Art*, we read: "Man is only the servant and interpreter of nature; he understands and achieves only so far as he gains a knowledge of the things around him, by experience or reflection." Accordingly the end of all art is "to give certain fixed forms to matter, or a function of the soul, or a product of nature." The difference between the liberal (fine) and the other (mechanic) arts is said, (Art. *Arts libéraux*) to arise from the difference between pleasure and want. "The liberal arts flourish, when society, satisfied as to its pressing wants, begins to employ itself in seeking pleasure; then the delight, once felt, becomes itself a necessity and enjoyment is the reward of life." Not the slightest reference is made to the relation between art and religion. The same shallow, worldly spirit is seen in the choice and extent of particular articles. Whilst *Béatitude*, *Confession*, *Déisme*, *Dogme* and *Dogmatique*, *Immortalité*, *Liberté*, *Metaphysique*, *Mystère* and *Mystique*, *Protestant*, *Symbole*, et al., consist of mere definitions of names and brief historical sketches, everything relating to the theatre, dancing, objects of luxury and pleasure, trade and manufactures, and the like, are discussed

with a fulness and thoroughness worthy of a better cause; and whilst we look in vain for an article on *pantheism*, we find in its stead a long dissertation on the *pantomime*. On every occasion classical antiquity, its art and its science, its literature and its civilization are loaded with the highest praise, whilst in the middle ages, before the so-called *renaissance des Lettres*, "the very principles of the arts and sciences were lost," the true and beautiful were neglected, poetry "had dwindled to a mere childish mechanism," the philosophy of the ancients "was displaced by a barbarous tradition," all Europe had sunk into a condition of slavery, and superstition, the mother of ignorance, reigned over all. (Art. *Sciences*, comp. *Discours prélim.*).

Enough—a closer examination of this famous Enc. furnishes a new proof, that it was not the attacks of philosophy, nor the pantheism of Spinoza, nor the skepticism of Bayle, nor the sensualism of Locke, Condillac, et al., not even the spirited polemics of Diderot beyond its pages (in the work itself he prudently concealed his real views), nor the biting wit and scorn of Voltaire, which brought about the decay of morals, the contempt of religion and the Church, the prostitution of art and science to purposes of sensual pleasure and material interests, by which the so-called *philosophic* century is distinguished; but rather the universal spirit of worldliness that had infected the highest circles of society. As sure as Christianity is not founded on philosophical ideas and metaphysical speculations, so sure is it that it has nothing to dread from philosophy, as long as conscience and religious feeling maintain their rightful supremacy in the human heart.

II. ULRICH. — *Porter*.

Endor, the witch of.—The town of Endor belonged (Josh. 17 : 11) to the tribe of Manasseh, but actually lay in the bounds of Issachar, and was, according to Eusebius, a large place in his day, near to Nain, and Scythopolis, about 24 miles S. of Tabor (see Ps. 83 : 10; Judges 4 : 6, 14, &c.; 1 Sam. 28 : 29 : 1). It was still known to the crusaders, and later travellers have discovered its locality. (*Robinson*, II., 356, 360; *Reland*, *Palest.*, 490, 762; *Ritter's Erdk.* XV., 1, p. 406).—Saul visited this place, shortly before his tragical death, full of gloomy forebodings, and on the eve of his last fatal battle with the Philistines, in order to ascertain from a necromancer, (the usual means of learning the future having failed him) what fate awaited him. In his better days he had banished those unlawful and idolatrous arts from the country (Ex. 22 : 18; Lev. 19 : 31; 20 : 6, &c.); but in his last extremity, having been told of this woman at Endor, renowned for her necromancy, he disguised himself, and went to her. But she no sooner saw Samuel's spirit, than she cried out, alarmed at his threatening mien, and at once detected Saul by his questions. The spirit, whom, however, he did not see, told Saul of his approaching end, as the punishment of his sins. Terrified he fell to the ground, and was raised with great difficulty by the woman and his own attendants. That same night he started on his way to meet his overhanging fate.—Some critics have assumed that the appearance was a fraud, practised by the cunning woman by means of ventriloquism, or some such art.

But the narrative shows, on the one hand, that the Israelites believed in the possibility of necromancy (cf. also Is. 8 : 19; 29 : 4; 2 Kings 21 : 10); on the other that to resort to it was most obnoxious to the O. T. religion. (See *Ewald*, *Gesch. Isr.* II., 1, p. 499. *Winer's Lex.*)

RÜETSCH.*

Engedi ('Eyyaddi, 'Eyyadu, &c.), the goat's fountain, the name of a fountain and town frequently mentioned in the Bible. Its more ancient name was Hazazon-tamar (2 Chron. 20 : 2) i. e. *amputatio palmarum*, probably from the custom of an artificial fructification of the date palms by cutting off the pistil (see *RITTER*, *Erdk.* XIV., 768, &c.). It lay near the centre of the W. shore of the Dead Sea, and was the most southern Israelitish town on that sea (cf. *Ezek.* 47 : 10). The country around is hilly, with steep, abrupt cliffs, rendering the approach to it from the desert of Judah difficult. It abounds in caves (1 Sam. 24 : 1, &c.), and is very fertile. Anciently it was well cultivated, and was noted for its vineyards, balm and palm-trees (Cant. 1 : 14; Ecclesiastic 24 : 18; Jos. *Ant.*, 9, 1, 2; *PLIN. H. N.*, 5, 15, [17]). The Amorites, primitively, dwelt there (Gen. 14 : 7, unless a much more southern town is meant. See *ROBINSON*, I., 500-6). David found shelter in its caves (1 Sam. 24, &c.); and there the Moabites and Ammonites perished (2 Chron. 20). The town belonged to the tribe of Judah (Josh. 15 : 62), and according to Jos. *B. J.*, 3, 3, 5, was one of the 11 toparchies of Judea, and (*ibid.* 4, 7, 2) was plundered during a passover feast by the Sicarii of Masada. Jerome still mentions it as a *vicus prægrandis*. This is the latest reference to it. The time of its overthrow is unknown. The monks of the middle ages sought the locality in entirely wrong places — near Bethlehem, at the southern or northern end of the Dead Sea — from a misapprehension of *Jerome* and *Euseb.* (*Onom.*) *Seetzen* was the first who saw the locality from the opposite shore of the sea, near the mouth of the Arnon; *Robinson*, the first modern traveller who visited and identified it. The fountain was still running, and around it lay remains of ancient buildings. The chief part of the town was some distance below the fountain. — (See *RELAND*, *Palest.*; *RITTER*, *Erdk.* XV., 1, p. 585. *LYNCH's Expedition*, &c.).

RÜETSCH.*

England, the Reformation in, sprang from two fundamentally distinct sources: the influence of the revival of religion in Germany upon the people, and the arbitrariness of a King enraged at Rome. The basis of union between these two factors was a common hatred of the Pope. But the separation from Rome led, of itself, to an approximation towards those favorable to a reform, and these, again, could hope to attain their end only under the wise guidance of the royal will. This explains both the peculiarity and development of the English Reformation. It was a compromise, and was impressed at each progressive step with the character of the reigning Prince. — The strong government of Henry VII. rose out of the civil wars with fresh energy and power. Henry VIII. (born June 28, 1491) succeeded his father on April 22, 1509. As the younger son he was

destined for the Church, and did not lose his literary tastes when his brother's death made him heir to the throne. He was the favorite of the people. They hated Henry VII. for his avarice. The son was prodigal and fond of splendor. All the glory of royalty was displayed; the knighthood revived, the court became a stage. — At first Henry retained the prudent counsellors of his father — *Warham*, *Fox*, and *Howard* (see Articles). But these were speedily cast into the shade by a man whom *Fox* introduced into the cabinet as an offset to *Howard's* growing influence. *Wolsey* soon superseded his patron and his patron's opponents. None knew better than *Wolsey* how to manage the will of the King. He studied Henry's humors, flattered his learning, and whilst feigning acquiescence did as he pleased. *Wolsey* soon persuaded Henry to transfer to his servants the onerous cares of government. Thenceforth the ambitious counsellor rapidly rose in power. As early as 1516 he stood at the head of Church and State, being at once Archb. of York, Cardinal Legate, and Lord Chancellor. He was a second King. More successful than *Becket*, he made the spiritual equal to the temporal power, and even superior to the throne. With its elevation it also acquired greater compactness in its several parts. The highest offices of State were held by ecclesiastics. In the Upper House 21 bishops and 26 mitred abbots sat beside a smaller number of temporal lords. The common people were led by a host of mendicant monks. Among the 4 millions of people 16,000 priests were distributed. But the chief props of Church power were the cloisters — 1000 in number, with 50,000 monks and nuns. They held more real estate than the nobility, their annual revenues reached £300,000, and enabled them to wield an immense patronage. But in their religious and moral character they had greatly degenerated.

Upon this spreading darkness, however, light broke in from two points; from the declining star of Lollardism, and from the rising star of Humanism. Lollardism, once so powerful, had long been banished from the upper classes, and the colleges, although Wickliffites were yet found in Oxford under Edward IV. But it was still cherished by the common people. The secret circulation of its tenets was facilitated by the press. The severe measures enforced against its followers failed to convince, and only exasperated them against the degenerate Church. — As Lollardism was the salt of the lower classes, so Humanism was a means of spreading light among the more educated classes. It was introduced into England in the early part of the 15th cent. As the colleges had sadly declined, and offered nothing but tedious lectures upon canon law and the sentences, those thirsting after knowledge repaired to Italy, where the sciences were reviving, and brought back rich treasures of learning and books. Among those educated in Italy were *Fleming*, *Grey*, *Tiptoft*, and *Selling*. Of this number also were *William Grocyn* († 1519), who taught Greek in Oxford, and studied not only Aristotle, but the Greek Testament, and *John Colet* († 1519) the English Erasmus, who founded (1512) the St. Paul's school, for the free education of 152 youth, of which the

celebrated philologist, *Wm. Lily* († 1523), was the principal teacher. Many other schools were soon established upon the model of Colet's. A number of the more prominent clergy favored this movement—as Wolsey, Chadworth, Langton, Fisher, Fox, who, besides some free schools, founded *Corpus Christi* College at Oxford, with three professorates, for Greek, Latin, and Theology. Among these humanists *Thomas More* deserves to be specially named. *Erasmus* became associated with these men. Thus, under Henry VIII., a golden age for literature seemed about to dawn. The humanists, "the Greeks," assailed the immoralities and ignorance of the clergy and the superstitions of the people with the weapons of learning and irony. "The Trojans" had poor means of defence against such skilful foes.

Thus the way was open for a reformation of the Church. Bishop Fox desired one (Letter to Wolsey, Jan. 2, 1517), and had many influential men, besides the urgent wishes of the people, with him. But a champion was wanting to gather the forces of the reform movement, and cast down the gauntlet before the powerful hierarchy. A German monk ventured forth. The tidings filled the friends of reform in England with joy and courage. The writings of the continental Reformers spread rapidly in England. A papal bull, early in 1521, complained of this, and demanded their extermination. Wolsey issued (April, 1521) orders accordingly, and had a list of 42 heresies, found in those writings, nailed to the church-doors. The Lollards, and others of like mind, hailed the German Reformers as brethren and confederates. But the Humanists, who had really built the bridge over which the continental reform had passed into England, now opposed its progress. In this they followed *Erasmus*. Unsparingly as they chastised particular abuses, they earnestly defended the Church itself; for they derived the means of pursuing their studies from the Church's benefices, and under it they could more freely indulge their religious or irreligious views. As the champion of this Humanist counter movement Henry himself stepped forth in his "*Assertio septem sacram.*," directed against Luther. Leo was so delighted by the King's zeal, and the assurance that Henry would defend the Church with the sword as well as the pen, that he conferred on him (Oct., 1521) the title: *Defensor fidei*—a title found in a charter of Richard II. for the University of Oxford.—Henry's determination to root out the new heresy appears from a decree of Oct. 21, 1521, enjoining it upon all the civil authorities to aid in the detection and punishment of its friends. The Humanists, headed by *Thos. More*, forgot their zeal for illumination and tolerance, and turned all their learning and wit against the Reformation. Its friends had to choose between prison and flight, recantation and the stake. The next twelve years were years of blood. But the work advanced. Even the places where exiles found refuge became workshops for the issue of the most important reformatory writings sent into England. This was especially the case in Antwerp. And respectable citizens were found in London, as *Humphrey Monmouth*, *John Petit*,

who received and circulated such works, the chief of which was *Tindal's* version of the N. T. with notes. Among those most active in its circulation were *R. Necton* and *Thomas Garret*, a London clergyman. *B. Longland*, the cruel persecutor of the Lollards, vainly resisted: *B. Tonstal*, of London, in vain bought up and burned (1528) all the copies of *Tindal's* version he could obtain; *More* showed in vain that *Tindal's* version was full of errors. Its superiority over all previous translations was too well known. Other works of *Tindal*: "*Of the Wicked Mammon*;" "*On the Sermon on the Mount*," &c., and *John Frith's* "*Mirror*," &c.; "*Treatise on the Sacrament*;" "*Book of Purgatory*," were widely scattered. But scarcely any was more read than "*The Supplication of the Beggars*," by *Simon Fish*, a fugitive Kentish lawyer, issued about 1527. It exposed, with biting sarcasm, the state of the Church, from a social-political point of view, and especially the vicious influence of monasticism. *More's* reply: "*The Supplication of Souls*," only laid bare the weakness of his cause. Henry, who received a copy of *Fish's* book from *Anne Bolen*, regarded it with favor, and protected *Fish* against persecution.

Thus the seed of evangelical truth secretly grew in spite of foes and flames. It is remarkable that its ablest advocates were found in Wolsey's Cardinal's College in Oxford. In 1526 *Garret* distributed some of *Tindal's* Testament among its students, and in 1527 a society, those friendly to Luther's views was formed there. *Frith*, whom Wolsey had called thither as a professor, was of the number. He was cast into a damp prison where many died. But he escaped and became a co-worker with *Tindal*. For his refutation of *More's* Defence of Purgatory, and his book against transubstantiation, he died at the stake in 1533.—The Reformation took still stronger hold upon Cambridge, where *Stafford* (1524–27) lectured upon the Bible instead of the sentences, and *Thos. Bilney*, *Barnes*, *Hugh Latimer*, *Bradford*, *Allen*, *Coverdale*, *Lambert*, and others, devoted themselves to the study of the Word of God.—Whilst, therefore, the old Humanists adhered to the old religion, a new race of classical scholars arose, who, by their writings and preaching, ably advocated the evangelical movements. But as long as the King, the chief civil officers, and the Bishops remained hostile to the Reformation there was no hope of its success. At this juncture an event occurred, which, though seemingly insignificant, estranged Henry from Rome, and led him to favor the Reformation.—The King desired his marriage with his brother's widow, for which a special papal dispensation had been granted (Dec. 26, 1503), to be annulled. Of their three sons and two daughters, only Mary survived. Catherine, moreover, had ceased childbearing, and was growing more and more infirm. With this Henry's old doubts about the lawfulness of their union revived. From *Thomas Aquinas* he learned that the Pope could not dispense from a divine injunction. His perplexity was increased by the question raised as to the legitimacy of Mary, whose marriage with Charles V., and then with Francis I., had been proposed. Negotiations were opened for Henry's union with the Duchess

Alençon, then with Renate; but they failed. Thereupon *Anne Bolen*, who had just returned from Paris, and drew all eyes upon her by her charms, appeared at court. Henry's strongest passions were inflamed, and when Anne resisted all unlawful advances, he became more determined to obtain a divorce from Catharine. The most distinguished Bishops and jurists were consulted. All but More and Fisher yielded to Henry's wishes. Wolsey wavered for a while, but finally pressed the King's request at Rome (Dec., 1527). Clement VII. was sorely perplexed. By annulling the bull of Julius II. he would enrage the Emperor, by refusing he would offend Henry; whereas he needed the help of both against Francis. At length he yielded to the persuasions of Wolsey, trusting to the prudence of Wolsey for the longest delay in the execution of the decree of divorce. Catharine was not summoned before the Legates entrusted with the case until June, 1529. Campeggio deferred a final decision. He knew that negotiations for peace were pending between the Emperor and the Pope, and actually held a letter from Clement (of July 19) recalling him from England, when tidings of the peace of Cambray (Aug. 5) reached him. Further proceedings in reference to the divorce were transferred to Rome, and Campeggio left London in Sept., 1529. — Then came Wolsey's fall. His numerous foes urged him with the failure of the divorce scheme. On Oct. 17, 1529, the King transferred the Great Seal from him to More, and he was dismissed from the court. His enemies even sought to press the *præmunire* against him. Although the act did not apply to his case, Wolsey hoped to gain something by meek confessions. The Parliament was convoked, Nov. 3, 1529, the first time for seven years, and numerous charges were brought against him. The Upper House at once sustained them, but through the influence of Cromwell, Wolsey's secretary, the Lower House rejected them. The fall of this mighty Prelate brought relief to the people. Men favorable to reforms in Church and State, became the King's councillors, such as the Duke of Suffolk, Sir Thomas Bolen, Cromwell, and Cranmer, who advised Henry to refer the question of divorce to the judgment of theologians. The opinion of Universities and distinguished scholars, at home and abroad, was accordingly sought. By menaces and bribes an approving sentence was obtained from Oxford; the Sorbonne reluctantly yielded to the King. But the French Bishops and Italian Universities at once approved. Among the Reformers Zwingli, Ecclampadius, and Andrew Osiander favored the divorce, Luther and Melancthon disapproved of it. These opinions were laid before the Parliament in Jan., 1531, and published; in July Catharine left the court forever. — Simultaneously with the above movement, the King used measures to make the clergy of the realm more dependent upon the throne. As most of them had acknowledged Wolsey's primacy they were also threatened with the *præmunire*. Seeing the sword overhead, they resolved, in the Convocation of Jan. 24, 1531, to purchase exemption with £100,000. But Henry demanded (Feb. 7) a recognition of himself as head of the

Church. They hesitated, but finally added to the preface of the subsidy bill: "We acknowledge his Majesty as the chief protector of the English Church, and its only and supreme Lord and Head, so far as the law of Christ allows this." By this act of submission, which was signed by 9 bishops and 62 abbots and priors of the Upper, and by 64 members of the Lower House, the clergy of the diocese of Canterbury were released from the *præmunire*. The Convocation of York followed this example, May 4. The next year the Convocation was deprived of the right of making ecclesiastical laws without the King's approval, and a change was proposed in the laws limiting the royal prerogatives. — Henry now stood at the head of his pliant clergy: the Parliament zealously seconded his plans: Sir Thomas Audley was made Chancellor (May 16, 1532), and Cranmer, Archb. of Canterbury (Aug. 23, 1532), both friends of the Reformation; he was on good terms with Francis I., and in union with the German Protestants. Whilst, therefore, Clement VII. was preparing a bull of excommunication (Nov. 15, and then Dec. 23, 1532), in case Henry refused to relinquish Anne Bolen, he secretly married her (Nov. 14, 1532; others say Jan. 25, 1533). The next step was to substitute another tribunal for the papal. This was done in Feb., 1533, by the statute (24 Henry VIII., c. 12), which made all appeals to Rome liable to the *præmunire*, and gave the episcopal courts jurisdiction over all the ecclesiastical affairs of the realm, with the right of ultimate appeal to the King, or if he were a party in the case, to the Upper House of the Convocation. Thereupon the matter of the divorce was brought before both Houses, and decided in the King's favor. But he had previously (Apr. 12, 1533) been publicly married to Anne. In May Catharine was summoned, and for refusing to appear, was condemned for contumacy, May 23. Her marriage was declared null, Henry's marriage with Anne Bolen confirmed, and Anne crowned on June 1. As soon as this was known in Rome the Pope annulled the divorce and the new marriage, and threatened the ban; but fearing to offend Francis I., he agreed to open negotiations, when *Bonner* appeared before him (Nov.) and appealed to a general council. Nevertheless, pressed by the Emperor and his own cardinals, Clement signed the ban (March 23, 1534). In England this event had been anticipated by a statute extending the King's powers (25 Henry VIII., c. 19; March 30, 1534), in the preface of which the Pope's supremacy is questioned, all the acts and decisions of the Convocation are made dependent upon the permission of the King, appeals referred to a royal court of delegates, the choice of bishops vested in the King, all tithes to Rome prohibited, the right of dispensation transferred to the Archbishop, and a visitation of the monasteries ordered. At the same time the royal succession was fixed, Mary declared illegitimate, and all assaults upon the new marriage, high treason. The oath of succession had to be taken by all the members of Parliament before its adjournment. The Convocation also signed a declaration (March 31, 1534) that the Roman bishop enjoyed no higher divine authority over England than any

other foreign prelate. The province of York, the universities, and many monasteries, also assented to this. The bishops speedily took the oath of succession from their clergy, and urged obedience to the King. Henry answered the ban of the Pope by abolishing the supremacy of the latter in the realm. On Nov. 3, the Parliament passed the act of the King's supremacy (Stat. III., 492), by which act a *Catholic National Church, under the royal supremacy, and independent of Rome, was established*. Henry desired no more. But in order to justify this rupture with Rome, and otherwise bring the people over to the new order, it was necessary for the King and his friends to fall back upon the authority of the Holy Scriptures, and to abolish the monasteries and mendicant orders, which were the bulwark of Popery in the land. This led the King to favor the friends of Evangelical truth. The violent denunciations of some of the monastic orders rendered severe measures necessary. During the winter of 1535-6 a visitation of the monasteries brought facts to light, touching their moral degradation and immense wealth, which led Parliament, Feb., 1536, to abolish 376 smaller ones, and transfer all their rights, possessions, and revenues to the crown, their treasures amounting to £100,000, and their annual revenues, £30,000, were committed to the management of a special commission. The priors of these monasteries received a dowry; the rest received little or no help. Many nuns were thrown out on the highways; many monks had to beg their bread. A diocesan visitation was likewise ordered, so that the clergy might also be instructed in the new measures, and the refractory punished. At the same time Henry sought favorable foreign alliances against Rome. In 1535 Fox, Heath, and Dr. Barnes were sent to the Smalcald Convention of Protestant princes, to close with them a league of mutual defence. They required Henry to adopt the Augsburg Confession, and to pledge money for the war, promising in turn to acknowledge him as Protector, and not to aid his foes. But Gardner managed to contravene the league. Further negotiations, to prosecute which Melancthon, Bucer, and Draco were to have gone to England, failed in consequence of Queen Anne's death, May 19, 1536. Catharine had died on Jan. 8 preceding. The tyrant Henry married Jane Seymour the day after Anne's execution. Both queens being now out of the way, Paul III., who, upon hearing of the execution of Fisher and More, and the dissolution of the monasteries, had prepared a violent bull of condemnation, hoped anew that the controversy might be settled. But his legate in England was soon convinced that the schism was incurable. The new queen also was favorable to the Reformation. The new Parliament was more pliant than the old, and declared both Mary and Elizabeth illegitimate, and yielded everything to Henry. The Convocation opened June 16, 1536, by Cromwell, the vicar-general, *laid the basis of a Confession of Faith*, by adopting the ten articles prepared by Cranmer and other theologians. These acknowledge: 1) the S.S., with the three old creeds as the ground of faith; 2-4) three

sacraments, Baptism, Penance, and the Lord's Supper under both forms, retaining transubstantiation; 5) justification as the gift of God's grace in Christ, and appropriated by contrition, faith, and active love; 6) pictures as helps to devotion, but not as objects of worship; 7-8) the saints as examples and intercessors; 9) the utility of Church usages; 10) that prayers and masses for the dead were allowable, but not papal indulgences. These articles were approved by 18 bishops, and 40 abbots and priors, and 50 members of the Lower House. By the King's orders they were published, the clergy were directed to preach upon the royal supremacy and upon the doctrines of the articles, saints' days were abolished, and a Latin and English Confession (Coverdale's, 1535) were to be placed in every church. This first Confession, however unsatisfactory, was the best that could be done at the time. The leaders of the Reformation did not wish to tear down the old Church, but correct its abuses. To this conservative party belonged, besides Cranmer and Cromwell, Bishops Latimer of Worcester (1535-9), Edw. Fox of Hereford (1535-8), Goodrich of Ely (1533-54), Shaxton of Sarum (1535-9), Barlow of St. David's (1535-54), Hilsey of Rochester (1539). The extreme Romish party was headed by Thomas Howard, Duke of Norfolk, and Stephen Gardiner, B. of Winchester, and included Stokesley of London, Lee, Archb. of York, with his three provincials, Longland (the King's confessor), Tonstal, and Kite. York was still the stronghold of Romanism; there popular ignorance, and clerical and monkish fanaticism most abounded; there the enforcement of the new measures caused the greatest commotion. In Lincolnshire a host of 20,000 men, led by two priests, rose in rebellion; but the prudence of the Duke of Suffolk soon suppressed it. Many of these rebels, however, joined another more alarming movement in Yorkshire, mustering 40,000 men, and favored by James V. of Scotland. Negotiations were opened with them. An amnesty and a parliament at York were promised; but the pledge was broken. The insurgents marched forth anew, but were soon put down, and the leaders, with 70 others, were executed. A general amnesty (July, 1537) then restored peace. The first result of these insurrections was the dissolving of the larger monasteries, as the chief sources of the recent troubles. Visitations were instituted. The officers, conscious of guilt, and fearing exposure and punishment, at once yielded upon being promised an annual stipend. One after another these seats of Romanism fell, and their relics and images were brought forth and burned. Even Becket's bones were not spared. The ban long withheld was now sealed against the heretical, adulterous, murderous, traitor; and the Emperor and Francis I. were commanded to wage a crusade against him. Henry parried the blow by warlike preparations and artful diplomacy, and went on dissolving the cloisters. The Parliament sanctioned his measures by a special act, and authorized further proceedings. The remaining monasteries were accordingly dissolved, and thus £160,000 added annually to

the state treasury. The monks and nuns, with thousands who had been employed at the monasteries, suffered greatly. This may have been unavoidable; but there is no justification for the reckless squandering of the wealth thus obtained, instead of using it, as Cranmer wished, for the establishment of free theological seminaries, many additional bishoprics and hospitals. But only six new sees were founded: Bristol, Oxford, Gloucester, Peterborough, Chester, and Westminster (the last soon again dissolved), with two university colleges, and a few schools. For the King desired reform only so far as it filled his coffers, and confirmed his supremacy. Things now took an unfavorable turn; *Jane Seymour* died (Oct. 24, 1537) after giving birth to a male heir to the throne. The King grew more morose and arbitrary than ever, and more accessible to the insinuations of the Romish party. Norfolk's influence increased; Gardiner had returned from a foreign mission, and found a new coadjutor in *Bonner* (B. of Hereford from 1538-40, and of London. 1540-9). The acts of the same Parliament which dissolved the cloisters, show the growing power of the friends of Rome. The want of a definite system of doctrine became ever more apparent. Lambert was executed at the stake (Nov., 1538), for holding Zwinglian sacramental views. The Parliament had never sanctioned the 10 articles of the Convocation. A commission of theologians, with Cranmer at their head, revised them, and in Dec., 1537, submitted "*The godly and pious institution of a Christian Man*," or "*The Bishops' Book*" to the King's approval. Henry made various changes, but gave no orders for its introduction. Cranmer now hoped to effect more by the help of the German Reformers. Henry thought much of Melancthon, and often invited him to England. M. could not comply, but in the spring of 1538 Burckhardt, Boyneburg, and Myconius were sent to England. Gardiner, however, frustrated the scheme. After discussing a few points the Germans returned, and the Parliament undertook the framing of articles. After violent debates the "six bloody articles" were adopted (June 28, 1539). They maintained, 1) transubstantiation, 2) the communion in one kind, 3) sacerdotal celibacy, 4) the perpetuity of vows of chastity, 5) masses for the dead, and 6) auricular confession. The penalty of denying the first, and of delay on the part of priests to dissolve marriages contracted, was death. The doctrines were enforced with unheard of cruelty. In a short time 500 persons were imprisoned. Cranmer and Cromwell strove to moderate the cruelties. Whilst Cromwell was at the helm, there were no executions. But his attempts to counteract the Papists, by inducing the uxorious King to marry Anne of Cleves, wrought his downfall. Henry was seized with such aversion towards Anne at his first sight of her, that though he consented to the marriage (Jan., 1540), he soon effected a divorce (July 10, 1540). The King's anger vented itself upon Cromwell. He was beheaded, July 28, 1540. His fall was a severe blow to the Evangelical cause. Cranmer could not, single-handed, stay the encroachments of the Romish party.

The rest of Henry's reign exhibits a wretched wavering between progress and retrogression, according to the King's humor, and party predominance. At first the Papists triumphed. Even before Anne's death Henry was captivated by *Catharine Howard*, niece of the Duke of Norfolk. He married her on Aug. 8, 1540. On Feb. 12, 1542, she was beheaded, ostensibly for her previously immoral life. In Henry's sixth wife, *Catharine Parr* (July 7, 1543), the Protestants found a true and prudent friend. The progress of the Reformation during this period may be briefly stated. Whilst Cromwell still lived two commissions were instituted (1540) for the establishment of a system of faith, and order of worship. "*The godly and pious institution of a Christian Man*," after being revised with Henry's assistance, was published, 1543, under the title: "*A necessary doctrine and erudition for any Christian Man*," also called "*The King's Book*." In many particulars the influence of the Romish party is seen. In Art. 1 an attempt is made to harmonize justification by faith with the efficacy of good works. Art. 2 treats of the Romish C. as including all believers, whatever their diversity in regard to externals. Art. 3 recognizes the 7 sacraments. Art. 4, of the decalogue, admits the utility of pictures. Arts. 5 and 6 retain the Lord's Prayer, and Ave Maria in the vernacular; 7 acknowledges free will; 8 and 9, on justification and good works, hold up rather the example than the merits of Christ, sanctification than justification, and admit the meritoriousness of good works, but not such as are merely outward; 10 approves of prayers for the dead, but says nothing of masses for them, or of purgatory. The *Liturgy*, revised by the other commission, was altered but little; but in 1544 the prayers for processions and litanies were ordered to be translated into English. In 1546 *Henry's Primer* was published,—an abbreviation of the Romish breviary, in English, which was used in public worship. But immediately after Cromwell's fall the Romish party carried an act of Parliament which made the King's orders in ecclesiastical matters, laws of the realm. In 1542 they obtained a prohibition of all religious works excepting the "*King's Book*," and in 1543 the reading of the Bible was limited to the higher classes. Their hopes of suppressing the Reformation were strengthened by Henry's alliance with the Emperor, on which occasion he legitimized Mary and Elizabeth. But the growing infirmity of the King changed matters. Mary turned towards the Seymours, the nearest kin of the successor. Henry, to secure Edward against peril from party conflicts, appointed his maternal uncle regent. Gardiner lost the King's confidence. Norfolk and his son Surrey were put out of the way by false charges; Surrey was beheaded, his father barely escaped by Henry's death.—The reign of Henry is commonly thought to have impeded the Reformation. It is true the faith of the people was fashioned after the arbitrary will of the King, who was prompted chiefly by worldly, selfish motives. Still it was fortunate that a monarch, at heart a Papist, was led even thus to aid

a cause which he might have suppressed by force, as his predecessors did Lollardism. And although the free development of many evangelical germs was hindered, the political and religious unity of the realm was preserved. It must be remembered, also, that England lacked men, like those raised up in Germany and Switzerland, who possessed the requisite ability to organize fully, and carry forward a complete Reformation. This will be more clearly seen in the next period of its history.

Edward VI. (Jan. 29, 1547, to July 6, 1553) ascended the throne in his 10th year. He was educated, under Cranmer's direction, by Dr. Richard Cox, and Sir John Cheke, who sedulously taught him the principles of evangelical truth. He combined the talent of his father with the amiability of his mother. Great things were expected from his reign. He was placed, during his minority, under the guidance of a council of 16 men, at whose side stood the privy council. The regency, according to intimations in Henry's will, at once raised themselves to a higher rank, and appropriated some earlier church estates. The two religious parties were pretty equally balanced in the Council. At the head of the Romish party stood the Lord Chancellor, Wriothesley and Bishop Tonsal; at that of the other party Cranmer and Count Hartford (Duke of Somerset) Edward's uncle, who was chosen president, in spite of Wriothesley's opposition. The latter was deprived of the Great Seal for some misdemeanor, and thus quieted. Somerset now became protector of the realm, and chief of the regency (March 13, 1547). Thus the Protestants obtained a decided ascendancy. Still the Romish party wielded great power, and found an able champion in Gardiner, supported by many bishops, nearly all the clergy, and by the Universities, where the light of the gospel was soon extinguished. The mass of the people was but little penetrated, as yet, by the leaven of truth. The cause was also endangered by the fanaticism of its friends. To preserve the unity of the Church, and reconcile conflicting views, a medium course had to be opened. No one could do this so well as Cranmer. In rearing the new edifice he endeavored to use as much as possible of the material of the old, and to retain its general plan. But he did not despise other material. Worthy exiles were encouraged to return home, and continental scholars were invited to assist in the work. The confessional writings of this period bear distinct traces of the influence of Luther, Zwingli, and Calvin. The royal supremacy furnished the surest defence of the Reformation, and made all attacks upon the measures of the regency high treason. Cranmer, therefore, received his office anew from the King, and requested all the bishops to do the same. In order to carry out this measure among all the clergy, and to prepare the way for a general Reformation, a Church visitation was appointed in April, 1547. Previously means were used to acquaint the people with the Holy Scriptures and evangelical principles. Cranmer had *Erasmus' paraphrases* circulated (July, 1547) in English. The Book of Homilies, composed by Cranmer, Ridley, Latimer, &c., dis-

tinctly asserted the doctrine of justification by faith. Both books were ordered to be read in the churches—a measure required by the ignorance of the clergy, and their hostility to the Reformation. To prevent disturbances, either by the sermons of Papists or fanatics, permission to preach had to be obtained from the superior courts. Accordingly the *visitation* began in September, in conformity with 37 articles of instruction, directing not merely the taking of the oath of supremacy, but also the abolition of pilgrimages, processions, and pictures from churches, the use of the paraphrases and homilies, of the litany in the vernacular, the reading of Scripture lessons, the examination of communicants, the strict observance of the Sabbath, the zealous discharge of ministerial duties, and the keeping Church records. The visitors were accompanied by preachers, who instructed the people concerning the Reformation.

On Nov. 4, 1547, the Parliament was opened which laid the foundation of the Reformed Church. Measures previously adopted were approved; the laws against heretics were abrogated; the royal supremacy was confirmed anew, and so far extended that the appointment of bishops and of ecclesiastical courts was invested entirely in the King; masses for souls were abolished; and the communion in both kinds was introduced,—but at the same time severe penalties were threatened against the frequent assaults upon the sacrament. The covetous nobility gave ready assent to the dissolution of still remaining eccl. establishments; but, as before, the wealth thus obtained was sadly squandered. The Protector, especially, appropriated a large share of it. Other propositions, however, as the revision of the eccl. laws, the remodelling of the order of worship, the abolition of celibacy, and the participation of the convocation in eccl. legislation, were not entertained. Cranmer went forward with his reforms. In Jan., 1548, he forbid the use of candles, ashes, and palms, and readily granted exemptions from fasting. In Febr. he ordered all pictures to be removed from the churches. He likewise had the sermons upon the Nuremberg Lutheran Catechism translated into Latin, by Justus Jonas, and then published an English version of the book. At the same time he, with Bishops Goodrich, Ridley, &c., prepared a new order of worship on the basis of the best ancient liturgies, and that of Cologne, in which the service for the Lord's Supper was copied almost literally from the Romish missal, and auricular confession, prayers for the dead, signing with the cross, unction, and priestly vestments were retained. It was published late in 1548, and offered as a Christmas present to the King. Early in 1549 the first act of Uniformity adopted it as the general prayer-book, and ordered its introduction on July 1. The abolition of celibacy was ruled by the same Parliament, but only as a necessary evil. Thus far the Papists resisted in vain. Gardiner, who, from the first, had opposed the paraphrases and homilies, and disputed the authority of the regency, was in the Tower. Tonsal had retired to his see, and was quiet. Bonner was now as pliant as

he had been fierce. Others were equally indifferent, Mary alone excepted. But the populace, ascribing the prevailing poverty and distress to reformatory measures, gave vent to smothered anger when the new liturgy was introduced. The excitement raged most in Devonshire and Norfolk, where Cardinal Pole had many adherents. In Cornwall an army of 10,000 men demanded the restoration of Popery, and was put down with difficulty. In Norfolk, *Ket*, a tanner, at the head of 20,000 insurgents, declared war against the nobility and regency. The Earl of Warwick had to be called with his troops from Scotland before the rebellion could be quelled. In addition to this England was involved in a war with France by Henry's scheme of having Mary of Scotland espoused to Edward—a scheme favored by the Protestants. This war emptied the treasury, and endangered the English possessions in France, and led to the fall of the *Protector*, whom the other councillors hated for his ambition—the Papists especially for his eccles. innovations. Warwick joined with Southampton, Somerset's chief opponent, and soon succeeded in having the Protector sent to the Tower (Sept., 1549), and deprived of his office. Still Warwick, to keep the King's favor, had to aid the Reformation; so that during Somerset's imprisonment, not only were stricter orders enforced for introducing the liturgy, but a form of ordination, and book of eccles. law were resolved upon; the former was completed in March, 1550, the latter work took several years. The ordination-service, with a few alterations, made under Charles II., is the same now used. Thus far the aim was not so much to found a new Church, as to purify the old. Hence the means used to suppress the Anabaptists, Antitrinitarians, Gospellers, and other fanatical bodies, were severer than those employed against Popery; for so far as they maintained views adverse to the State and good morals, they forfeited claims to toleration. But it is a stain upon Edward's reign, that Joan Bocher was burnt (May, 1550) for denying Christ's true humanity, and van Paris, a Hollander, for denying his divinity.

Gradually the principles of the German and Swiss Reformation exerted a more decided influence upon the further development of that in England. This was mainly effected by the return from exile of such men as *Miles Coverdale*, *John Rogers*, and *John Hooper*, and by such foreign fugitives as *Peter Martyr*, *Ochino*, *Bucer*, *Fagius*, and *de Lasky*. To secure competent teachers for the colleges, Cranmer had (1548) called *P. Martyr Vermigli*, and *Bern. Ochino* to Oxford, and (1549) *M. Bucer* and *Paul Fagius* to Cambridge. Fagius died in Nov. following. Bucer continued a year and a half, and by his learning as well as piety and peaceableness, won high regard. After his death the post was left vacant for two years, in the hope that Melancthon might be obtained for it. These men scattered seed which yielded fruit in the rising generation. The scholastic professors vehemently opposed the new doctrine—especially that touching the Lord's Supper. But the frequent disputations about it led the Reformers themselves further off from the

Romish dogma. *Knox* and *Hooper* particularly asked for more thorough reforms in the cultus and constitution of the Church. On Hooper's motion the cabinet ordered, Nov., 1550, that *communion tables should be used instead of altars*; *Heath* and *Day* opposing lost their offices (Oct., 1551). *Knox* rejected the liturgy and episcopacy, and declined a see. The Holland Church of *de Lasky* (1550) became a pattern to others. It was a complete Presbyterian Church, holding decidedly Reformed doctrines, after the model of the Apostolic Church. It realized what the Lollards strove after. Many desired the English Church to be modelled after it. These foreign influences produced a tendency adverse to that of the national Church, which subsequently caused so much dissension. But at first it was confined to a narrow circle, and was harmless. The light of the Gospel had penetrated but a little way into most places. And no wonder. There were congregations which had not heard a sermon for years. Many clergymen had several parishes let out to such as worked cheapest; most of them were secret Papists. *Fagius* wrote, 1549, that scarcely ten competent preachers could be found. Hence Cranmer's plan of having six court chaplains, four of whom should always be travelling through the country to preach. He also endeavored to appoint the most evangelical men bishops and priests. By the close of 1551 all Romish bishops had been removed. But Somerset's fall checked the joy of the evangelicals. And yet it did not stop the progress of their cause. Northumberland's private interests constrained him to abet the Protestants, especially as Edward had declared his full approval of the reforms urged by the foreign theologians, and insisted upon a revision of the Prayer-Book. Calvin, Martyr, and Bucer thought it retained too many Popish features. Bucer desired not only the elimination of many Romish usages, but the introduction of well organized congregations, with discipline, the care of the poor, schools, and the restitution to the congregations of the eccl. property. His work, "*Censura supra libro sanctorum*" (1550), led Edward to appoint a committee of revision. This committee adopted many of Bucer's suggestions, derived some things from Polanus' edition of Calvin's liturgy—the introductory sentences, responses, part of the confession, and the commandments in the Lord's Supper—and struck out the use of oil, the exorcism, sign of the cross, auricular confession, prayers for the dead, and the Romish vestments. The revision was submitted to the Convocation, and to the Parliament happily convoked before Somerset's execution, and which met immediately after it, Jan. 23, 1552, which, by the *second act of Uniformity*, Apr. 6, 1552, adopted the revised Prayer-Book, and ordered its introduction upon the following All-Saint's Day. After enacting some other laws for the observance of the Sabbath and holydays, and modifying the extreme act against high treason, the Parliament was dissolved, April 15.

Simultaneously with the Liturgy, the code of eccl. laws was revised. A comm. was appointed

for this purpose in 1549, but the work was not vigorously taken up for two years; and though finished before Edward's death, it was first publ. under Elizabeth, and entitled: "*Reformatio legum ecclesiastic.*" It was prepared by Cranmer, Goodrich, Cox, P. Martyr, and four jurists. The Bible is made the basis, with continual reference to the first four general councils, the Church fathers, and the reformatory laws of the realm. Though a most excellent work, it was never legally adopted. At last Cranmer addressed himself to the preparation of a *Confession of Faith*. The peculiar course of the English Reformation caused the usual order of events in this respect to be thus reversed. It was hoped, also, that by this delay continental Protestants might unite with England in one Confession. Cranmer prepared 42 Articles (see Anglican Church), and laid them, May, 1552, before the Privy Council. Their Calvinistic tone so predominates that they scarcely harmonize with the Liturgy. This made it almost impossible to use the Nuremberg Catechism. A new one, probably by B. Poinet, was therefore prepared. The King ordered its use, May, 1553, and also that the clergy should take an oath of approval of the 42 Articles, although these were not submitted to the Convocation or Parliament for confirmation. Thus the Reformation was completed; and very fortunately, for Edward's declining health opened a gloomy prospect. Northumberland, as ambitious as he was covetous, now aspired to nothing less than to secure the crown for his daughter-in-law, Jane Grey. The illegitimacy of Henry's daughter had not yet been annulled by Parliament; the mother of James V. was not named in Henry's will, so that Lady Jane Grey's mother, as Henry's niece, had the next claim to the throne. Northumberland showed Edward the danger to which Mary's reign would expose the Reformation, and in spite of the objections of Cranmer and others, effected (June 10) a change of the succession in favor of his daughter-in-law. Edward died on July 6, 1553 — deplored by the friends of the Gospel at home and abroad. On the 9th Lady Jane was proclaimed Queen, and Mary a few days later. The Romanists, strengthened by Northumberland's many foes, rallied around Mary. Many were gained by promises of liberty of conscience. But Mary did not feel bound by promises given to heretics. Her previous training and wrongs inspired her with glowing hatred against all innovations. Neither the entreaties nor threats of her brother, or the regency, could change her mind. She felt called to restore Romanism in her realm. On the day she entered the Tower (July 31), Norfolk and Gardiner, on the next, Toustal, Heath, and Day were released and reinstated. More than 60 persons were excluded from the general amnesty, including Northumberland, who was forthwith convicted of high treason, and executed, Aug. 22. Edward's burial, and Mary's coronation were performed according to the ancient ritual. An edict of Aug. 18, curtailed, "until further enactments," the liberty of preaching and the press. For resisting this, Hooper, Ridley, Latimer, Coverdale, Rogers, Cox, and others, and, finally,

Cranmer, were imprisoned. The Parliament convened that fall validated Henry's marriage with Catharine, and abrogated, after violent opposition, all the Reformatory laws passed under Edward. The body of the people, hankering after the pomp of Romanism, and the fleshpots of the cloisters, rejoiced; the nobility, not yet required to restore the church treasures, acquiesced; the Convocation, from which all the Reformed prelates were excluded, exulted in the doings of a Queen who had "chosen the better part." The friends of the Gospel, and the married priests, were in consternation. In one thing, however, friends and foes agreed, in their aversion to the plan of Mary and Charles V., of her marriage with Philip of Spain. The Parliament, fearing foreign influence, desired her to choose an Englishman. But Cardinal Pole, whom Mary once regarded favorably, was now too old for her, and young Courtenay was too frivolous. In Jan., 1554, therefore, she had her purpose announced to marry Philip. This caused disturbances in Warwickshire, the home of the Greys, in Cornwall, and in Wales. These were soon quelled. But the approach of Sir Thomas Wyatt, with an army, filled London with alarm. Mary, however, did not fear. Her warm appeal to the citizens in Guildhall inspired them with courage, and thousands rallied around her, and compelled Wyatt to surrender (Feb. 11, 1554). On the next day Lady Jane Grey was executed. Her husband had preceded her; her father and uncle soon followed. Fifty of Wyatt's followers were put to death in London, others in Kent. He tried to screen himself by placing Elizabeth under suspicion. She was brought to the Tower, soon released, but strictly watched. Many nobles fled to France. Peace being restored, Mary was married to Philip on July 25. Mary, relying upon the support of Papal powers, now recklessly pressed her plans. A royal order drove thousands of worthy foreigners from England; 800 Englishmen, including many students and theologians — Knox, Grindal, Sandys, Jewel — also fled, to Frankfort, Basel, Zurich, and Geneva. Another edict abrogated the supremacy, in consequence of which the remaining evangelical bishops were deposed, and probably half the clergy were involved in misery for violating the law of celibacy. In Nov., 1554, Pole entered London as the Papal legate. *The beginning of 1555 found the English Church in the arms of Popery again.* Now came those fearful persecutions which brand Mary's reign. In a few years, about 300 persons, including men and women, old and young, 5 bishops, 21 theologians, died at the stake. Many others perished in prisons. The persecutions lasted until Mary's death, Nov. 17, 1558, put an end to her reign of terror. Pole died the day following. Mary's reign was a baptism of fire for the Reformation. The cloud of witnesses which arose testified to the worth and power of the Gospel; the bloody persecutions kindled inextinguishable hatred of Popery in the hearts of the people.

A brighter day dawned with Elizabeth's accession. It was her vocation to consummate the work of the Reformation. In pursuit of this

she adopted a mediating policy, rising above existing parties. Her Privy Council was composed of Romanists and Protestants. The coronation ceremony was performed according to the Romish ritual; the oath was taken upon an English Bible. Through the influence of the new government many friends of the Reformation were returned to the new Parliament, but it was opened (Jan. 25, 1559) with a high mass. The transactions of the body were left untrammelled, and to show her impartiality, the Queen had referred the revision of Edward's Liturgy to an equal number of Romanists and Protestants. After some violent struggles the Romish worship restored by Mary was thrown aside, the royal supremacy reasserted, and its exercise entrusted to a *High Commission* appointed by the crown, and, finally (April), by a *new act of Uniformity*, the revised Book of Common Prayer was introduced. In execution of these enactments the Queen ordered a general visitation under instructions based on those of the visitation under Edward, and having regard as well to Romanists as to the stricter Protestants. Altars, images, crucifixes and candles were to be removed, but instrumental music, kneeling in prayer and at the communion retained. Attendance upon public worship, and the sanctification of the Sabbath were urged; but liberty to preach and of the press, and even of the clergy to marry, had to be obtained from the higher courts. Most of the clergy seemed willing to take the oath of supremacy and uniformity; of 9400 only 80 priests, and 70 cathedral ecclesiastics, university professors, and principals of colleges, refused. Of the 16 bishops all but one refused. The vacancies occasioned by the non-juring clergy were temporarily supplied by lay readers, but soon well filled by theologians who returned from exile. It was more difficult to fill the bench of prelates. *Matthew Parker*, the Queen's instructor, an unassuming, learned man, was made Archb. of Canterbury. Fortunately, three bishops, Barlow, Scory, and Coverdale, who had fled under Mary, and Hodgkin, suffragan of Bedford, were at hand to consecrate Parker (Dec. 17, 1559). Parker then consecrated other bishops, and within two years all the sees were invested with evangelical men. As before, matters pertaining to government and worship were first arranged, and then steps taken towards forming a Confession of Faith. A brief temporary confession of 11 Articles was framed, which the clergy were required to subscribe, and to read twice a year in their churches. Meanwhile the 42 Art. were revised and submitted, in Jan., 1563, to the Convocation, which, after striking out the last three, adopted (Febr.) the remaining 39 almost unaltered. With the royal approbation they were published in Nov., but were not sanctioned by Parliament until Apr., 1571; till then they were binding only upon the clergy. The same Convocation adopted the Latin *Catechism* of Noel, based upon Poinet's, and publ. in English in 1570, a *Book of Homilies*, prepared by Parker and Jewell, and, finally, resolved upon a new version of the Bible, which was publ. in 1572. In accordance with her conciliatory plan, full

liberty of conscience was allowed to the laity during the first ten years of Elizabeth's reign. The order of worship retained so much of the ancient forms, that it might satisfy the reasonable demands of Protestants and Romanists. And though zealous Papists shunned the oath of conformity by flight, the most of them succumbed. But ere long *the seditious movements of Romanists, and stubborn opposition of the Puritans, required severe measures*. In 1561 a conspiracy was discovered, under the management of Pole's nephew, which led Parliament to insist upon the oath of supremacy. This was done to frighten the malcontents. Afterwards Popish tracts were circulated by fanatical priests, who, having returned from Holland, went through the country in disguise, and used various means to inflame the people, until a conspiracy in favor of Mary of Scotland was fomented. The Pope, moreover, by a bull of Apr. 27, 1570, excommunicated Elizabeth, and sought to excite a crusade against her. Then the Parliament passed a series of enactments in her defence, making all assaults upon her person, her orthodoxy, her title to the crown, as well as the introduction into the realm of Papal bulls, &c., high treason. All the clergy and officers of the kingdom were required to subscribe the 39 Articles, and fugitive Romanists were threatened with confiscation. Various other edicts were subsequently issued to suppress the spreading of seditious prints which issued mainly from the English colleges in Douay (founded by Philip II., 1569) and Rome (founded by Gregory, 1579). If, therefore, during the next 20 y. 62 priests were executed, they suffered not for their religious views, but as traitors. But whilst the movements of the Romanists were chiefly political, the opposition of the *Puritans* was based in religious considerations (see *Puritans*).—(Sources: *Statutes of the Realm*, III., IV., 1817, &c.; Fox's *Martyrology*; BURNET's *History of the Reformation*, &c., 1679; STRYPE's *Eccl. Memorials*, &c., 1721, and *Annals of the Reformation*, 1725; HENRY SOAME's *Hist. of the Ref.*, &c., 1825, &c.; J. BLUNT, *Sketch of the Ref. in England*, 1832; TURNER, *Hist. of England*, 1839; G. WEBER, *Gesch. d. akatholischen Kirchen u. Sekten in Grossbrit.*, 1845–53; J. COLLIER, *An Ec. Hist. of Gr. Britain*, 1708; LINGARD, *Hist. of Engl.*, 1819, &c. C. SCHÖLL.*

England, Church statistics of.—The census of the 30th and 31st of March, 1851, in other respects full and reliable, fails to give the number of members belonging to the different denominations. This defect, however, may be partly supplied from the statistics of church-attendance. Assuming that $\frac{1}{2}$ the afternoon and $\frac{1}{2}$ the evening attendance should be added to that of the morning, we may obtain a pretty accurate result. Others suppose the membership to be $\frac{2}{3}$ the whole attendance. These calculations must further be compared with the number of communicants, &c., given in the course of the article.—The population of Great Britain in 1851 was 27,557,313: that of England and Wales 17,927,609; the smaller islands 143,126; Scotland 2,870,784; Ireland 6,615,794.

CHURCH STATISTICS OF ENGLAND AND WALES IN MARCH, 1851.

Names of Churches and Sects.	Places of Worship.	Accommodation.	Attendants.
CHURCH OF ENGLAND.....	14,077	5,317,915	3,773,474
Other Chs. and Sects.			
METHODISTS			
<i>Wesleyans.</i>			
Original Connexion.....	6,579	1,447,580	907,313
New Connexion.....	297	96,964	61,319
Primit. Methodists.....	2,871	414,430	260,555
Bible Christians.....	482	66,832	38,612
Wesl. Meth.-Assoc.....	419	98,813	56,430
Independent Method....	20	2,263	1,659
Wesl. Reformers.....	339	67,814	53,494
<i>Calvinistic Methodists.</i>			
Welsh Methodists.....	828	211,951	151,046
Huntingdon Soc.....	109	38,727	29,679
INDEPENDENTS OR CONGREGATIONALISTS.....	3,244	1,063,136	793,142
BAPTISTS			
General B. (Arminian)	93	20,539	12,323
" " New Soc....	182	52,604	40,027
Partic. B. (Calvinistic)	1,947	582,953	471,283
Seventh-Day B.....	2	390	52
Scotch B.....	15	2,547	1,246
Miscellaneous.....	550	93,316	63,047
SCOTCH PRESBYTERIANS..	160	86,692	60,131
Church of Scotland....	18	13,789	8,712
United Pres. Church...	66	31,351	23,207
Presb. C. in England..	76	41,552	28,212
UNITARIANS.....	229	68,554	37,156
MORAVIANS.....	32	9,301	7,364
FRIENDS.....	371	91,599	18,172
PLYMOUTH BRETHREN....	132	18,529	10,414
SANDENIANS.....	6	956	587
SWEDENBORGIANS.....	50	12,107	7,082
IRVINGITES.....	32	7,437	4,908
SMALLER SECTS.....	539	104,481	63,572
ROMAN CATHOLICS.....	570	186,111	305,393
MORMONS.....	222	30,783	18,800
Foreign Churches.			
Lutheran.....	5	2,406	1,184
Reformed.....	1	200	140
German Catholics.....	1	300	567
Swede Luth. C.....	1	20	100
Reformed Dutch.....	1	350	70
French Protestants.....	3	560	291
Italian Reformers.....	1	150	21
Greek Church.....	3	291	240
JEWS.....	53	8,438	4,150
Total.....	34,536	10,225,558	7,267,694

From the above (deducting 21,673 superfluous seats from the number given for the C. of England) the proportion of the Episcopalians to the rest is, as 51.9 to 48.1, and that of attendants as 52 to 48. Of this last number 21 per cent. are Methodists, 11 Independents, 8 Baptists, 4 Roman Catholics, and 4 all others. Taking the entire population, the proportion of attendants gives 21 per cent. Episcopalians, all others 19.5. But as it is pretty certain that 58 per cent. might attend church at one time, we get 17.5 per cent. of non-attendants. But the above table gives only the regular attendants, exclusive of children, sick persons, and others necessarily detained, making 42 per cent. of the population, 15.2 of which may be put down as Episcopalians, 14.1 as Dissenters, and 12.7 as non-attending. Thus we get a population of 6½ millions for the first; 6 millions for the second; and nearly 5½ millions for the last class. But this non-attending class must, in the widest sense,

be included in the National Church, which nominally extends to all who are not Dissenters.

The table given below¹ shows the rapid increase of the Free Churches from 1801 to 1851. But although the number of church buildings has so greatly increased, the present accommodations are far too limited. The deficiency is greatest in large cities, especially in London, where, in no less than 28 parishes, there is not church-room for 30 per cent. of the population. The comparative church accommodation of the National and other churches in the different parts of the country is as follows, for 1851:

Locality.	Popul'n. in 1851.	National Church.	Wesleyans.	Inde. and A.	Baptists.	Rom. Cath.	Total.
City Districts.	9,229,120	1,295,729	895,375	154,729	318,015	116,116	2,780,964
Country "	13,696,469	2,766,613	1,297,926	613,001	434,354	67,915	5,179,739

The Nat. C. preponderates in the southern part of England, excepting in Bedfordshire, Monmouthshire, and Cornwall. In Wales not $\frac{1}{4}$ of the population are Episcopalians. The Wesleyans predominate in Cornwall, York, Derby, and Nottingham. The Independents in Wales, Essex, Dorset, Monmouth, and Suffolk. The Baptists in S. Wales, Huntingdon, Bedford, Northampton, Leicester, and Buckingham.—The following difference exists in church-attendance in city and country:

Locality and Chs.	Morning.	Afternoon.	Evening.	Pr. c. of pop.		
				A.M.	P.M.	Ev'g.
City Districts....	2,202,943	970,140	4,900,329			
Country "	2,444,539	1,213,995	6,205,737			
National C.....	2,541,244	1,890,764	860,543	23.9	10.5	15.3
Wesleyans.....	707,921	645,895	1,063,537	23.9	25.5	19.8
Independent....	524,612	232,285	457,162			
Baptist.....	360,806	224,268	345,115			
Roman Catholic	252,783	53,967	76,880			

From this general review we proceed to notice the principal denominations separately.

I. THE NATIONAL CHURCH is divided into 28 bishoprics, of which 21 belong to the province of Canterbury, population 12,785,048, and 7 to that of York, pop. 5,285,687. In England and Wales there are 11,728 benefices, of which 1144 are held by the Crown, 1853 by the Bishops, 938 by the cathedral clergy and other dignitaries, 770 by Universities, 931 by the clergy of the parent church, and 6092 by private persons. In 1841, when there were 10,987 parishes, 3736 clergymen were absent; viz., 1853 as pluralists (though 401 in service), 917 by permission, and 961 without. — In 1854 there were about 18,000 clergymen, some engaged as teachers, about $\frac{1}{3}$ as assistants, and $\frac{1}{3}$ of these supply the place of sinecurists. — The Church revenues amount to more than 5 millions of pounds, the Episcopal income alone having reached, in 1851, £282,936. The revenues are very unequally divided; whilst the six wealthiest dioceses yielded £143,000, there were,

Yr.	Popul'n.	National C.		Wesleyans.		Independents.		Baptists.	
		Ch'ns.	Seats.	Ch'ns.	Seats.	Ch'ns.	Seats.	Ch'ns.	Seats.
1801.	8,490,536	11,379	1,289,883	825	165,000	91	39,791	652	176,692
1811	10,161,256	11,441	1,314,388	1,485	296,100	1,140	373,920	819	232,516
1821	12,100,236	11,558	1,357,386	2,748	519,600	1,478	484,784	1,170	317,070
1831	13,896,797	11,783	1,481,591	4,622	924,400	1,999	615,672	1,613	437,129
1841	15,914,145	12,868	1,755,836	7,919	1,563,800	2,606	851,765	2,174	599,154
1851	17,927,609	14,077	2,317,915	11,007	2,194,286	3,244	1,067,700	2,780	732,343

in 1853, 3528 parishes yielding less than £150 annually.

II. THE METHODISTS.—1) *Wesleyans*.—a) The W. Meth. Connexion was founded in 1739. The *classes* form the groundwork of its organism, each class consisting of about 12 members, and meeting weekly under a leader. Several *classes* form a *congregation*, with one or more local preachers, (laymen). About 15 congregations form a *circuit*, having from 1 to 4 preachers, appointed usually for 3 years, one of whom is *superintendent*; these preach alternately in the chapels of the circuit, and administer the sacraments,—using the Common Prayer Book. From 2 to 20, or more, circuits form a *district*, in which regular meetings are held under a presiding officer, who statedly reports to the highest court, the *Conference*. This consists, according to law, of 109 members, exclusively ministers, and fills its own vacancies from the clergy. At the annual meetings of the Conference, other clergy of the Church may speak and vote; but all decisions must be confirmed by the 100 legal members, who govern the Church. Standing committees are appointed, partly of laymen, to manage the various affairs of the connexion. The Conference annually elects a president.—In July, 1854, the connexion numbered in Great Britain 264,168 communicants, 32 districts, 428 circuits, and about 915 clergymen; in Ireland, 19,608 members, with 160 clergymen, and in other countries 94,520 members, with 356 clergymen. United with the British Conference are the congregations in Canada, with 264 clergymen and 36,323 members; and in France 1098 members, with 25 clergymen. The local preachers are reckoned at 15,000; they receive no pay.—The connexion has 2 theol. seminaries, at Richmond and Didsbury (near Manchester), with 55 students, 3 schools for educating the sons of ministers (New-Kingswood, Woodhouse-Grove, and Bath), a Normal Training Institution, Westminster, with 100 students (of which 40 are young women), 326 day schools with 39,216 pupils, and 4084 Sunday-schools, with nearly 400,000 children.—In the *foreign missionary field* they have 367 principal circuits, with 3116 stations, 507 missionaries, 703 catechists, &c., 8779 local preachers and Sunday-school teachers, 110,000 communicants, and about 5000 catechumens, 844 day, and 879 Sunday-schools, with 79,000 scholars. The contributions to missions amount to £114,498.—The income of the Church is derived from the weekly payments, in the classes, of the members. In 1854 about £230,000 besides were paid for chapels, schools, &c.

b) Other Wesleyan connexions. Soon after Wesley's death divisions arose because many were dissatisfied with the unlimited power of the Conference. (1) The *New Connexion*, 1797, which gives laymen equal rights with ministers in governing the church; (2) The *Primitive Methodists* 1810; (3) The *Wesleyan Reformers*, 1849, which sect has drawn 50,000 communicants from the parent connexion, and is gaining ground. Another split occurred in 1834, from opposition to the founding of a theol. seminary. Those clergymen driven off on this account formed themselves into (4) the *West. Method. Association*, which gives laymen part in the

eccl. government. (5) The *Bible Christians*, started 1815 by O'Bryan, a local preacher. They are found chiefly in Devonshire, and Cornwall.

STATISTICS OF JULY, 1854, OF THESE SMALLER BRANCHES.

Countries	Chapels & Stations	Circuit Preachers	Local Preachers	Missionaries	Members	S. Schools	Teachers	Scholars
(1) England.	291	87	820		16,001	280	7,199	44,515
Ireland...	116		11	11	674	10	114	877
Canada...	468		79	51	4,466	87	457	2,997
(2)	5,220	583	9,834		107,913	1,550	22,934	123,341
(3)	1,468		2,963		49,082	779	13,673	80,000
(4)	480	93	1,017		18,373	294	6,603	40,328
(5)	482	62	1,249	88	16,614		4,046	17,167

2) *Calvinistic Methodists*.—The Whitefield Methodists gradually became Independents, those of the Lady Huntingdon Connexion alone excepted; but of late years Congregational principles gained ground among these also. The seminary in Cheshunt numbers 20 students.

The *Welsh Methodists* have been formed into a separate connexion since 1811. Each county constitutes a circuit, the ministers and class-leaders of which meet monthly for counsel. Their quarterly meetings answer to the "Conference." They have 2 theological seminaries, in Bala and Trevecca. In 1853 they had 207 ministers, 234 local preachers, and 58,577 communicants.

III. THE INDEPENDENTS (Congregationalists) notwithstanding their avowal of independency, have various unions among themselves. The largest, "*The Congregational Union*," composed of the clergy and lay representatives of the congregations, has charge of "*The British Missions*:" a) *The Home Mission Society* (since 1819) with 51 missionaries, 63 assistants, 154 lay-preachers, 130 chapels, 34,801 hearers, 4865 communicants, 172 Sunday-schools, 13,171 scholars. b) *The Irish Evang. Soc.* has 21 stations. c) *The Colonial Miss. Soc.* supports about 60 ministers. This Union also has a *Board of Education*, to establish and aid schools, and assist young persons in acquiring an education.—Another Union of clergy in and around London was started as early as 1729; but in 1848 many of these separated and formed the "*Independent Union*," for the defence of Congregational principles.—For the protection of the civil rights of Dissenters a society of "*Dissenting Delegates*" has existed since 1732.—In the *Congregational school*, founded 1811, the sons of ministers are educated.—They have 8 theol. seminaries: in Plymouth, 1752; Rotherham, 1756; Airedale, 1794; Hackney, 1803; Manchester, 1806; Brecon, 1838; Birmingham, 1838; and St. Johnswood, 1850,—with 161 students. University College, London, is under their auspices.—The *London Soc. for Foreign Miss.* was founded in 1795, its income in 1854 was £76,781. It has 167 missionaries, and more than 600 native catechists, &c.—In 1854 the Independents had, in Great Britain and Ireland, 2140 congr., in the colonies 120, and in all 2320 ministers and missionaries.

IV. THE BAPTISTS also, although professedly Congregational, have "*The B. Union of Great*

Britain and Ireland," comprising, 1854, 35 associations with 1158 churches, 102,815 members, 561 village stations, and Sunday-schools with 108,056 children. The whole number of their churches on the British isles was 1925. The *B. Home Miss. Soc.* (founded 1797) has 144 stations, 4475 members, and 7255 Sunday-school scholars. In Germany, Switzerland, Denmark, and Sweden, they have 338 stations, and 4600 members. An Irish mission exists since 1814.—To the Union belong General and Particular Baptists. Both unite in the Home and Irish mission, and also in sustaining the *Bible Society*, founded 1840 (the annual income about £2,157); but they have separate seminaries and For. Missions.—The *Calvinistic B. Miss. Soc.* (founded 1792) has 385 missionaries, catechists, &c., and 4956 members; the "Western Union" (Jamaica) 18,000. Its income, 1854, £24,759.—The "*Particular B.*" have 5 seminaries at Bristol, founded 1770; Horton, 1804; Pontypool, 1807; Stepney, 1810; and Haverford, 1841,—with 93 students.—The "New Soc. of the General B." founded 1769, had in 1854, in England, 18-244 members, 25,492 Sunday-school scholars, and 300 members in 4 mission churches. In its seminary, Leicester, there are 10 students.

V. ROMAN CATHOLICS.¹—England is divided into 12 bishoprics under the Archb. of Westminster. They are most numerous in Lancashire, being $\frac{1}{4}$ of its population, and comprising $\frac{2}{3}$ of all the Rom. Cath. in England; then in London, Warwickshire, and Staffordshire. Of the 92 monasteries 75 are nunneries.

VI. THE SMALL SECTS.—1) *Mixed*, including 128 congregations. The mixture consists chiefly of Independents and Baptists; but there are various other combinations, as of Methodists, Baptists, Independents, Presbyterians, &c.—2) *Sects of one-sided tendencies* (mostly Calvinistic), such as Supralapsarians, Universalists, Predestinarians, Millenarians, &c., about 7 varieties with 92 congregations. 3) *Orthodox Societies*, belonging to no particular Church or sect, and assuming some general name. There are about 198 congregations of such. 4) *Thirteen other sects*, such as Southcottians, Agapemonists, Christian Israelites, Rational Progressives, &c.—5) Separate Mission congregations, connected with the London city Mission, &c., in all 48.

The contributions to the several religious societies, for 1854 were:—Bible Soc., £230,616; For. Miss. £444,007; Home Miss., £166,867; Irish Miss., £42,147; Educat. Soc., £78,512; Benev. Soc., £132,904; Miscell., £24,463.—Total, £1,109,376. C. SCHÖLL.*

English Versions of the Bible.—Anglo-Saxon literature is rich in paraphrases and translations of portions of the S.S. The first attempt at translation was made by *Bede*, who,

Year.	Churches.	Priests.	Colleges.	Monastic Houses.	Members.	Schools.
1780	200	(9,367	...
1830	392
1841	468	667	...	17
1851	583	824	...	68	305,393	...
1854	781	1,309	11	92	132

according to Cuthbert, his pupil, finished the Gospel of John on his deathbed; this is lost. Several *interlinear-glosses* followed this, one on the Psalms (8th cent.; ed. Thorpe); two on the Gospels, one in the "*Durham-book*" (MS. in *Brit. Mus.*, D. IV.); another, the "*Beeshworth-glosse*" (Bodl. Libr. D. 24. N. 3964); both of the 9th cent., and all in the Northumbr. dialect. King *Alfred* is said to have begun a transl. of the Psalms. In the 10th cent. *Aelfric*, the monk, transl. the Heptateuch and portions of the other histor. books, and of Job; often, however, he gave only the contents. The Gospel cod., 140. *Corp. Chr. Camb.* of the 11th cent. is also a gloss, departing often from the Vulgate; it is probably a copy of an older work. Finally the Gospels, *Jun. I.*, *Bodl. Libr.*—We have several metrical paraphrases of the transition-period from the Saxon to the more modern English, as the "*Ormulum*" and a revision of the Psalms, but in prose, only a version of the Psalms by *Rolle*, a monk of Hampole († 1349), the Gospels of Mark and Luke, and Paul's Epistles (No. 32, *Corp. Chr. Camb.*), and the gospel pericopes (MS. Harl. 5085).

John Wycliffe (b. 1324, † 1384) was the first to appreciate the infinite value of the Bible, not only as the rule of faith, but for popular use. He made a transl. from the Vulgate with the use of existing helps, which however is so literal that the sense is often obscure, and the idiom violated. As he studied simplicity of style his book spread rapidly. His N. T. was publ. 1731 and 1810.—The Reformation called forth a new version. Unlike the German version it required many laborers during a period of 90 years, to produce one which was generally received.—*William Tyndale* made the beginning. He was probably born in Gloucestershire, and studied at Oxford, just when the Greek Testament of Erasmus appeared, which he read there and then at Cambridge with Bilney and Frith. Afterwards appointed chaplain and tutor in the house of Sir John Walsh, Gloucestershire, he began the transl. of the N. T. For greater security he went to London, and enjoyed the hospitality of Alderman Monmouth; thence to Hamburg and Cologne. But he first found safety in Wittenberg, and there publ., 1526, his N. T. Its circulation in England was strictly prohibited. Sir Thos. More violently assailed it. It was publicly burned. And yet it spread so rapidly that in four years five editions were sold. T. returned to Hamburg and joined *Coverdale* in translating the Pentateuch. C. became acquainted in Cambridge with the N. T. of Erasmus, was led by Bilney to embrace Reformed principles, and for these forsook his home. Tyndale soon left Hamburg for Antwerp, where, aided by Frith, he secretly prosecuted his work. Whilst there his enemies seized him, imprisoned him in Vilvoord, near Brussels, and burned him Oct. 6, 1536. T.'s version is faithful and clear, and forms the basis of all subsequent ones, which are properly mere revisions of it.—In 1535 Coverdale finished his transl. of the O. T., making use of five older versions (German) besides the Vulgate and original text. It was admitted into England.—In 1537 "*Matthew's Bible*" was publ. by royal permission, probably

by Rogers, Tyndale's friend, who added a preface and notes. It contained Tyndale's transl. with slight changes, the lacking parts supplied from Coverdale's. C. publ., 1538, an improved version of the N. T., with the Vulgate, which C. followed only too closely; he also publ. paraphrases of some Psalms, with tunes, the first attempt of this kind. Matthew's Bible was well received by the people, but regarded suspiciously by the clergy on account of its preface and notes. The clergy desired a new version. At Cromwell's suggestion Coverdale began a revised ed. without notes at Paris, and finished it in London, 1539. It was styled the "Great Bible," also Cranmer's Bible because he added a preface to the 2d improved ed. of 1540. But papists were not satisfied. They wished a version which closely adhered to the Vulgate. The Convocation passed a resolution to this effect in 1542, but it was never carried out; meanwhile the general use of the Bible was greatly restricted.—Under Edward VI. the Great Bible was the authorized version, though others were used. Mary's elevation drove the Reformed to the Continent. In Geneva, 1557, a version of the N. T. appeared (probably by Wittingham, an English clergyman) in which first, words not in the original were enclosed in brackets, and the division into verses copied from Stephen's Greek N. T. It mainly follows Cranmer's Bible, but has many new transl., and practical notes in the Calvinistic spirit. The "Geneva Bible," with the last named N. T. revised, was publ. by Coverdale, Wittingham, Gilby, and others, in 1560. This version of the O. T. is more original than any after Coverdale's Bible, and is furnished with notes. The people highly prized it, and even Parker acknowledged its merits, though on account of its Calvinistic source he could not favor it. He therefore projected a new version of the Great Bible. He distributed the work in 14 parts among learned theologians, mostly bishops, for examination; each one returned his part signed with his initials. Parker himself edited it, with a preface and notes, in 1568; it was styled the "Bishops' Bible." The "Great Bible" is closely followed, with an occasional use of the Geneva version, and the omission of the Vulgate's additions. The persons engaged on it were Davies, B. of St. David's; Sandys, afterwards Archb. of York; Horne, B. of Winchester; Bentham, B. of Coventry; Grindal, afterwards Archb. of Canterbury, Parkhurst, B. of Norwich; Cox, of Ely, and some others. It was read in the churches, but never spread among the people. The struggle between the Romish and Reformed parties extended to a transl. of the S. S.; they kept apart until the last revision. Before this was undertaken the Romish fugitives, William Allen and others, transl. the N. T., 1578, at Rheims. The entire Bible, transl. from the revised Vulgate of 1592, appeared at Douay in 1610.

The chief mover of a new revision was Dr. Reynolds, of Corp. Chr. Coll., Oxford, and leader of the Puritans. He advocated it at a conference in Hampton Court, 1604. King James approved the measure, and appointed a commission of 54 members, in six parties, to each of which a portion was assigned. Each member

was separately to revise the portion assigned to his company; then the party was to meet, compare results and report to the other parties. Difficult points, and the final revision of the whole, were to be submitted to a general conference, composed of the chairman of the parties and three or four professors of theology, the Vice-Chancellor presiding. The list of revisors (of whom there were actually but 47) has been preserved, as well as the portions prepared by each.—The 1st party of 10 members sat in Westminster, revised from *Gen.*—2 *Kings*. Their chairman was Dr. L. Andrews, Dean of Westminster, a noted linguist, co-laborer of the learned Spaniard, Dr. de Savaria, previously professor in Leyden:—2d, of 8 in Cambridge, rev. *Chron.* to *Canticles*, chairman, Prof. Lively. The rabbinical scholar, Dr. Chaderton, belonged to this party; 3d, of 7 in Oxford, rev. the *Prophets*, Dr. Harding, chairman, and Dr. Reynolds, &c., members; 4th, of 8 in Oxford, rev. the Gospels and Acts, Prof. Revel, chairman; 5th, of 7 in Westminster, rev. *Romans* to *Revelation*, consisted of Barlowe, Hutchinson, &c.; 6th, of 7 in Cambridge, rev. the *Apocrypha*, members, Dr. Duport, J. Bois, &c. The King gave strict instructions for the revision. The Bishops' Bible should be the basis, and varied from only when the original demanded it; words of divers significations to be used in the patristic sense; the previous division into chapters to be retained if possible; no marginal notes excepting as various readings; and marginal references to parallels. The work was probably done during 1604–7, but the Bible, with a dedication to King James and an introduction, was not publ. and authorized until 1611. It was generally well received, but the other versions were only gradually supplanted; in the Common Prayer the Gospels and Epp. of the Bishops' Bible, and the Psalms of Cranmer's, are retained.—An accurate revision of King James' Bible was made by Dr. Blayney, 1769, and contains some improvements. But the excellence of the standard version is almost universally admitted.—(See BAGSTER's *Hexapla*; "Our Engl. B.," by the author of the Introd. to 2d ed. of Bagster's Hex., publ. by Lond. Rel. Tr. Soc., and Amer. S. S. Union; LEWIS, Hist. of Translations; Anderson's "Annals of the Bible," London.

C. SCHÖLL.*

Enkratites, 'Εγκρατῆς, 'Εγκραταῖται, *continentes*—the name of one or more Gnostic sects, or rather of a wide-spread Gnostic-ascetic tendency in the early Church. Their founders were Saturnin, Marcion, particularly Tatian (see Arts.). According to Epiphanius and others, they were a specific party, and regarded marriage as a φθορά καὶ πορνεία, abstained from meat (ἐμψύχα), wine, and spirituous liquors, and as they used water in the communion, were called ὑπονασταταῖται, *aquarii*. The name, however, does not denote so much any special founder or sect as that tendency of Gnosticism which sought to spiritualize life by sundering it from matter as the principle of evil, or that form of strict asceticism which vested itself in Gnostic-dualistic theories, and in practice went far beyond the asceticism recognized and encouraged by the Church. Individual societies of such continentes

may have existed in the form of the later monastic orders, and as the heads of such, perhaps, are to be regarded, *e. g.*, Tatian, the Docetic Julianus Cassianus, and Severus. In the 12th cent., to denote and condemn the Bogomiles, the names of ancient heresies were used, amongst them Enkratites (Euthym. Zigab. *Ἐκκραῖτες καὶ Σπριαμβοῖτες*). See Church Hist. and Daniel's Tatian, 1837.

WAGENMANN.—*Ermentrout*.

Ennodius, Magnus Felix, B. of Ticinum (Pavia), b. 473, at Arles, or Milan, of a poor but eminent Gallic family, was early left as an orphan to the care of an aunt in Milan, who furnished him with his first instructions. After her death, 489, he married a woman of wealth, but ere long a dangerous sickness led him to consecrate himself to a holy life, should he recover. Restored to health he became an ecclesiastic, his wife a nun. In 494 he accompanied B. Epiphanius of Pavia on his Burgundy mission; in 502 wrote in vindication of Pope Symmachus against Laurentius. He was the first who, in his letters, addressed the B. of Rome as *papa*, and was zealous for the Papal supremacy. In 510 or 511 he succeeded Maximus as B. of Pavia, then was sent by Pope Hormisdas on two missions (1515, 1517) to Emp. Anastasius of Constantinople with reference to the preservation of union between the E. and W. Churches. In both he failed; the second time he and his companion, B. Peregrinus, were even sent out of the country. He died 521. The following writings, by E., have been preserved: 1) several poems, composed before his conversion; 2) a fulsome eulogy upon King Theodorick; 3) Letters, in 9 books, mostly about private affairs, and of little historical value. From Ep. 19, B. II. we discover that he was a Semipelagian, in decided opposition to Augustine's doctrine that since the fall man is only free to do evil; 4) *libellus adv. eos, qui contra Symmachum scribere præsumerunt*, or briefly: *lib. apolog. pro Synodo IV. Rom.*, and by J. v. Trittenheim: *de fide cath. ad Symm. papam*; 5) biogr. of Epiph. B. of Pavia, and of Antony, Monk of Lerina—both fulsome and legendary; 6) *Eucharisticon de vita*, furnishing hints of his own life before his conversion, the title is by Sirmond; 7) *Parænesis didascalica*, to youth; 8) *Præceptum*, a diocesan address; 9) *Petitorium*, touching the liberation of a slave; 10) *Dictiones*, 28, on various subjects (some in DURAND, *Coll. Mon.*, V., 61). The 1st ed. of E's works was publ. Basel, 1569; far better that of Schott, Tournay, 1610; the best, Sirmond's, Paris, 1611 (also in S.'s collected works, Par., 1696, Ven., 1728).—(See *Hist. littér. de la France*, III., 9639; FABRICII, *bibl. lat.* II., 100; DUPIN, *nouvelle bibl. des auteurs eccl.*, V., 12; SCHRÖCKH, *K.-Gesch.*, 17, 204; WIGGERS, *Augustinism. u. Pelagianism.*, II., 356; BÄHR, *d. chr. röm. Theologie*, 1837, p. 406).

HERZOG.*

Enthusiasm, fanatical inspiration, from *ἔνθεος*, filled with a divinity—as Apollo, the god of prophecy. In this sense it must be distinguished from true *inspiration* (see Art.). And yet we may notice points of contact between them, in defining the two conceptions. Inspiration, as such, is a moral power of vast

bonds of selfishness, and the free expansion of the heart and soul; an excitement and elevation of the world of feeling; a self-surrender of soul and body. Hence 2) a surrender to a higher power, a rising above the mere material and tangible. It presupposes, therefore, the presence of an operative, impelling idea, not in the form of an abstract philosophical thought, but in a concrete form; something *ideal*, yet in such a form (of a person, object, or principle) as sets it definitely before the consciousness. Thus there may be an enth. for art, for one's country, for the temperance movement, &c., &c.; and this again will be likely to attach itself to some leader, as the personal representative of the object of the enthusiasm. For 3) such an operative *idea* will *inflare* not one mind only, but many, who may be related, nationally, or may sympathize with each other on some other ground. For not only in religion, but in art, politics, &c., enthusiasm spreads from some given point, kindles a common flame in many breasts, and unites them for a common end. It must, consequently, be acknowledged as a great ethical, moral power, which has sprung up in important epochs of the world's history, and wrought wonderful changes in the life of nations: as in the Crusades, the Reformation, and in mighty political movements. An age of enthusiasm is always a great age. But viewed more closely there is a difference between inspiration and enthusiasm, which we have intimated by the term *fanatical*. 1) as a surrender of self, a being carried away by some ruling idea,—as the "pathos" of passion—*enthusiasm is ever prone to overleap all limits of internal and external feasibility*, to disregard them, to break through all conditions of time and locality,—and by violence to force events. This may secure temporary success, but no enduring results. 2) It is *one-sided*, and fails to take comprehensive views of principles and means. Its sphere of life is *feeling*, and feeling unrestrained by law. Hence its affinity to *fanaticism* (see Art.). 3) It *lacks firmness of will*, is transient; in special matters it is dilettantic, in an age it moves by bounds. If one or two sudden and violent assaults fail, its spirit flags, and it yields. The electric idea which ignited it, exhausts itself, and the flame dies out. The men who eagerly rallied around the uplifted standard scatter, and desert it. Enthusiasm is like a fire kindled with straw; inspiration like the genial illumining light of the sun. But there are *differences* in enthusiasm as such. There is a *genuine* and a *fictional* enthusiasm. The *former* shows its genuineness in its grounds and in its operations. It rests upon a real tangible *idea*, which is its justification, an idea the significance of which constitutes its claim to sympathy, and thus to personal support. The *latter*, when it is excited artificially by one of whom it has not, itself, taken full possession, but who seeks by it to use others for purely selfish ends. The more genuine enthusiasm is, the more enduring; empty, artificial enthusiasm soon vanishes in smoke. It may likewise be distinguished as *pure* and *impure*, and equally in regard to its source, means, and aim. It is impure in its source when the impelling motive, whether in

involves, 1) the breaking of the

the mind in which it originated, or in those who take up and disseminate it, lacks moral force, and is the product of a selfishness which believes in no idea, and cannot appreciate ideal worth, or of caprice and folly, which delight in starting new things. Thus the idea may be objectively good, but is subjectively without moral power, as recently in the case of German Catholicism. The motive idea must be something positive, not a mere negation, which collects only such as are opposed to something existing, but have no definite conception of what they really wish to secure. E. is impure in its *means*, when it has no faith in the inherent power of its idea, and therefore employs extraneous, foreign means—as in the European revolution of 1848. It is impure in its *aim*, when it does not contemplate the welfare of mankind, not even that of those immediately enlisted in its service, but employs them merely in suberviency to its own projects. Thus, at different periods, enthusiasm has scandalized religion, by using it to further the purposes of a hierarchy, caesareopapy, or sectarianism. Pure enthusiasm, on the contrary, makes self a sacrifice to truth, and the good of the world. Its motto is, "one for all."

CARL BECK.*

Epaon.—In order to correct abuses that had crept into the Catholic Church of Burgundy, and to attend to its government in general, Viventius, Archbishop of Lyons, and Avitus, Bishop of Vienne, convened a Council of the Burgundian clergy on 6th Sept., 517, at Epaon. The 24 bishops who had obeyed the summons, soon finished their deliberations, and on 14th Sept., 517, put their names to the memorial they had drawn up "under Divine inspiration." In 40 canons they fixed the relations which should subsist between bishops, clergy, monks, private persons, the state and heretics, and made regulations touching Church property and discipline. Worthy of note are the rules concerning the Arians of Burgundy, c. 15, 16, 29, 33, which forbid the clergy to take a meal with heretics. A layman dare not dine with a Jew under penalty of being never invited to sit at table with a Catholic priest. If sick unto death, and he desire it, a priest can administer the sacrament to a heretic; if well, he must have recourse to a bishop. Though the King Siegmund had a short time previous to the Council joined the Catholic Church, its proceedings were not adapted to conciliate his Arian subjects, who seemed to be in the majority. Nor was he himself by any means satisfied with the hierarchical temper of the bishops who had presumed to govern the Church without any consultation with himself. Circumstances afforded him an opportunity for venting his displeasure. The 30th canon forbade marriage between relations; also that with the sister of a deceased wife. Stephanus, an esteemed and powerful courtier, had married his sister-in-law, and still retained his position. The Council, dreading the vengeance of the King, hurriedly closed its sittings. Eleven of the assembled bishops, however, retired to Lyons, and under the presidency of Viventius, re-affirmed the condemnation of Stephanus and Palladia, pronounced it against all guilty of the same sin,

and pledged each other a mutual support in the event of persecution. And in case the King separated himself from the Church, they would retire to cloisters, and remain there until their prayers had reduced him again to allegiance. Against any bishop who would discharge their functions whilst absent, excommunication was pronounced by 4th canon. The same punishment was visited by 5th canon on any one who might be consecrated to fill their places. The 6th canon, however, declared that the King should be obeyed, and that Stephanus and Palladia should be allowed to pray at holy places until after the reading of the Gospel. In the end Siegmund became their pliant and obedient servant. Though the freedom of the Burgundian Church passed away with the incorporation of Burgundy with France, 13 of the canons of Epaon were included in the 24 can. added to the 47 adopted by the Council of Agde (506). The following can. correspond with each other: Epaon, can. 4 = Agath, can. 55; Ep. c. 6 = Ag. c. 52; Ep. c. 7 = Ag. c. 53; Ep. c. 8 = Ag. c. 54 and 56; Ep. c. 9 = Ag. c. 57; Ep. c. 10 = Ag. c. 58; Ep. c. 17 = Ag. c. 51; Ep. c. 18 = Ag. c. 59; Ep. c. 29 = Ag. c. 60; Ep. c. 30 = Ag. c. 61; Ep. c. 34 = Ag. c. 62; Ep. c. 35 = Ag. c. 63. For many centuries attempts have been made to determine what town is meant by Epaon, there being no longer a place by that name. It is certain that it denotes some town in the kingdom of Burgundy. Claudius Castellanus, as early as 519, contended that by Epaon was meant the small Savoyan town Yenne or Hyenne, on the left bank of the Rhone, opposite Beley. Ukert (*Geography of Greeks and Romans*, II., 7: 454) thinks that Etanna named on the second Peutinger table as on the right bank of the Rhone, is the present Yenne. According to *Chorier* (*histoire générale de Dauphiné*, pp. 583–586), it is the little town Ponas, situate between Vienne and Lyons, and in the *Mémoires de Trevoux* (Fevr., 1715), mention is made of an *Epaona sine Tortilianum*, near to Vienne.—Comp. MANSI, *Collectio Conciliorum*, T. VIII., 319–342, 347–372, 555–574; LABBE, *Dissertatio philosophica de Concilio Epauensi*; J. J. CHIFFLET, *Dissertatio de loco legitimo Concilii Epauensis*.

ALBRECHT VOGEL.—*Ermentrout*.

Epaphras, born in Colosse (Col. 4: 12), member of the Church there, teacher and deacon (*διακονος*). Welte, in his Church Lexicon, gives no proof for the assertion that he was the founder of this congregation; it is more probable from Col. 2: 5 (*ἀνεμι*), and 1: 7 (*χαί*), that Paul established it, either after his first journey from Ephesus, Acts 18: 23 (comp. Schneckenburger in Zeller's *Jahr Buch*, 1850, 3, 313), or during his second sojourn there, 19: 8. This worthy co-worker with Paul (Col. 1: 7; 4: 12), seems to have extended his labors to Laodicea and Hieropolis (Col. 4: 13). Love for the apostle took him to Rome, where Paul was a prisoner, 60–62 A.D. (Col. 2: 1, 5, 8, 18, 20–23; 3: 8, &c.). There he himself was made a prisoner, Philemon v. 23. The Martyrologies mention him as the first Bishop of Colosse, where he died a confessor (see *Epaphroditus*).

VAHINGER.—*Ermentrout*.

Epaphroditus, a distinguished Christian and leader of the congregation at Philippi, in Macedonia, called by Paul a co-laborer and an apostle of the Church at Philippi. In order to nurse Paul in his imprisonment, he was despatched to Rome with liberal contributions (Phil. 4: 18). Whilst here he was sick nigh unto death (Phil. 2: 27). To console the Philippians, on his recovery, Paul sent him back with the Epistle bearing this name. From the title "your Apostle," Theodoret supposes that he might have been bishop in Philippi; he was so-called, however, as is most probable, to designate him as an ambassador of the congregation (see John 13: 16; comp. 1 Kings 14: 6).

Grotius and others supposed that, as their names were similar, they were one and the same individual. But the name Epaphrodet was quite common (*Tac. Annal.* 15, 55; *Sueton. Dom.* 14; *Joseph.*, vita 76). Besides the one labored in Colosse, Laodicea, and Hierophilus, the other in Philippi and Macedonia. Comp. Epaphras. **VAIHINGER.**—*Ermentrout.*

Eparchy, a province, consisting of several districts, and forming part of a diocese. This political division of the Roman empire, to which allusions are found in the *Notitia dignitatum et administrationum utriusque imperii* of a. 400–404 (*ed. Boecking.*, Bonn. 1839, sq.), was adopted in the organization of the Church. Those having charge of districts became Bishops: those of the eparchies, in their chief towns, Metropolitans; those of the dioceses, Patriarchs. This is apparent from c. 4 of the Council of Nice: τὸ δὲ πῦρος τῶν γινόμενων δίδωσθαι καὶ ἑκάστην ἐπαρχίαν τῷ μητροπολίτῃ, as transl. by Dion. in c. 1, dist. LXIV.: *Potestas sane vel confirmatio pertinebit per singulas provincias ad metropolitanum episcopum.* Hence the explanation of *Macarius of Ancyra* (in *Suicer, thes. eccl.*, I., 1159): ἐπαρχία λέγεται ἡ ἑκάστης μητροπόλεως ἐνορία (see *Bishopric*). This mode of expression so far changed in the later Greek and Russian C. that eparchy was used to designate the episcopal diocese; because the distinction between metropolitans, archbishops, and bishops, disappeared in everything but the title and external rank. (See *STRAHL, Gesch. d. russ. K.* (Halle, 1830), Th. I., p. 671, &c.). **H. F. JACOBSON.***

Ephesus, Robber Synod (σύνδος ληστρικὴ, so-called, first by Leo, *epist.* 95), the name given to the Synod, held Aug., 449, in reference to Eutychianism (see *Art.*). As its object was particular, although properly œcumenical, it was stricken from the list of regular Church Councils, by the Synod, which afterwards met at Chalcedon. Its spirit and probable results were foreshadowed by the measures taken to bring it to pass. The imperial proclamation, declaring its proper object to be the utter extirpation of the arch-heresy of Nestorianism, and that no one would be allowed to speak, who was not fully satisfied with the Nicene and Ephesian creeds, and ready to submit implicitly to the judgment of the presidents; the order also to arrest all who attempted to agitate anything to the prejudice of the holy faith, and the authority given the president to employ the military to enforce it; the arbitrary exclusion of all who favored the Antiochian form of doctrine,

especially of Theodoret, for the undisguised reason that he had spoken against the views of Cyril; on the other hand, the no less objectionable introduction of the fanatical Abbot Barsumas, as the representative of Oriental monasticism: these and other preliminary arrangements, were so many indications that the Synod was not intended to come to an impartial decision as to Eutyches, or to the promotion of truth in any way, but merely to favor the previously concerted intrigues of the ruling court party. The first instance of violence was the attack upon the Bishop of Ephesus, whose soldiers and monks were threatened with death, because he had hospitably entertained the enemies of the Emperor, as those were regarded who favored the Synod of Antioch. Nor was it without significance, that the patriarch Flavianus of Constantinople, in an assembly of perhaps 130 bishops, amongst whom were two legates from the Bishop of Rome, was only admitted to the fifth seat, and took rank after the Bishops of Antioch and Jerusalem. The patriarch *Dioscurus* of Alexandria was honored with the presidency. He succeeded Cyril in 444, and was a man whose unlicensed ambition was only equalled by his rapacity. Accustomed to look upon Egypt, in a certain sense, as his province, he ordered everything according to his own will and pleasure, and regarded the exclusive prevalence of the Alexandrian doctrines, as the means of promoting his profoundly laid hierarchical plans; and thought everything right that was required for their accomplishment. In entering upon his bishopric, instead of protecting the friends and relatives of his predecessors committed to his care, he robbed them, banished them from the city, and threatened their lives. In the habit himself of trampling upon all law, civil and ecclesiastical, he permitted no free expression of opinion to go unpunished. If, indeed, the charges brought against him by the Synod of Chalcedon were but half true, no one will deny that his proper place would have been at the head of a band of robbers, instead of being one of the dignitaries of the Church. That he might at once place everything at variance with the Alexandrian theory of doctrine in the light of a heresy contradictory of the teachings of the Fathers, he had the address at the opening of the proceedings at Ephesus, to declare that every innovation upon the Nicene and Ephesian creeds, as universally received, or any investigation or discussion of the same, would be inadmissible, inasmuch as it called in question the grace of the Holy Ghost, under whose inspiration the decrees were drawn up. To this piece of trickery the witless assembly paid the tribute of their vociferous approbation. After the citation of Eutyches, one of his petitions was read, in which, after solemnly declaring that he held firmly to the confession adopted at Nice and Ephesus, condemning every heretic from Simon, the magician, down to Nestorius, he earnestly asked for protection and a new investigation. So little did the Synod regard it necessary to maintain the appearance of impartiality, that they did not even allow Eusebius, the Bishop of Dorylaum, the accuser of Eutyches, the hearing he desired. With great

dexterity Dioscurus also prevented the communication of Bishop Leo of Rome, verified upon oath, from reaching the Synod. At the reading of the acts of the provincial Synod of Constantinople, in 448, when they came to the acknowledgment of the two natures in Christ after his incarnation, the meeting broke up in the wildest disorder, with the cry: away with Eusebius! burn him alive! as he has divided Christ, so must he be torn into two pieces! (Mansi, VI., 737). Eutyches, recognized as orthodox, according to the Alexandrian confessions, was restored to his office and rank, and with him, the monks of his cloisters, having renewed the professions of their faith, were again received into the communion of the Church. This reaffirmation of the Ephesian decrees had the effect indirectly of establishing the Alexandrian theory of one nature, as the only orthodox view, and of revising the Ephesian canon, that no one should be allowed to teach anything to the contrary, or to change or disturb, in any way, the acknowledged faith. This blow was aimed directly at Flavianus and Eusebius of Dorylaeum, although other distinguished bishops of the East, such as Theoderet, Domnus of Antioch, and Ibas of Edessa, were included in this anathema. The vote was carried by acclamation; the only dissenting voice was that of the Roman deacon, Hilarus, one of the Pope's legates. Flavianus presented an oral and written appeal to the Bishop of Rome, and to another Synod, to be convoked by him in Italy. From first to last Dioscurus controlled the terrified assembly with threats and abuse. When a *viva voce* vote was not in accordance with his wish, he would call for a show of hands. Many of the members were cowardly enough to retract the confession of the two natures, which they had made at Constantinople, so that the reproach of having falsified the acts was made to rest upon Flavianus (Mansi VI., 637, 688, &c.). Those who ventured to speak after his condemnation, were told: he who does not subscribe, has me for his enemy. After the reading of the sentence, when several bishops rose from their seats, and embracing his knees, begged him not to be guilty of an act of such gross injustice to an innocent man, he furiously repelled them, exclaiming: if his tongue were cut out, he would pronounce no other judgment! Glad of this opportunity he at once proceeded to violence, and called out in a voice of thunder that resounded through the assembly: you are exciting tumult! officers here! This was the signal for the commencement of those disgraceful scenes, which, as long as a sense of justice remains in the human breast, will brand this assembly with the name of the Robber Synod. Behind the soldiery who now entered the church, there rushed in also a crowd of fanatical monks, together with the rabble of the city. A blank sheet of paper was placed before the bishops, and the cry was, cut down every man that speaks of two natures, or that refuses to subscribe. Those who hesitated were abused and locked up in the church. The notaries of the independent bishops were driven from the writing-desks, lest any account of their shameful proceedings should be made public.

The brutality was so great, that Dioscurus knocked Flavianus down, and trampled him with his feet; although at Chalcedon Barsumas was charged with his murder. Hilarus, the Roman deacon, escaped with difficulty, and reached Rome in disguise; having solemnly protested against their decisions as irreconcilable with the Catholic faith, and declaring that they never would receive the sanction of the Apostolic chair. Such substantially was the character and termination of a Synod, of which the Emperor Theodosius II., the Augustus of the Western Empire, willingly imposed upon, perhaps, by a falsified protocol, affirmed that there was nothing in its proceedings contrary to the rule of faith and righteousness, but that as its proper results, it had contributed to general peace and harmony and truth in the Church (Mansi VI. 67). For more information, see Art. *Eutychianism*. Principal sources: *Verhandlungen des chalced. Concils*, in MANSI. *Bearbeitungen*: SCHRÖCKH, *Christl. Kirchengesch.* XVIII.; NEANDER, *Ch. Hist.*; ILLGEN's *Zeitschr. für d. hist. Theol.*, 1838, H. I., p. 39. &c. SEMISCH. — Dr. Wolff.

Ephesus, a city of Asia Minor, visited for a short time by the Apostle Paul, in company with Aquila and Priscilla, upon his return from Corinth, during his second missionary tour, Acts 18: 19-21. Aquila and Priscilla remained when Paul left, and were instrumental in the conversion of Apollos. Upon his third journey, the Apostle returned to this place, and continued there two years and three months, teaching first in the synagogue and then in the school of one Tyrannus, and organized a church made up of those who had received John's baptism. The success of the Apostle excited the fears of the Ephesians, that their great goddess, Diana, would be brought into discredit, and led on by Demetrius, a goldsmith, they raised a great tumult, endangering the lives of the Apostle and his companions. Upon leaving the city the Apostle left Timothy behind to guard against impure doctrines (1 Tim. 1: 3), which led to the tradition that Timothy was the first bishop of Ephesus. The Epistle to the Ephesians was written by Paul during his imprisonment, and was transmitted by Tychicus. In the revelations of St. John, Ephesus is one of the churches to which the Apostle addresses himself, and in ch. 2: 1-7, a favorable testimony is borne to its members. According to tradition, John himself, after his return from exile in Patmos, lived and died at a great age in Ephesus, and with Mary, the mother of our Lord, was also buried there. Their graves were still to be found at the time of the Crusades, (see Art. *John the Ap.*). The city subsequently became the seat of a bishopric, and in the years 431 and 449 two remarkable Synods were held within its walls. The ancient Ephesus, one of the most celebrated cities of Asia Minor, lay upon the bank of the Cayster near the sea, between Smyrna and Miletus (Plin. II., 87). The original inhabitants, according to Strabo, were the Carians and Leleges; Pliny and Step. Byzant. suppose that it was built by the Amazons (according to Mela, 1, 17, and Solin. Polyhist. c. 40, the Amazons only dedicated

the temple of Diana), and adduce a number of names by which it was said to have been called. When the Ionians emigrated to Asia Minor, under the command of Androclus, a son of Codrus, they took possession of the city, extended it, and made it the capital of the twelve cities of the province (Strabo, XIV., p. 682, &c.). It was afterwards captured by Croesus (Herod, I, 26), came then under Persian and Grecian rule, and under the Romans was the chief city of *Proconsular Asia*. After the division of the Roman empire, it fell into the hands of the eastern monarch, and subsequently into those of the Arabs and Turks. In ancient times the city was celebrated for its commerce (Pliny, V., 31, mentions the nations that attended its markets), and still more as the principal seat of the worship of the great goddess, honored by the Grecians under the name of the Ephesian Diana. She is the same with the great Asiatic goddess of nature, Anaitis, whose service was spread over the larger portion of anterior Asia, see HYDE, *de rel. vet. Pers.*, p. 92, &c.; RELANDI, *diss. Miscell.*, p. 118, &c.; CREUZER, *Symbolik*, II, S. 190; GESENIUS, *Mon. Phœnici*, p. 155, &c. Her temple at Ephesus was one of the seven wonders of the world. The building of it, to which King Croesus and the cities of Asia Minor contributed, took 220 years. According to the description of it by Pliny, *Hist. Nat.*, XXXIV., 21, its length was 425 feet, and its breadth 220, and was adorned with 127 columns, each 60 feet high. The altar was the work of Praxiteles. This temple was set on fire by Herostratus, the night Alexander the Great was born, for the purpose of perpetuating his name to posterity. To prevent this, the Ephesians decreed that no historian should mention his name, which however was done by Theopompus. It was replaced by a still more magnificent edifice, to the erection of which the Ephesian ladies contributed their ornaments. This temple may also have been rebuilt more than once, at least Pliny, XVI., 79, says that at the seventh reconstruction, the image of the goddess remained unchanged. About the middle of the third century it was at last utterly destroyed by the Goths, (*Hist. Aug.*, p. 178, comp. Gibbon, *Hist.*, cap. X). Small silver images of the temple were made and sold to the worshippers of the goddess, and the apprehension that Paul's preaching might interfere with this traffic led to the uproar excited by the goldsmith, Demetrius. Of the ancient magnificence of the plan, nothing now remains but ruins; even the name is lost; for the village lying north of these ruins is called Ajasoluk, derived probably from *ἅγιος θεόλογος*, and referring to the Apostle John. The ruins consist of the remains of the great theatre, a circus, several palaces, some relics of the temple, and a few tombstones. See POCOCKE, *Descript. of the East*; and, more recently, FELLOWS's *Journal of Excurs. in Asia Minor*.
 ARNOLD.—*Dr. Wolff*.

Ephod (עִפְדָּן, Sept. *ἐπωμίς*, Vulgate *superhumera*, Luth. Leibrock), the cape, a short cloak of the high-priest, worn on his dress, or long gown, during the discharge of official duties, and covered in part with the breast-plate, together with the

Urim and Thummim. We have a description of it in Ex. 28:6-11; and 39:2-5. According to this it was made of fine woven linen, inwrought with threads of gold and ornaments of blue, and purple, and scarlet, and consisted of two pieces, which, like a surplice, hung down upon the breast and back. The two pieces were held fast together upon the shoulders with clasps of onyx stones: upon each the names of six of the tribes of Israel were inscribed. Around the waist, the two folds of the Ephod were adjusted by a girdle worked in the same way. Over the Ephod, or short cloak, in front upon the breast, was the official breast-plate, four square and a span long on each side, (עֶפְדָּן Sept. λογίον τῶν κρίσεων, Vulg. *rationale judicii*), a sort of purse or pocket, similar in workmanship and material to the Ephod, and connected with it at the shoulder pieces by means of small chains of pure gold running through the rings, and fastened at the same time below to the surplice by a blue lace passing through two rings, so as to be secure. Upon the official breast-plate were four rows of precious stones, three in a row, each stone inscribed with the name of one of the twelve tribes of Israel. In front upon the open breast-plate, were the Urim and Thummim, probably two sacred stones of judgment, with which the high-priest prophesied. (Instances, 1 Sam. 10:20, 22; 23:9-12; 30:7). It would seem that this piece of apparel, in the same or similar form, was the official dress in ancient times and amongst the oldest nations. Among the ruins of Persepolis, we meet with the pictures of persons in similar costume. If then the Ephod properly belonged to the priestly apparel, or was used upon festival occasions, it is not surprising that we meet with it made of ordinary material, as used by common priests, 1 Sam. 2:18; 22:18, or that David himself should have worn it in a sacred procession, 2 Sam. 6:14. Inasmuch as in Israel the Ephod was regarded as the *official dress* of the high-priest, to wear it is frequently spoken of as equivalent to being high-priest, 1 Sam. 2:28; 14:3. Thus too it may have happened, that in the consciousness of the people, they ascribed to it, as was the case with the brazen serpent, a magical operation, and that they made use of imitations of the same in gold and silver in connection with the teraphim as household gods privately for idolatrous worship, as may be seen from the history of Gideon: Jud. 8:27, and Micah: Jud. 17:5, and much later, Hosea 3:4.

VAHINGER.—*Dr. Wolff*.

Ephräm (the Syr. form of Ephraim), commonly known as Ephräm Syrus, is the most prominent Syrian Church Father of the 4th cent., and at the same time the most distinguished orator and hymnologist. Having a reputation for eminent sanctity, *Mar*, or as the Maronites pronounce it, *Mor* (properly *Mari*), that is, "Lord," was prefixed to his name. He was also called "the pillar of the Church," "the Syrian Prophet," the "persuasive mouth," and as a pious poet, "the harp of the Holy Ghost." In the memoirs written of him there is mixed up much that is traditionary and marvellous. Besides his so-called confessions, and his pre-

tended Testament, extant in the Greek and Armenian languages, we have his full biography in Syriac, which, however, is not fully reliable. In modern times, Hoffmann, Hahn, Credner, von Lengerke, Alsleben, and others, have written concerning him. He was born in Mesopotamia, as he himself says in his commentary upon Genesis. According to Sozomenus, and the Syrian biographer, his birth-place was Nesibis, in the early part of the reign of Constantine the Great, although he lived also at Edessa. His father, it is said, was a pagan priest, who punished his son for conversing with a Christian. Jacob, the Bishop of Nesibis, took the boy under his protection, instructed him, and afterwards appointed him tutor in the school which he had established. It is also said that he accompanied the Bishop to the Council of Nice, which, however, is doubtful. He studied the Scriptures profoundly, and became learned as a theologian. He soon acquired great reputation among his cotemporaries, for his strict orthodoxy, and ascetic devotion. In the year 363, when the Emperor Jovinian surrendered Nesibis to the Persians, Ephräm removed to Roman territory, lived awhile in Amed, his mother's birth-place, and finally settled in Edessa, which then already was regarded as the emporium of Syriac learning. He there became acquainted with the hermits, determined upon a monastic life, and lived as a monk in a cave near the city, where, with prayer and fasting, he employed himself in the study of the Scriptures and writing theological books, frequently preaching repentance to the monks and the people, and opposing most earnestly every form of error and idolatry. In his polemical writings he combated the various forms of pagan worship prevalent in his day, the Chaldaic astrology, as well as the heresies of Bardesanes and Harmonius, of Arius and Sabellius, the Manichaeans and Novatians, Apollinarians, Marcion, &c. We are also told that he established a school at Edessa, which was continued after his death.—At a later period of his life, Ephräm also made a journey to Egypt, where, according to tradition, he spent eight years among the hermits of that country, and wrote several books in the Coptic language. He afterwards went to Cæsarea, in Cappadocia, for the purpose of making the acquaintance of Basilus the Great, who received him with distinguished honor, and ordained him a deacon. According to the Syriac biography, and the testimony of (pseudo)-Amphilochius, their first meeting was marked by the miracle that Ephräm was enabled immediately to speak in the Greek language, and Basilus in the Syriac, and they were capable of conversing without an interpreter. This improbable story is introduced in connection with the more important question, whether Ephräm was at all acquainted with the Greek language, and thus able to read the original text of the New Test., the Septuagint, and the writings of the Greek Fathers. There is a difference of opinion upon this point; and although a knowledge of the Greek was not unusual at that time amongst cultivated Syrians, still we have nothing in the Syriac writings of Ephräm to establish the facts; and just as little to assure us that he had more than a superficial

acquaintance with the Hebrew. His residence at Cæsarea was short. He soon returned to the scene of his earlier labors at Edessa, where he died during the reign of the Emperor Valens, according to some in 373, perhaps not before 378.

Ephräm was a copious and very distinguished theological writer. His numerous writings, a part only of which appear in the Syriac original, and other portions in Greek, Latin, and Armenian translations, are most complete as published by Jos. Simon Asseman in the *Biblioth. Orientalis*, T. I., p. 59–164, and in the *Prolegomena* of the Roman edition of Ephräm's works. Comp. also HARLESS, *Fabric. Biblioth. graec.*, Vol. VIII., p. 219, &c.

The writings in Greek, yet extant, ascribed to Ephräm, consist chiefly of spiritual discourses, homilies, and tracts, of an exegetic, dogmatic, paraitic, and ascetic character. Of such dissertations, Photius was acquainted with fifty-two, and supposes there were more than a thousand. Sozomen is also of the opinion that he must have written 300 myriads of verses. He mentions his poetic tracts against Bardesanes and Harmonius, and says that his writings in his lifetime already were translated into Greek; a statement confirmed by the testimony of Chrysostom and Jerome. Of the printed writings in Greek there are several that can scarcely be attributed to Ephräm, and others are so much involved in suspicion that their authenticity can only be established by the production of the Syriac original. But few of his writings exist in this original form; more of them have an Arabic translation, made at first from the Greek. We are not, however, with *Tzschirner*, to infer from this, that Ephräm composed some of his writings in Greek, although one of his paraneses is arranged after the order of the Greek alphabet.

In many of the Eastern churches, as stated by Jerome, several of Ephräm's sermons were read in public worship after the Scripture lessons. The same honor was paid to them in the West, where some of them were, at an early period, translated into Latin, and included in their ancient Homilies (*Assem. Proleg.*, &c.). In the 16th cent., and indeed as early as the 15th cent., smaller collections of Ephräm's discourses were printed in Latin. The first larger collection contained the Latin translations made by *Ger. Vossius* from Greek manuscripts in the Vatican and other Italian libraries, and published in three folio volumes at Rome, in 1589, 1583, and 1598. It was reprinted in 1603 and 1619 at Cologne, and in 1619 also at Antwerp. In 1709, the first new complete Greek edition, containing 156 discourses, appeared at Oxford under the supervision of *Edw. Thwaites*. The principal edition, however, is that which appeared at Rome in the year 1732–1746, in six folio vols., under the auspices of the Pope. Clement XI. already had bought up manuscripts for the purpose in the East, although the printing was only commenced by Clement XII., and was carried on chiefly by the librarian of the Vatican, Cardinal *Angelus Maria Quirinus*. The edition consists of three volumes in the Greek, and three in the Syriac text, with Latin translations.

The first volume of the Greek work appeared in 1732, prepared and furnished with copious prolegomena by the learned Maronite, Jos. Sim. Asseman. As he, however, was sent to Syria upon a mission by the Pope for several years, the publishing of the succeeding volumes was left in the hands of the Maronite and Jesuit *Peter Benedict* (Mobarek). In 1737 the first volume of the Syriac work appeared, which was followed by the second in 1740. During the printing of the third volume *Benedict* died. It then passed into the hands of Step. Evod. Asseman, the nephew of Jos. Sim. Asseman, who finished it in 1743. In the meantime, Jos. Sim. Asseman returned, who finally published the second and third volumes of the Greek work, and brought it to an end. The Oxford edition is based upon the Greek text, but its deficiencies and mistakes are filled up and corrected from the Italian manuscripts; the Latin translation is essentially that of Ger. Vossius. The translation of the Syriac text by Pet. Benedict and Step. Evod. Asseman (the latter translated from page 425 of the 3d vol. to the end) is very free and often arbitrary and unreliable. The critical treatment of the Syriac text is also defective, owing in part to the paucity and imperfect character of the manuscripts. A new collection of the manuscripts is accordingly very desirable. Nineteen hymns selected from the Roman edition were edited and illustrated in HAHN and SIEFFERT'S *Chrestomathia Syriaca sive S. Eph. carmina selecta* (Lips., 1825, 8vo.). Hahn has treated of others in his *Bardesanes Gnosticus*, and in his tract on the Psalmody of the Syrian Church (in *Stäudlin kirchenhist. Archiv*, 1823). Many of his discourses and hymns have been happily translated into German by *Pius Zingerle*: "Select writings of the H. C. Father, Ephräm:" Insbruck, 1830-38, 8vo., &c.; the "Complete works of the Church Fathers," Vol. 38, part 1: Kempten, 1850, 8vo. The funeral hymns have been recently translated into Italian. There has also been an elegant translation of the metrical hymns and homilies of Ephräm the Syrian, with illustrations by Henry Burgess: London, 1853, 2 vols., 12mo.; also, *The Repentance of Nineveh*, a metrical Homily on the Mission of Jonah and some smaller pieces: London, 1853, 12mo. Comp. Zeitsch. d. D. Morgenl. Gesellschaft., Bd IX. p. 285, &c. *Alsleben* has in contemplation a new complete edition of his works.

Of Ephräm's writings in the Syriac language, we mention, first of all, his commentary upon the books of the Bible. This commentary, at least so far as the Pentateuch is concerned, was written during the later period of his life, for in it he refers to his Homilies. The commentary upon the Psalms is wanting in the Roman edition, although the Cod. Vatic. 752 contains fragmentary portions of it in Greek. Of Ephräm's commentary on the N. T., the Roman editors could discover no manuscripts, although later Syriac writers testify that he expounded the Gospels, and that, too, according to the Tatian Diatessaron, fragments of which in Greek still exist. Of his commentary upon the Pauline Epistles, we have an Armenian translation, so that the commendation of Gregory, of Nyssa, "that Ephräm commented upon the whole Bible, from

the first book of Creation to the last book of Grace," is altogether and literally true.

The remaining Syriac writings of Ephräm are all composed in verses, that is, in lines of the same number of syllables, generally seven, although without regard to prosodic measure, and these are grouped in stanzas of different compass, from four to twelve lines. Rhyme and accent are only occasionally regarded, and that without any particular rule. This very mechanical sort of rhythm was certainly not inappropriate to the elevated tone of the Ephrämian homilies, and especially the earnest and solemn character and grandiloquence of satirical discourses in general, at the same time that it would be too external and monotonous, if the expression and the thought were extended too far, which was not unfrequently the case. It was only his compositions of a tenderer character which really possessed poetic merit; such as his elegiac odes, his funeral hymns, and the rhetorical parts of passages in which the judgments of God, the torments of the damned, the terrors of death, the inward power and blessedness of faith, the love of the Saviour, or something of the kind was described.

Besides these published works of Ephräm (see the list in ASSEMAN'S *Bibl. Critic.*, Tom. 1, p. 63, &c.), some of his writings are yet in manuscript, and much has been lost. Amongst these are his seven metrical tracts, *de Ecclesia*. Also, a chronicle from the Creation down to the time of Christ, in six periods, each of a thousand years, containing a great deal of traditionary and apocryphal matter relating to primal biblical history, bears the name of Ephräm, and is to be met with in a Codex Vatican., and also in a manuscript belonging to the British Museum. It is there found immediately after the testament of Ephräm, and it is possible that the author may have been more recent than Ephräm, and may have only availed himself of his writings. In the liturgical books of the Syrian Church, many of the hymns and prayers, &c., bear his name, although it is certain that he never wrote them. To such belong the two prayers at the end of the baptismal Form prepared by *Guido Fabricius Roderianus*, Antw., 1572, and improperly ascribed to Severus. They are also printed in the *Opp. Graec.*, p. 605, and greatly improved. In the three Syriac parts of the Rom. edition, there is also more or less that is spurious, as may easily be seen in several additions and interpolations.

Ephräm was a man of inward and strict integrity. As a champion of the orthodox faith, as well as a zealous popular orator, and theological writer, he maintained a highly honorable position in the ancient Syrian Church. As a commentator, with all his defects and advantages, he is best and most faithfully described by *Lengerke* in his work: *De Ephraemi Syri arte hermeneutica*: Königsb., 1831). He does not expound the original text of the Scriptures, but the Syriac translation, the Peschito, which may be much improved by the use of his commentary. His occasional references to the Hebrew, and to the Septuagint, rest exclusively upon oral interrogatories and the Syriac annotations. Of the Apocrypha, which is sometimes adverted

to, and other New Testament books, wanting in the Peschito, such as 2d and 3d John, 2 Pet., Jude, and Revelations, as made use of by Ephräm, there were Syriac translations then in existence. His commentaries, accordingly, were especially serviceable in the critical study and illustration of the Peschito, although they also contained much that was useful in explanation of the original. — The doctrinal value of Ephräm's writings, and his precise theological standpoint have not yet been clearly and distinctly exhibited. It has been partially done by *Hahn*, *Uhlman*, and others. *Tschirner* describes him in his peculiarities as an orator, but only as seen in his Greek writings. The poetic merit of his works we find appreciated by *Zingerle* and *Burgess*. Ephräm wrote especially for the people, and for this purpose chose the metrical form, by means of which the heresies of *Bardesanes* and *Harmonius* obtained such a wide circulation. The doctrines he promulgated were those then prevalent in the Church. He was not accustomed to explain them learnedly, but to present them in a parnetic way, less in a dogmatic than a pathetic form. He insisted upon a believing reception of the same without philosophical speculation. He required moral strictness, demanded an ascetic mode of life, despised and condemned all worldly employments, and these requisitions and principles he enforced by his own example. The Holy Scriptures, as to form and contents, were the basis of his whole literary activity; still he did not hesitate to give to the words of Scripture a poetic or rhetorical expansion, or to admit a slight apocryphal tradition, or even a legendary embellishment. His elocution is often graphic, sometimes dramatic, although not always at the right place, for instance, the way in which Mary speaks to the child Jesus. He delights in exclamations and apostrophe, antitheses, and an ingenious play upon words, frequent and striking pictures, which, in the way of diversified comparison, he made use of and applied, sometimes even to insipid superfluity and far-fetched sport. His exhibitions generally had a great deal of outward adornment; he knew how to avail himself of the external means of oratory, although it frequently also betrayed him into bombast and extravagance, and diffuseness perfectly wearisome. His language was affecting, for it was generally addressed to human joys and sorrows, it described the conflicts and storms of life, as well as its undisturbed repose. He knew how to excite fear and alarm, when he portrayed to the sinner his punishment, or the judgments of God on the fate of the damned; but he also knew how to encourage and comfort when it pleased him to preach of the hope of the believing soul, or the joys of eternal salvation. His discourses would sweetly ring with mild and soft tones when he delineated the peaceful rest of the pious, and the inward joys of the believing saint; it stormed and thundered when he castigated the heretic, or reproved pride and obstinacy. Ephräm was a spirited and skilful speaker, and the measure of his poetic gifts was well calculated to make him effective as a teacher among the people. See the writer's

article "Ephräm," in the *Hall. Encyclop.*, and *Aschbachs allg. Kirchen Lexikon Bd. II., § 613.*

E. RÖDIGER. — *Dr. Wolff.*

Ephraim (עֲפְרַיִם, fruitfulness, from פֶּרָה, as אֶפְרָא with א prefixed, Gen. 41:52; Hos. 13:15). — 1. The name of the second son of the patriarch Joseph, and of the tribe proceeding from him, Jacob out of pure love to Joseph adopted him, together with his brother, Manasseh, as a child, and gave him an equal portion with the rest of his children, preferring him on account of his future significance to his older brothers. Gen. 48:1-19. It is true that the tribe, which, at the time of their departure from Egypt, numbered 40,500 fighting men, whilst that of Manasseh consisted of 32,200, Numb. 1:32-35, was reduced by misfortune in the wilderness to 32,500, according to the second enumeration at the close of their wanderings, when at the same time Manasseh had increased to 52,700 (Numb. 26:34, 37); for which reason, owing to the discretion of Joshua, who belonged to this tribe, it received, as compared with Manasseh in the division of the land, an inferior inheritance, with which it also was dissatisfied (Josh. 17:15). But under Joshua already, who gave them by lot a very fruitful tract of country intermediate between the tribes of Dan and Benjamin, and the half tribe of Manasseh, reaching from the Mediterranean to the Jordan, and still more under the Judges, it attained again to a consciousness of its strength and decided superiority; which may have been increased by the fact that until the death of Eli, the tabernacle and ark of the covenant were kept in Shiloh as the central point of Palestine (Josh. 18:1; 1 Sam. 1:3, &c.). Its numbers at a later period are given in 1 Chron. 12:30, and it may thence be inferred that many of the people in the time of the Judges had settled among other tribes. In this tribe it was that the idea of a monarchy was first entertained and intimated to Gideon, Jud. 8:22, and afterwards for a short time realized under Abimelech. Samuel also, who was of this tribe, gave to it additional significance. After the death of Saul, the tribe of Ephraim, jealous of the spiritual superiority of Judah, took Ishbosheth, and, in connection with the ten other tribes, made him King, 2 Sam. 2:9; and when he was assassinated they submitted to David, without, however, being able to overcome their aversion to the tribe of Judah, 2 Sam. 19:41. After the death of Solomon, they again separated from Judah and the house of David, finally and forever, the prophet Ahijah, an Ephraimitic Shilomite, having proposed the step (1 Kings 11:29). The chief seat of the new kingdom (Sichem, Thirza, Samaria) was uniformly in this tribe, and Ephraim was the name generally given to it by the prophets, Is. 7:2; 9:9; 11:13; 28:1; Hos. 4:17; Wisdom 47:23.

2. The name of a mountain and forest. The mountain, which in Josh. 17:15; 19:50, and Jud. 3:27; 4:5; 1 Sam. 1:1; 9:4; 2 Sam. 20:21, is called Mount Ephraim, and in Josh. 11:16, 21, the mountain of Israel, in which passage it is carefully distinguished from the moun-

tain of Judah, commences in the plain of Esdraelon, near the village of Ginea, and extending beyond the southern boundary of Ephraim in the direction of Jerusalem, it is then joined to the mountains of Judah. It consists of lofty ridges covered with forests, and pervaded by long and fruitful valleys, becoming narrower and milder as they approach towards Judah. *Ritter*, 2, 392; *Schub.* 3, 127. The prominent mountains in the tribe of Ephraim were Zalmon, near Shechem, Jud. 9: 48; Ps. 68: 14, Ebal, the northern, and Gerizim the southern peak of Mount Ephraim, Gaas, (Josh. 24: 30), and the mount of the Amelekites, Jud. 12: 15. — The forest of Ephraim, 2 Sam. 18: 6, comp. Josh. 17: 15, was doubtless in the north-eastern part of the tribe towards Jordan and Succoth. There was fought the decisive battle between the armies of Absalom and David, to the advantage of the latter. *Ewald*, *Isr. Gesch.*, 2, 656, and *Thenius* upon 2 Sam. 17: 22, 24, improperly place the forest on the east of Jordan. If, for instance, *Ewald* is unable to conceive why David, in case he was on the side of Jordan next to Jerusalem, did not at once proceed thither, it is nevertheless perfectly intelligible that, in not advancing upon the tribe in rebellion against him, he spared the effusion of blood, and that his return to Mahanaim was suggested by wisdom and forbearance.

3. The name of a city, mentioned in John 11: 54. Josephus also speaks of a city named 'Εφραιμ, in the neighborhood of Bethel. It is, doubtless, the same spoken of in Josh. 18: 23, and that probably at a later period changed its name in consequence of its enlargement, (comp. Josh. 15: 19). By the wilderness, of which mention is made (John 11: 54), as lying in the neighborhood, we are not to understand the wilderness of Judea, but that of Bethaven, which, as is known, was in the immediate vicinity of Bethel (Jos. 7: 2; 18: 12, &c.).

VAIHINGER.—*Dr. Wulff.*

Ephron, עֲפְרוֹן, the name of several localities in Canaan. It designates, 1) Jos. 15: 9, a mountain range (not a single mountain) on the boundary between Judah and Benjamin; the same, doubtless, with the "mountains of Ephraim," which stretch towards Jerusalem, and unite with the "mountains of Israel," (comp. Judges 4: 5; 1 Sam. 1: 1; see Robinson *Pal.*, I., p. 447, &c.). 2) A city in the vicinity of Bethel, taken by Abijah from the kingdom of Jeroboam, 2 Chron. 13: 19, and is probably the place spoken of (John 11: 54), to which Jesus retired after the resurrection of Lazarus, and from whence he made his last journey to Jerusalem. This city was near to the so-called wilderness of Bethaven, upon the north-eastern boundary of Benjamin, Josh. 16: 1; 18: 12. Josephus also speaks of a small city called Ephraim, near Bethel. Josephus makes Εφρων, the place mentioned by John, to be eight miles north of Jerusalem, and Jerome increases the distance to twenty miles. The same place, with a slight change, is called Ophrah, in the tribe of Benjamin, Josh. 18: 23, while the LXX. read 'Εφραδα (Cod. Alex. Αφρα). This lay in the N. E. part of Benjamin, and, according to Eusebius,

5 miles east of Bethel; perhaps it is the place called, Mic. 1: 10, Beth-leaphra, only that the form is slightly changed for the sake of a play upon the word. It is well translated by Rückert: "Staubheim." In all probability there are only different names for the same place, which, as ascertained by Robinson (*Pal.* III., 290), is the Taigibeh of our day—a village inhabited by from 3 to 400 Greek Christians, built upon a hill, planted with olive and fig trees, and covered with the ruins of an ancient Roman town. The distances, 20 miles from Jerusalem, and 5 from Bethel, also corresponds; so too it is marked upon Kiepert's map; comp. *Lightfoot*, *centur. chorogr.* in Matth. c. 53. The native city of Gideon in the tribe of Manasseh, which is also called Ophra, LXX.: 'Εφραδα, 'Εφρα, 'Εφραιμ, is a different place, Jud. 6: 11, 24; 8: 27; its precise locality has, however, not as yet been ascertained.

3. Finally, there is a large and populous city in Gilead, called 'Εφρων. It was taken and destroyed by Jud. Maccabeus, upon his return from Ashtaroth Karnaim, upon the Jordan, in the direction of Scythopolis, 1 Maccab. 5: 46, 52; 2 Maccab. 12: 27; Jos. Antiq., 12: 8, 5. As is the case with many other places in that inhospitable region beyond Jordan, this locality also has not yet been ascertained. As to the opinion of Kloeden, in Winer, R.W.B., 1, 335, that it is the place of the present mountain castle, Kalerat er Rabbad, it must be said that this is too far south. *Ewald* is, perhaps, more correct (*Gesch. Isr.*, 2, p. 360) in supposing it to be Fau'arah, on Kiepert's map, south of Jarmak; whilst to locate it in the "wilderness of Ephraim," where Absalom was killed, as is attempted by the same learned author, would again carry it too far south. RÜRTSCH.—*Dr. Wulff.*

Epiphany, *Feast of the Manifestation*, Revelation of Christ, ΕΠΙΦΑΝΙΑ, τὰ ἐπιφάνια, was the feast in the Eastern Church, according to Tit. 2: 11; 3: 4, until the time of Chrysostom, with which the cycle of Christian festivals commenced (Chrys.: παρ' ἡμῶν ἡ εὐρητη πρώτη τὰ ἐπιφάνια). It commemorates the baptism of Christ, for, as Chrysostom also observes, it was not at his birth, but at his baptism, that Christ was manifested to men, so that his ἐπιφάνια refers particularly to this transaction. A particular Christmas or birth-day festival was not yet at that time observed in the Oriental Church, but it was regarded as *præcedens*, and subordinate to the feast of the Epiphany, which took place on the 6th of January. In this the reference to his birth would be the less prominent, for the reason, that with the baptism of Christ was connected the thought of the baptism of Christians, so far as it was admitted that Christ, by his baptism, had communicated to the water the property of a laver of regeneration (Chrys.: τὴν τῶν ὑδατῶν ἡγιασὲ φύσιν). Wherefore, according to Gregory of Nazianzen, the festival was called τὰ φωτὰ ἡμέρα τῶν φωτῶν. The baptism of Christ was regarded as his φωτισμός, in relation to mankind; the baptism of Christians as their φωτισμός in regard to themselves; and hence the feast of the Epiphany, as well as Easter and Whitsunday, was set apart in many of the eastern churches as the proper time for baptism (thus

Greg. of Naz. calls it *Χριστοῦ ἐμφανισθῆναι*). Neander is of the opinion, that the feast originated with Jewish Christians, inasmuch as they regarded the baptism of Christ to be of more significance than his birth. It is a fact that the Basilidians, according to the testimony of Clem. of Alex. Strom., 1, 1, first observed the feast in Alexandria, and Neander supposes that they had the custom from the Jewish Christian congregations of Syria and Palestine. In this way we can best explain how it came that the Alexandrian Church so soon adopted a feast introduced by heretics. It was their purpose to authenticate and establish the true antagonistic significance of the baptism of Christ.

Be this as it may, the feast is peculiar to the Oriental Churches, and the Christmas festival was first introduced in the latter part of the 4th century, as Chrysostom distinctly avers, in a homily on the 25th Decr., 386, at Antioch. We have the first trace of the Epiphany in the Western Church in the second half of the same century. Ammianus Marcellinus, lib. 21, 2, mentions that the Emperor Julian, in 360, celebrated the feast of the Epiphany at Vienne; and Neander justly remarks, that, by the connexion of the Grecian colonial and commercial cities of southern France with the East, this festival might have been introduced into those countries earlier than it was in other portions of the Western Empire. Just as the Christmas festival originating in the West was carried to the East, so the feast of the Epiphany took the opposite direction; and though the Donatist polemics objected to it as an innovation from the East, they could not arrest its progress, but were obliged to encourage its extension. As, however, it did not belong to the tradition of the Western Church, its significance could the more easily be changed. In the time of Augustine already it was regarded as the feast of the Manifestation of Christ to the heathen, and the adoration of the wise men of the East was used as an argument in favor of it. Hence the name of the "festival of the three kings" (see Art.). But the idea of the Epiphany is also derived from the first revelation of the miraculous power of Christ after his baptism in Cana, John 2: 11, hence the names *dies natalis virtutum Domini*, and *Bethphania*; but these three relations, the baptism of Christ, the first manifestation to the heathen, and the first manifestation by miracles, were all combined and retained, as may be seen in a sermon by Bishop Maximus, of Turin, upon the subject of the festival in the beginning of the 5th century. At that time already, the tradition had obtained that the three events just mentioned had all taken place on the same day. The miraculous feeding of the 5000 was a fourth reference in addition to these, and hence the name *Phagiphania*. In the West, however, the most prevalent reference was to the adoration of the wise men, and the appearance of the star was accounted for and explained by the word Epiphany. In the Western Church, in some of the congregations, the feast of the Epiphany was also regarded as the time for baptism (*dies luminum*), and so too in the African Church. At first the custom was strenuously opposed in

Italy by Leo I., who denounced it as an irrational innovation. It however found its way into France. Gerbert, in the *vetus lit. Alem.*, p. II., disq. 5, cites an old ordo, S. Gallensis, in which Epiphany is given as the time for baptism; and Charlemagne, in the epistle to the Bishop Garibald, speaks of the custom as prevalent to some extent in France, without, however, approving it. Gregory II., in 726, already had forbidden the performance of baptism, except at Easter and Whitsunday. The prohibition was repeated by several Councils during the 9th and 11th centuries.

In accordance with an old tradition of the Greek Church, it is customary in the Græco-Russian Church in our day, to consecrate the water at the feast of the Epiphany. S. Stäudlin says (*kirchl. Geogr. u. Statist.*, I., 279), that whilst in Rome, persons of various countries, educated in the Propaganda for missionaries, are accustomed to deliver addresses, at Epiphany, in their native tongue, and thus illustrate the manifestation of Christ to the heathen; upon which occasions the celebrated Mezzofanti was wont to exhibit his extraordinary talent for speaking. It must also be borne in mind that the feast of the Epiphany was the time prescribed by the eastern bishops for the celebration of Easter; it was called *indictio paschalis*. The custom also prevailed for a time in the Western Church, and was finally sanctioned by the fourth Synod of Orleans, in 541. See Neander, *Ch. Hist.*, Amer. ed., I., 301, &c.; *Augusti Handbuch. chr. Arch.*, I. 528, II. 476.

HERZOG.—Dr. Wolff.

Epiphanius, Bishop of Constantia, the ancient Salamis of Cyprus. If every tendency of spiritual life, before it has impressed itself decidedly and permanently upon the age, has its prototypical expression in particular prominent personalities, it must certainly be true in a twofold measure, in reference to the monastic piety and the verbal orthodoxy of Epiphanius, as connected with the largest liberty of religious inquiry. He lived at a time when monasticism, averse to the world and its refinements, and having been strengthened by the self-denials and sufferings which the ancient Church was obliged to endure, took the first step towards authority and power in the Church, and pervading all its departments, without regard to evangelical freedom, sought to petrify Christianity into a system of outward arbitrary prescribed customs, founded more upon heroic, than upon morally ennobling exercises of strength, and to substitute in the place of a positive believing Biblical philosophy, with all its earnestness of inquiry, as seen in the course of the great doctrinal controversies, a predilection for the formularies of traditional Church doctrine, this so-called patristic theology. Epiphanius was, by nature, education, habit of life, and study, one of the chief promoters of both these tendencies. He was born at Besandus, a village of Palestine, in the neighborhood of the city of Eleutheropolis, in the beginning of the 4th century, and from his early youth was brought up by the monks of Palestine. At a later period, he was under the care of the monks of Egypt, where he, perhaps, came into

contact with Antonius, the father of monasticism, and venerated as the archetype of ascetism. In Egypt, his zeal for orthodoxy, imbibed, as may be said, with his mother's milk, met with its first trial. Gnostic women, of fascinating charms, sought to lead the young zealot astray, but he at once avoided the danger, by delivering to the bishop of the place the heretical books placed in his hands, by which means nearly a hundred of the prevailing heresies of the land were proscribed. Having returned to his native country, he co-operated with Hilarion, the founder and ideal of Palestinian monasticism, in the strictest intimacy; and more enthusiastic even than he, for this form of secluded and pious life, he labored for a long time, as superior of a convent in the vicinity of his native village. From Constantia, his metropolitan residence after 367, where he spent his time either in reading devotional books, the discharge of episcopal duties, the study of theological writings, and the defence of church doctrines against the heretics, or in actual controversy, his fame spread throughout the whole Church. Thus we meet with him as a member of the Synod at Antioch in 376, endeavoring to allay the disturbances which had arisen in relation to Apollinarianism. A few years afterwards, in 382, he went to Rome, at the request of the emperor, to advise with the bishops there present concerning the final settlement of the protracted Meletianic division at Antioch, upon which occasion he was successful in renewing the bond of mutual admiration and esteem. His peculiar vocation, next to the spread of monasticism, was, as he thought, to oppose heretics, the most formidable of whom was Origen. This burning hatred of heretics, and especially of Origen, he acquired from the hermits of Egypt. Then Pachomius was accustomed to denounce the great Alexandrian, of whose services to the Church and to science the monks of his class had no conception, not merely as the worst of all heretics, and to forbid the reading of his writings, as great and deceitful perversions of the sense of the Scriptures, but he solemnly obliged every superior placed at the head of the convention which he governed never to have anything to do with the followers of Origen. To justify this bitter denunciation, Epiphanius put himself to the trouble of perusing the whole of Origen's numerous works; and having satisfied himself, that, as the father of Arianism, and a bold innovator in almost every article of faith, he was an arch heretic, he was surprised to learn that he was still held in high estimation by the most distinguished divines of Palestine. This determined him to go there, and pronounce the same anathema upon them. He did so at Easter, in 394; and his furious attack upon Bishop John of Jerusalem, and his equally unwarranted intermeddling with his acknowledged diocesan rights, led to those protracted Origenistic controversies, which, paltry and odious as they were in their origin, engaged the Church for a long time in religious speculation and philosophy. Urged on by his feelings, he was not ashamed to avail himself of the artful hypocrite, Theophilus, of

Alexandria, who after all held him in slight estimation, and to suffer himself to be used as a mere tool in his hierarchical plans against the pious Chrysostom, of Constantinople. Not doubting, as he wrote in a letter to Jerome, that Amalek could be destroyed, and that the trophies of the cross would be displayed on Mt. Rephidim, he communicated to Chrysostom, whose mind was not yet made up as to the errors of Origen, although he was fully aware of their importance in reference to the Church, the sentence of condemnation passed upon them, by an assembly of the bishops of Cyprus and the neighborhood, in 401. Chrysostom took no notice of this communication, and Epiphanius concluded that he was disposed to favor Origen, and that nothing more now was necessary to destroy the last remaining head of the hydra than his personal presence. An old man, nearly an hundred years of age, he was stirred up by Theophilus to go to the metropolis in the midst of winter, in the year 402, where he was kindly received by Chrysostom, who sent the whole body of his clergy to welcome him at his entrance into the city. He would, however, have no church-fellowship with him, nor would he even pray for a dying son of the empress, until every follower of Origen was expelled from the residence, and immediately threatened to excite the fury of the populace against Origen, and those who favored him, by solemnly publishing the anathema against him from the altar of the metropolitan church, and was only deterred from attempting it by considering the possible consequences to himself. Rash, but honest, as he was, he saw something of the tendencies of his partizan zeal, and at length entirely undeceived in a conversation he had with the heretical Origenists, he abruptly withdrew from a service of such doubtful character, with the remark: I leave you the city, the palace, and the hypocrisy. He seemed to have a presentiment of his approaching death, to which he gave expression in the words: I go, and must be in great haste. He died upon the ship, before he got home, in the summer of 403.

In the character of Epiphanius, mingled with honesty of purpose and sincere piety, we meet with great imperfections. His ardent zeal for purity of doctrine, and his strict self-denial, which abated nothing of the privations of the monk, when he was seated in the episcopal chair, show that he was prompted by a holy earnestness in what he regarded as the perfection of Christian truth and duty. But this easily excited zeal was not accompanied by the proper measure of spiritual freedom and prudence. Disposed by nature, and still more by his monastic education to be moderate, he was unable, owing to the want of an inward independent religious development, to conceive of the rights of the religious subject alongside of the despotic authority of the Church, and thus made the whole of salvation to consist of outward confession and practice. His extensive reading only served to increase his hatred of heresy. Besides his native language, the Syriac, he spoke the Hebrew, the Egyptian, the Greek, and, to some extent, the Latin language, which induced

Rufin successively to remark, that he considered it his duty as an Evangelist, to denounce Origen's errors in every language and amongst all nations. His credulity frequently betrayed him into all sorts of opinions and purposes, and when heresy was to be extirpated, he could be both defamatory and despotic. But with all his faults and indiscretions, he stood so high in the estimation of his contemporaries, as the patriarch of orthodoxy, that such instances of violence were only the occasion of new triumphs. It was not just a Jerome who gratulated him as the relic of ancient holiness. As he one day passed along the streets in Jerusalem, in company with Bishop John, mothers carried to him their children that he might bless them. The multitudes thronged around him to kiss his feet, and thought themselves happy to touch the hem of his garments. To hear him preach, the assembled multitudes would listen breathlessly for hours. That his life would be adorned with the halo of miraculous powers and revelations, and that his childhood already would be provided with a garland of traditions of significant import by some younger mythograph, as was always the case in ancient times, and at the birth of extraordinary men, could scarcely fail with one to whose memory the Cyprians dedicated one of their churches.

In 374 already, Epiphanius, at the request of the priests and monks, prepared a work upon faith, which, as were all his writings, was read with eagerness, by the learned, for the sake of its contents, and by the unlearned on account of its style. It was intended to be a defence of Christian doctrines, especially the doctrine of the Trinity, of the incarnation of Christ, and of his resurrection from the dead; for the benefit of such as were driven about upon the ocean of uncertainty by heretics and the devil. But, as in this work, the controverted errors were simply enumerated in brief categories, Epiphanius readily consented to complete his principal work upon heresy as a sure and certain remedy against the stings of the soul-destroying serpent, to which, as it only gave a historical statement of the 80 forms of schism, but was also a refutation of them, he gave the title *πανάριον*, medicine-chest. Its object was to exhaust the idea of heresy in its whole range. With untiring diligence he here collects and presents to view every heresy known to have existed in the world. Rich, however, as it is in material, everything is thrown together in the greatest confusion, without any regard to chronology or logical arrangement. The style is old, diffused, and unpolished, as might be expected of one deficient in attic grace, and fatiguingly monotonous. But with all these imperfections, the work is one of the most important literary productions of Christian antiquity, as a rich record on the one hand of the history of ancient heresy, and on the other as a memorial and type of polemics as carried on in that age against religious error. An abridgement of his *Panarion*, with a somewhat different arrangement, was attempted by Epiphanius himself in his *δρακεφαλαίωσις*. Of his other less accessible works there is still extant his treatise "on the weight and measures of the Bible," of the year

393, with all sorts of digressions — and his tract upon the twelve precious stones in Aaron's vestments, in triple text, a historical exposition of their seams, forms, and properties, with their allegorical interpretations. The Latin translation by Foggini (Rome, 1750, 4to.), of his published commentary upon Solomon's Song abounds in mystical remarks, partly moral and partly prophetic in their character. The brief eulogy upon Hilarion is lost. Much was never printed.—(Sources: SOCRATES, *H. E.*, 6, 10, 12, &c.; 7, 27; SOZOM., 6, 32; 8, 14, and JEROME in several places; SCHRÖCKH, *Chr. K.-Gesch.* 2, Aufl. X., 3, &c. Concerning his writings: FABRIC., *bibl. graec.*, p. 261. SEMISCH.—*Dr. Wolff*.)

Epiphanius, *Bishop of Pavia*, was born in Pavia, of a noble family, in the year 439, and was trained up for the ministry under the care of the Bishop of that city. In his eighteenth year already, he was ordained a sub-deacon, and two years afterwards, as deacon, he was entrusted with the management of the property of the Church, and was so attentive to the poor and the suffering, and in all respects of so much assistance to the Bishop in his declining days, that after his death, in 466, he was unanimously chosen, by the public and clergy, to be his successor. In entering upon his office, he delivered a discourse to his clergy, in which he requested, that if they observed anything improper in himself, they should let him know it. From that time forth his life was more strict than ever; he ate but once a day, and then no flesh, and it was reported as a proof of his devotion, that he always attended upon worship with his feet in fetters. At that time earnest-minded Bishops were much needed in the Church. The West Roman empire lay under the lash of Odoacer; Theodoric was deposed, and the people groaned for deliverance. Under these circumstances it required that the Bishops should be strong-minded men of the old Roman families, who would protect the oppressed, promote peace between the opposing parties, and introduce Roman and Christian civilization among their conquerors. Epiphanius must be considered as one of these Bishops, if even he did not immediately exert himself for the preservation of the spiritual treasures of ancient Rome. He it was who mediated peace between Ricimer and his father-in-law, the Emperor Anthemius. When Eurich, King of the Western Goths, in 474, threatened the Western empire with new dangers, the Emperor Nepos sent to him the Bishop of Pavia, by whom he was induced to listen to terms of peace. When, in the same year, Odoacer subdued Pavia and destroyed its cathedral, Epiphanius succeeded in having it rebuilt; and it was by his influence that Odoacer remitted to the inhabitants of Pavia, after its destruction, their taxes for five years. Especially did he distinguish himself in the war between Odoacer and Theodoric in meliorating the destiny of thousands. Theodoric held him in great esteem. At his request E. went to Gundobald, King of Burgundy, for the purpose of ransoming a number of Ligurian prisoners, who might again populate Upper Italy. The mission was eminently successful; all the Ligurians, who had not taken up arms

were set free without ransom, the others were redeemed at a low rate. At a later period he interposed still more successfully in favor of the oppressed Ligurians. He died in consequence of his exposure upon his journey to Theodoric, in the 55th year of his age. His biography may be found in the works of his successor, Ennodius.

HERZOG. — *Dr. Wolff.*

Epiphanius, Scholasticus, the friend of Cassiodorus (see Art.), at whose request he translated the Church histories of Socrates, Sozomen, and Theodoret, which, abridged by Cassiodorus and somewhat improved in style, were so celebrated during the middle ages as *historia tripartita*. At the request of Cassiodorus, he also translated several other works, the so-called *Codex encyclicus*, a collection of synodical letters to the Emperor Leo I., in defence of the Synod of Chalcedon against Timotheus Aelurus; the Commentaries of Epiphanius, Bishop of Cyprus, upon the Song of Solomon, and the Commentary of Didymus upon the Proverbs, the Catholic Epistles, &c.

HERZOG. — *Dr. Wolff.*

Episcopus in Partibus, Ep. titularis, Ep. suffraganeus, terms often used synonymously, refer, strictly speaking, to different matters.—As the *jura pontificalia* could not be performed by the ordinary assistants of the bishops (archpresbyter, archdeacon, &c., see Art.), and each diocese could have but one bishop (c. 8, *Conc. Nic.*, a. 325), assistance in those functions could be obtained, originally, only from a neighboring bishop. Afterwards bishops expelled from their own sees were thus employed, since they were regarded as still having *de jure* possession of their diocese. For the Church was ever intent upon maintaining congregations once founded, and the connection of bishops expelled by enemies with their *cathedra* (GREG. I., a. 592, in c. 42. *Can. VII. qu. I.*). Those driven from Spain in the 9th cent., by the Arabs, fled to Oviedo, patiently awaiting an opportunity to return to their sees; and when one died a successor was immediately chosen. Meanwhile they labored as assistants of the Bishop of Oviedo, "*ut episcopi, qui ditone carerent, Ovetensi præsuli vicariam operam exhiberant, cura in multos partita, ejusque redditibus alerentur*" (see THOMASSIN, *vel. ac nova eccl. discipl. de benef.*, P. I., lib. I., c. XXVII., nro VIII.; BINTERIM, *Denkwürdigk.*, &c., Bd. I., Th. II., 379–80). Later instances of such *Vice-Episcopi, vices gerentes in pontifical.*, *vicarii in pontifical.* are also met with in Germany, especially since the 12th cent. After that bishops were appointed as assistants in other dioceses, with the title of sees (*episc. titulares*) wrested from Christians by unbelievers (*in partibus infidelium*). This soon led to abuses, as prominent monks aspired after such dignities, and degraded the episcopate. Hence Clem. V., decreed at Vienne, a. 1311, that such bishops should no longer be created without the authority of the Pope, and that no monks should be appointed without permission from their superiors (c. 5 *Clem. de electione* [I. 3]). Other limitations were enacted at Ravenna, 1311, 1314, &c., but the office itself continued. In 1322 a titular b., *Ep. eccl. Hennensis* (HARTZHEIM, *Conc. Germ.*, IV., 284), attended a Synod at Cologne, as substitute for the

B. of Liege. And the Synod of Salzburg, 1420, refers to *ep. titul.*, and that of Passau, 1470, to *suffraganei*, authorized to ordain clergy, and consecrate churches (HARTZ., *l. c.*, V., 179, 478). They were called *suffraganei* because they were to aid the bishops by act and word (*suffragio*, DU FRESNE). Leo X., at the 5th Lat. Council, 1514, s. IX., allowed cardinals to have *vicarii seu suffrag.* The abuses which still occurred, especially the attempts of titular B., to found exempted dioceses within existing sees (*episcopalem cathedram in loco nullius diocesis*) were opposed by the Council of Trent (s. VI., c. 5, *de ref.*, s. XIV., c. 2, 8, *de ref.*). The present practice of the Romish C. still rests upon the decree of Trent (see *Bishops*).—*Episcopi in partibus*, as mere titular B. are revocable papal delegates, apostolic vicars. Even when employed as missionary B. they may be recalled.—(See ANDR. ILLERON. ANDREUCCI, *tract. de ep. titul. &c.*: Rom., 1732, 4to. FR. AUG. DÜRR, *diss. de suffrag.*, &c.: Mogunt., 1782, 4to. J. H. HEISTER, *suffrag. Colonienses extraord.*, &c.: Mogunt., 1843).

H. F. JACOBSON.*

Episcopal System in the Romish Church.—It is an essential principle in the constitution of this Church that all authority is vested in the clergy, the *Eccl. docens*, and that the C. is governed by the organized clerical hierarchy, with the Pope at its head as the organ of its unity. In regard to the relation of this organ to the entire hierarchy, two systems obtain, the feudal *Papal system* (see Art.), and the aristocratic *Episcopal-system*, which regards the bishops as the *jure ordinario* rulers of the C., who receive their authority immediately from God, and, for the maintenance of unity, appoint the Pope as *primus inter pares*. Some suggest, as a third system, a combination of these two (WALTER, *Lehrb. d. K.-rechts*, 11 Ausg., § 128).—The *Episcopal-system* bases itself upon Matt. 18:18, contending that equal authority was given to all the Apostles, and that Peter was placed foremost (comp. Matt. 16:16; 17:4, &c.), merely to exhibit their unity. Thus CYRILIAN, *de unitate eccl.* says, *Loquitur Dominus ad Petrum: Matt. 16:18. Super unum ædificat eccl., et quamvis Apostolis omnibus post resurrectionem suam parem potestatem tribuet et dicat: sicut misit, etc. Joann. 20:21, tamen ut unitatem manifestaret unitatis ejusdem originem ab uno incipientem, sua auctoritate disposuit. Hoc erant utique ceteri Apostoli, quod fuit Petrus, pari consortio præditi et honoris et potestatis. Sed exordium ab unitate proficiscitur, ut eccl. una monstretur* (c. 18, *Can. XXVI. qu. I.*). Peter was made *primus inter pares* less for the Apostles' sake than for subsequent times, when an infallible primacy would be more needful (SAUTER, *fundamenta juris eccl. Cathol.*, ed. III., Rotwilæ, 1825, § 62). In thus singling out Peter, our Lord merely indicated in general that one bishop should perpetuate the primacy, but did not fix the episcopal seat; and though circumstances favored the choice of Rome, the primacy might be transferred to the Bishop of another see, if the good of the Church required it (SAUTER, *l. c.*, § 63, 64).—The course of history has determined the prerogatives of the primacy. The Episcopalists

distinguish between *jura essentialia, primigenia, naturalia* and *jura accidentalia, acquisita, secundaria* (SAUTER, l. c., § 466; EICHORN, K.-recht, I., 574, &c.; ROSKOVANY, *de primatu Pont. Rom. Augustæ Vindelicor.*, 1834, § 44, &c., 54, &c., opposes this distinction). Among the essential prerogatives are the primacy of honor and jurisdiction, of supreme supervision, general government, especially of discipline, devolution and protection, and legislation. To the acquired prerogatives may be reckoned the disposal of *causæ arduæ ac majores*, jurisdiction over referred cases in the first appeal, over others in *appellatorio*, and manifold reservations.

Doctrinally this system was not perfected until a later period, and was based upon the historical development of the Church itself. The controversies of Bonif. VIII. with Philip the Fair, and of John XXII., Bened. XII., and Clem. VI. with Louis of Bavaria, led to investigations upon the relation of the papacy to the temporal powers and the Church in general. Marsilius, of Padua, Bebenburg (see Art.), *et al.* affirmed that the primacy of the Pope does not transcend the authority of the Emperor in temporal matters, nor allow him to arrogate the jurisdiction of Bishops, or the rights of general councils. The schism of 1378, and the efforts made to correct the evils it entailed, led to the conviction that a general council, as representing the universal C., was superior to the primacy of the Pope (see *D'Ailly*). Even Clem. VII. said, in 1387: "*se Concilii generalis auctoritati et definitioni libenter submissurum imo cessurum, si sic Eccl. videretur expedire* (BULÆI, *hist. universit. Paris*, IV., 618, and 687, &c.). The University of Paris issued an opinion to this effect in 1394 (BULÆI, l. c., 687, &c.), was often afterwards reiterated (GIESLER, *Eccl. Hist.*, § 104, § 105, § 136). And although the validity of the Councils of Pisa, Costnitz, and Basel, by which this view was confirmed, has been assailed, they have always had advocates. In France the episcopalistic principles were supported by Gallicanism, and were officially affirmed in the pragmaticsanction at Bourges, 1438, in the declaration of the Theol. Faculty of Paris, 1663, and in the articles of the Gallican clergy approved by Louis XIV., &c. (DUPIN, *manuel du droit public eccl. franç.*: Par., 1845, &c.). G. DE CHAMPAUX, *le droit civil eccl. franç.*: &c., Paris, 1848, &c.)—In Holland this system was advanced by the Jansenist controversies. It found special favor in the Austrian Netherlands and in Germany itself, where the suffragan N. v. Hontheim, of Treves, published a complete system of Episcopatism (*de statu eccl. et legitima potestate Rom. Pont.* (Francof., 1763, 4to.).—Rome persistently opposed this tendency. Thus Innoc. XI. in a bull of April 11, 1682; Pius VI. in a letter of Nov. 24, 1789 (in ROSKOVANY, *Monum. Cathol. pro independentia potestatis eccl.*, &c., 1847, I., 352, &c.).

The adherents of the system sought aid from the State, but without the desired success. And when the Church, in consequence of the revolution and its secularizations, found itself forsaken by the State, the only alternative left was for the Episcopacy to attach itself more closely again to the Roman curia, the claims of which

were thus strengthened.—In France, however, the system is still adhered to, and the government acts, from time to time, in accordance with its principles. Thus, the papal encyclical of Aug. 1, 1854, was not publ. until Jan., 1855, and then with the remark: "but without assenting to or approving of those clauses, &c., which may conflict with the constitution, the laws of the empire, or the liberties of the Gallican Church."—In Holland the Archbishopric of Utrecht and its suffragans still exist upon the principle of the system. H. F. JACOBSON.*

Episcopal System in the Evangelical Church.—The Reformers of the 16th cent. pronounced the old Romish hierarchy unscriptural; and though willing to tolerate the Episcopacy as a human ordinance, they set aside the hierarchical element. In many countries, therefore, evangelical bishops with restricted functions, or some other officers, were substituted for those of Rome. Consequently the *jus episcopale* underwent many changes, both material and formal, especially through the partial assumption of episcopal prerogatives by the State (see JACOBSON, *Gesch. d. Quellen d. evang. K.-rechts v. Preussen*, I., 2, 53. *Corpus Reform.*, II., 994). It was argued that circumstances required this, that the Bible made it the duty of the civil government to maintain religion (*Corpus Ref.*, III., 224, 470, &c.), and even that Christ had appointed civil rulers heads of the Church as *custodes utriusque tabulæ* (CAPITO in his *Resp. de missa, matrimonio et jure magistr. in relig.*, to Russrecht, 1537, Argentor., 1540). But such sentiments show the influence of circumstances rather than the actual convictions and wishes of the Reformers, who expected no better results from the union of spiritual and temporal power in the persons of princes, than from their previous concentration in the episcopacy (*Corp. Ref.*, II., 333, 362). It was their constant desire, rather, to keep the government of the Church separate from the State (*Corp. Ref.*, VI., 882). But their desire was frustrated, as the bishops would not consent to an arrangement which subserved the Reformation. Their only alternative, therefore, seemed to be to transfer episcopal jurisdiction, as a *jus episc.*, to the civil rulers (see Augsb. Religionsfriede, 1555, § 20. RICHTER, *K.-ordnungen d. 16. Jahrh.* II., 178, 349. NETTELBLADT, *obs. juris eccl.*: Halæ, 1783. J. GERHARD, *loci theol.*: Jenæ, 1610. And *Consistorial Constitution*. H. F. JACOBSON.*

Epistolæ obscurorum virorum.—With the conversion to Christianity of the Jew, John Pfefferkorn, who, in a circular publ. 1589, advocated the banishment of the Jews, the education of their children in the Christian religion, and the burning of all their books, the Old Testaments excepted, the war which had been going on towards the close of the 15th and the beginning of the 16th cent., between the Humanists and the adherents of the old, worn-out Scholastics, reached its height. On the side of Pfefferk., between whom and Reuchlin several encounters had taken place (comp *Ernst. Theod. Mayerhoff*, *Reuchlin and his times*: Berl., 1830), were ranged the Dominicans, Arnold von Tungarn, Ortwinus Gratius and Jacob Hochstraten, of Cologne; and on that of Reuchlin, a numerous host

of Humanists. Of the many satires issued by the Reuchlinists, the *Epistolæ obscurorum virorum* is worthy of special mention. Written in barbarous monkish Latin, they describe the mode of thought and action pursued by the Obscurantists, and, in piquant style, paint the immoralities, stupid ignorance, and pretended piety of Popes, monks and clergy. So successfully did they imitate the character and language of the monks that the Franciscans and Dominicans of England, and even Erasmus (in a letter to Mart. Lipsius, 5th Sept., 1528; *Ernsmi*, Opp. III., 2, Pag. 1110) supposed they had been written in vindication of the monks, and against Reuchlin, whilst a Dominican prior had some copies printed and circulated in *ordinis honorem*. Enraged by the discovery of their mistake, they raised a large outcry against the Letters, and succeeded in obtaining from Pope Leo X. a Brief of Condemnation, 15th March, 1517 (see Ed. of *Epistolæ obscur. vir.* by E. Münch, Lpz., 1827, Introd., p. 31, comp. Pag. 504; *Oratio de virtute clavium et Bulla condemnatoria Leonis*). Pfefferkorn, in 1516, issued an Apology against the Letters, and the monks the *Lamentationes obscurorum virorum*, Col., 1518.

These Epist., which in type, binding, and general appearance, as well as in substance, caricatured the monks, were published in three books, at different times, places, and with different titles. The first of them, in 1515, at Hagenau, by Wolfgang Angst, or Anxst, a learned printer, poet, and philologist; its title: *Epistolæ obscurorum virorum ad venerabilem virum Mag. Ortuinum, Daventriensen, Coloniae Agrippinæ bonas litteras docentem, variis et locis et temporibus missæ ac demum in volumen coactæ*: the second, by Froben, in Basel, 1517, with the title: *Epistolæ obscurorum virorum ad Mag. Ortuinum Gratium, Daventriensen, Coloniae latinas litteras proficientem, non illæ quidem veteres et prius visæ, sed et novæ et illis prioribus elegantia, argutiis, lepore ac venustate longe superiores*; the third, later, and smaller in extent, with the title: *Epist. obscur. vir. a diversis ad diversos scriptorum et nil præter lusum jocumque continentium, in arrogantes sciolos, plerumque famæ bonorum virorum obtrectatores, et sanioris doctrinæ contaminatores*, Pars. III. That the authors of these Epist. sometimes went beyond the truth, cannot be denied. Luther in a letter to John Lange (De Wette, L.'s Lett., I., p. 37), puts them on a level with the *Supplicatio contra Theologastros*, which he terms *Ineptias*, and adds: *nimis apparet, a non modesto ingenio effictas, prorsusque eandem olentes testam, quam Epistolæ obscurorum virorum*; also in a letter to Spalatin, of these *Ineptias* he says: *eundem vel similem histrionem sui testantur autorem. quem et Epistolæ obscurorum virorum. Votum ejus probo, sed opus non probo, quod nec a conviciis et contumeliis sibi temperat.*

Touching the authorship of these Epist. it was at first attributed either to Erasmus, or Reuchlin, or Hutter, &c. The latest investigations prove that neither Erasmus nor Reuchlin had anything to do with them; that the learned printer, Angst, and Crotus Rubianus had most to do with the first book, and Crotus Rubianus, Hutter, and Pirkheimer, perhaps, also Angst,

Eoban Hess, Franz v. Sickingen, and other humanists, with the second, and that the third was completed on the Ebernburg. The original conception of the Epist. is ascribed by some to Angst, by others, to Crotus Rubianus. On the authors, comp. MEUSEL, Hist.-lit.-bibliog. Mag. St. 7, 1788, Zürich, p. 38; PANZER, Ulrich v. Hutten in a literary view, Nürmb., 1798, p. 40; MOHRKE, in the Encycl. by Ersch and Gruber, Art. Angst; MÜNCH's Ed. of *Epistolæ*, Introd., p. 28, also his exploits of Franz v. Sickingen, Stuttg., 1827, I., p. 348. The best editions of the Epist. are those pub. in Frankfurt, in 1643, in London, and by Maittaire (London, 1710). Of the modern edit. the best by H. W. ROTERMUND (Ham., 1827), and by MÜNCH. NEUDECKER. — *Ermentrout*.

Equitius, Abbot of several cloisters in the Province Valeria, lived in the 6th cent. Though not ordained, he frequently preached in various towns and cities, clothed in poor garments, and riding on the meanest horse he could get. The Scriptures were his constant companion. The Pope, though not pleased with his exercise of an unauthorized ministry, allowed him to go on without interference on account of the holiness of his life. Gregory the Great, in his *Dialogues* I., 4, speaks in detail of his life and actions. According to Alanus, the Waldenses, when they began to preach without the consent of the hierarchy, claimed him as their antecedent authority. HERZOG. — *Ermentrout*.

Erasmus, *Desiderius*, an illegitimate son of his mother, Margaretta, and a young man by the name of Gerhard, born 28th October, in Rotterdam. In his sixth year, he sang in the choir of the cathedral Church in Utrecht, where, and also at Deventer, he was put to school. When 12 years old his parents died, and he was sent to Herzogenbusch to prepare for the ministry, and, from thence, after two years' sojourn, to Gouda (South Holland). Having spent five years in the cloister, Erasmus (1486-91) accepted an invitation from the Bishop of Cambray to travel with him to Rome. In Feb., 1492, Erasmus became a priest; in 1496 he went to Paris to study scholastics, and through one of the English students whom he taught for a livelihood — Lord Montjoie — he passed over to England, where he made the acquaintance of *Thomas Morus*, chancellor, and Prince Henry, the future King of that country. At the end of a little more than a year, he returned to France and the Netherlands, and, in 1506, journeyed to Italy. Having received the Doctorate at Turin, he sojourned a while in Bologna and Venice, where, under the patronage of the celebrated printer, Aldus Manutius, he published his *Adagia*, and an edition of Terence and Pliny. Called to England by Henry VIII., he issued his *ἑρξώμων μωρίας, laus stultitiæ*. Devoted to authorship, in the year 1516, he retired to Basel, and pub. the first printed edition of the New Test.,¹ which, in his own lifetime,

¹ *Novum Instrumentum omne, diligenter ab Erasmo Roterdamo recognitum et emendatum, non solum ad græcam veritatem, verum etiam ad multorum utriusque linguæ codicum eorumque veterum simul et emendatorum fidem, &c., una cum annotationibus, quæ lectorem doceant quid et qua ratione mutatum sit.*

went through five new editions.¹ Beside the text, he added an elegant Latin transl. dedic. to Leo X. His *Ratio s. method. comp. perveniendi ad veram theol.* 1522, he also sent to Leo X., from whom he had received a brief of approbation for his transl. of the N. T. His *Adnotationes in N. T.*, Basel, 1522, and his *Paraphrases* of the N. T. were, and still are in part, highly esteemed; though, it must be confessed, his elegant paraphrase of the text sometimes weakens its sense. His exegetical labors, as Melancthon acknowledges, prepared the way for a more tasteful treatment of theology and the overthrow of the dry scholastic method.² Around him in Basel, where, from 1521, he determined permanently to reside, was gathered a numerous company of learned men and admirers, such as *John Amerbach*, *John Œcolampad.*, *Bishop Christopher of Utenheim*. That Erasmus prepared the way, both negatively and positively, for the Reformation, cannot be denied; negatively, by lashing with his merciless satire the ignorance and laziness of the monks, the barbarousness of the scholastic system, and the follies and immoralities of the age; positively, by pointing to the Scriptures as the pure fountain of Christian knowledge which should be opened to all, and to Christ as the source of salvation.³ Though he was better adapted by nature to appreciate those portions of the Christian system which accorded with the wisdom of the ancients⁴ than to penetrate the depths of its mysteries, it would be a mistake to regard him as the Voltaire of his age. His contemporaries, the monks, declared that Erasmus laid the egg, and Luther hatched it.⁵ In his correspondence with Zwingli,⁶ E. took occasion to warn him against the extravagances of those who, like Luther and Hutten, went too far. Between Luth. and Eras. there was not much conge-

niality. Religious convictions and deep earnestness were the mainspring of L.'s actions, whilst E. aimed chiefly at the improvement of taste and the spread of knowledge. The one was a man for the people, the other for the learned. As early as the Reuchlinian contest, E. had not evinced that energy which his hatred of the obscurantism⁷ of the monks warranted his friends in looking for, and, when the theses controversy broke out (1515-17), he regarded it at first as a fight among the monks, but later, recognizing in L. a co-worker against the ignorance of the times, expressed a more favorable opinion.⁸ Whilst L. in private letters to his friends (to Spalatin,⁹ and to *John Lange*,¹⁰ Prior in Erfurt, March, 1517), expressed his apprehensions touching Erasmus, and feared he did not make enough of Christ and divine grace, he vindicated his merits against the advocates of ignorance. In reply to a friendly letter (28th March, 1519) from L.,¹¹ E. encouraged him in his preaching of the Gospel, but advised a moderate course, accommodation to the prejudices of his enemies, and a more respectful language towards the head of the Church.¹² Hutten, in order to drive E. into an open advocacy of the Ref., having changed the word "Luther" into "our Luther" in a letter from E. to the Elector Albert of Mayence, in which honorable mention had been made of L., and the stupidity of the monks censured as the fountain of evil,¹³ E. sought to separate himself from the Reformation.¹⁴ Still he did not wish to come into collision with L., whom he regarded as a powerful opponent.¹⁵ When hard pressed at Cologne (Dec., 1520) by the Elector Frederick the Wise, of Saxony, he gave utterance to the following well-known evasive reply: *Lutherus peccavit in duobus, nempe quod tetigit coronam pontificis et ventres monachorum*.¹⁶ His journey to Rome, whither he had

¹ The second, 1519; the third, 1522 (into this he put 1 John 5:7, which he had omitted on critical grounds); the fourth, 1527; the fifth, 1535. See *Wetsteni*, Proleg. in N. T.: Amst., 1730, p. 132; *Hug*, Introd. to N. T., Vol. I, chap. 7.

² Comp. also *Herder*, who, although averse to all paraph., thought those of Erasmus worth their weight in gold, on account of their clear thought and beautiful language. Lett. on study of Theol. Luther, on the other hand, despised them, calling them *Paraphroneses*.

³ In quite reformatory style the preface to the P. of N. T. says: *Judeorum est populum celare sua mysteria, qui in umbris vergebantur. Evangelici lux premi non sustinet. Olim in sancta sanctorum unus ingrediebatur sacerdos. At ubi templi velum in morte domini scissum est, ad ipsum usque Christum, qui vere sanctus est sanctorum et sanctificator omnium datus est omnibus aditus, et exaltatus a terra omnia trahit ad se, qui cupit omnes salvos facere. Exclamant indignum fucinus, si mulier aut coriarius loquatur de sacris litteris, at ego puellas quaedam audire mallet de Christo loquentes, quam quosdam summos vulgi opinione Rabbinos. . . . Equidem cupio (sacras litteras) in omnes verti linguas, &c.*

⁴ Characteristic the passage in the Colloq. familiar. (*Convivium religionum*): *sacris quidem litteris ubique primum debetur auctoritas, sed tamen ego nonnunquam offendo quodam vel dicta a veteribus vel scripta ab Ethnicis, etiam poetis, tam caste, tam sancte, tam divinitus, ut mihi non possim persuadere, quin peccus illorum, cum illa scriberent, numen aliquod bonum agita-*

sanctorum, qui non sunt apud nos in catalogo. Proinde quum hujusmodi quædam lego de talibus viris, vix mihi tempero quin dicam: Sancte Socrates, ora pro nobis. At ipse mihi sapientissimo non tempero, quin bene ominer sanctæ animæ Maronis et Flucci.

⁵ Erasmus was frequently named by the enemies of the Reformation in connection with Luther.

⁶ Comp. *OPP. ZWINGLI*, ed. *Schuler et Schulthess*, VII., (Epist. lat., Pars., 1), p. 9, 12, 221, 222, 251, 307, 310. Amongst these only one letter (p. 12) from Z. to E., all the rest from the latter to the former.

⁷ *Conflictationes illæ virulentæ inter Reuchlinum et hos, qui Jacobo Hoogstrato favebant, mihi majorem in modum displicuerunt.*—(Epp. ed. Bas., p. 400).

⁸ He wrote, 1518, to Card. Wolsey: *Adversus Lutherum aliquando fuimus iniquiores, ne quid invidia recideret in bonas litteras, quas volebatur amplius onerari.*

⁹ Comp. Lett. to Spalatin, Oct. 19, 1516, in *DE WETTE*, I., No. XXII.

¹⁰ In *DE WETTE*, I., No. XXIX., comp. also the Lett. to Spalatin, Nov., 1517, No. 47, and 18; Jan. 1518, No. 53.

¹¹ He calls him a *virum amabilem*, himself *fraterculum in Christo*. See *DE WETTE*, I., No. 129.

¹² Epp., p. 244 (ed. Bas.).

¹³ *Erasm. Epp.* (ed. Bas.), p. 4011, *Adolf. Müller*, p. 280, 83.

¹⁴ Comp. *Müller*, p. 297, and particularly the excellent judgment of Melancthon, p. 298.

¹⁵ Epp. (ed. Bas.), bb. XV., p. 475.

¹⁶ See the representation of this in Spalatin's *Annals*, p. 28 (copied by *Marheinecke*, *Hist. of Ger. Ref.*, I. p. 225).

been invited by Pope Hadrian VI. to a conference touching the Reformation of the Church, was interrupted at Constance by sickness. On his return to Basel, his refusal to grant an interview to *Ulrich von Hutten* (1522) caused some alienation of feeling between them,¹ which soon led to open hostilities. Hutten gave vent to his feelings in his *Expostulatio*, and Erasmus, in his *Spongia*. Circumstances soon compelled him to enter the list against Luther, who, in the year 1524, had written him a letter² not very complimentary to his theological knowledge. E. replied, May 5th,³ and prepared himself for a final attack. In semipelagian style he defended the freedom of the will against Augustine's doctrine *de seruo arbitrio*. Whilst ascribing the greater part of man's conversion to Divine grace, E. also left room for the action of man's free will. The enemies of L. greeted the treatise with jubilant joy, and Henry VIII. returned thanks to its author. L. read it with disgust,⁴ and soon answered it by his *de seruo arbitrio*. Erasmus replied,⁵ and thenceforth made it a point to satirize the Reformation which he could not stop. The friendly relations hitherto subsisting between E. and the Basel Reformer, *Œcolampadius* were now also disturbed,⁶ and, as the Ref. in Basel was accompanied with tumults and disorders, though personally safe, he yet thought it prudent to retire, in 1529, to Freiburg (in Breisgau), where he was joyfully welcomed by the celebrated jurist, *Zasius*, and honored by the most distinguished notabilities of Europe. Declining all ecclesiastical honors, the cardinal's hat, which Pope Paul III. offered, had no attractions for him. His contemplated visit to Brabant, at the invitation of the governess of the Netherlands, was prevented by sickness. His body, previously reduced by the gravel and gout, yielded to an attack of dysentery, July 12th, 1536. He died unaided by the ceremonies of the Church, calling on the name of Jesus. His remains were interred with great honors in the Basel Minster. He made his learned friend, Amerbach, heir of all his property. In the Basel Library are to be found several of his MSS., a copy of *laus stulticie*, with illustrations by Holbein, and other relics, and in the Museum a striking likeness by Holbein. His native city, Rotterdam, erected in his honor, a brazen column, 1622. As the Protestants regarded Luther a second Augustine, so the Catholics, Erasmus a second Jerome. Besides his theol. works already mentioned, are *Enchiridion militis christiani* (1508); *Modus orandi Deum*; *de immensa Dei misericordia*; *de contemptu mundi*; *Expli-*

catio in Symb. Apostolorum et Decalogum; *Institutio principis christiani*; *Pacis Querela*; *de sarcienda ecclesie concordia*, &c. He edited the works of many of the Church-fathers (Irenæus, Origen, Cyprian, Lactantius, Chrysostom, Augustine, &c.), and by his translations of the Greek Fathers into Latin, promoted the study of Patriatics. In his *Ecclesiastes, sive de ratione concionandi* may be found a useful homiletic. Among his philological and philosoph. writings, besides the above-mentioned *Adagia* and *laus stult.*, are edits. of various classics, *Ciceronianus, s. de optimo genere decendi*, *Anti-Barbarus*, *Colloquia*, and annotations to *Curcius*, *Sueton.*, *Terence*, &c. His entire works were first pub. in Basel (1540) in 9 vols.; the best edit. by *Clericus*, Lugd. Batav., 1703-1706, in 11 vols. Of his letters — valuable for his biog. — various editions. He himself wrote a brief outline of his life (Ed. by *Cler.*, *Tom. I.*); also his friend, *Beatus Rhenanus*. Besides these, worthy of mention: *ADAMI VITÆ*, p. 40-47; *BAILE*, *Dictionnaire*; *LE CLERC*, *Bibliothèque choisie*, T. V., p. 135; *S. KNIGHT*, *The Life of Erasmus*: Lond., 1726; *JORTIN*, *Life of E.*: Lond., 1758-60; *BURIGNY*, *Vie d'Erasme*: Par., 1757; *ADOLF MÜLLER*, *Leben E. v.* Rotterdam: Hamb., 1828, and by *ULLMAN*, in *Stud. & Crit.*, 1829, II. 1; *ERHARD*, *Art. Erasmi*, in *Ersch and Gruber.*, 36; *STOCKMEIER*, *E.* in his letters to *Ronif. Amerbach*, in *Swiss Museum for Hist. Science*; *Frauenfeld*, 1839, III., p. 73; *ESCHER*, in *Raumer's Hist. Manual*, 1843, p. 489; *GLASIUS*, on E. as a Reformer (Holland prize-treatise in vindic. of Christ. rel. in the Hague, 1850).

HAGENBACH. — *Ermentrout*.

Erasmus, the Saint, Bishop, and martyr; his oldest acts are in the *Act. SS.* of 2d June. According to the Bollandists, he was Bishop in a town of the Antiochian Patriarchate under Diocletian, and, having suffered much in Antioch and Sirmium, finally settled in Formia, Campania, where he died. Greg. the Great calls him a martyr, *Ep. I.*, 8. This town having been laid waste by the Saracens in 9th cent., his bones, it is said, were transferred to Gaeta; other towns in Italy claim the possession of his remains. He is often painted with his entrails torn out, on which account he is invoked by the people as their patron against colic and the pains of child-bearing. In Italy and Portugal he is honored under the title of St. Elmo.

HERZOG. — *Ermentrout*.

Erastus, *Thomas*, properly *Liebler* or *Lieber*, born in 1524, according to some, in Baden, Switzerland, acc. to others, in Auggen, near Mühlheim and Badenweiler, in the upper part

¹ Comp. the one letter to Melanchth. (*Ep.* 703, p. 817), the other to Laurinus (*Ep.* 650, p. 748), and on the whole dispute: *Stolz*, *Ulrich v. Hutten against Desiderius Erasmus*, and *Des. E. against U. v. H.*: Aarau, 1813, 8vo.; and *Stockmeier*, *Ulrich v. Hutten in "Beiträgen vaterländ. Geschichte"*: Basel, 1843, II., p. 99.

² *DE WETTE*, Vol. II., No. DXCII.

³ Not to be found in the ed. of E.'s letters. *SECHENDORF*, *Commentar. de Lutherismo*, I., p. 310.

⁴ *DE WETTE*, II., No. DCXXIX.

⁵ *HYPERASPISTES*, *Diatriba adv. servum arbitrium*

Lutheri. Comp. also the violent letter to Luther, April 11, 1526 (ed. *BNA.*, p. 790).

⁶ Comp. *HERZOG*, *Œcolampad.* I., p. 120, and 123. An unfriendly opinion by Luther concerning Eras. in a letter to *Œcolampad.* (*DE WETTE*, II., No. DV.), in all probability first tended to lessen their friendship. Later, Luther advised *Œcolampad.* to effect a reconciliation (*DE WETTE*, II., No. DXCIII.). Characteristic is E.'s judgment on *Œcolampad's* treatise on the Lord's Supper (1525): *Perlegi librum . . . mea sententia doctum, disertum et elaboratum, adderem etiam pium, si quid pium esse posset, quod pugnat cum sententia consensu que ecclesia, a qua dissentire periculosum est iudico.*

of the then margraviate of Baden. The plague having driven him from Basle, where he studied theology, he retired to Bologna, and devoted himself there, and in Padua, to philosophy and medicine. After 9 years' residence in Italy, he became physician to the Count of Henneberg, in 1558, to the Elector Otto Henry of the Palatinate, and professor of medicine in Heidelberg. Whilst he vigorously exposed the astrological and magical errors of Paracelsus and others, he justified the infliction of capital punishment on witches. In the department of theology, he belonged to the Zwinglian school. At the command of Frederick III. (1559-1576), who nominated him a member of the Church-council, he attended the religious conference between Lutheran and Reformed theologians in Heidelberg, 1560, and in the cloister Maulbronn, 1564. He advocated the Swiss view of the Lord's Supper in a treatise: "Of the meaning of Christ's words, This is my body, &c.," and in a reply (1565) to Dr. John Marbach, of Strassburg, who had attacked his position. His view may be thus briefly stated: The Sacramental bread is a sign by which they, who partake of it, publicly profess that they are members of Christ, and put their trust alone in Him. Whilst all who eat of it are outwardly one, they only who partake inwardly of the crucified body of Christ, according to John 6 c., are really members of the body of which C. is the head. The "communion of the body of Christ," as mentioned in 1 Cor. 10: 16, he refers to the bread as being the sign, seal or pledge of such communion. Not only on the sacrament was he strictly Zwinglian and anti-Calvinistic, but also on Church-power, government, and discipline. Against the Calvinistic party of Heidelberg, which, since 1560, had sought to introduce the Presbyterian gov. and discipl., he together with some preachers and professors of philosophy, waged a determined, but, for the most part, unsuccessful warfare. He was the first to fall a victim to the newly-introduced system. His correspondence with the Transylvania Unitarians, exposed him to the charge of heresy touching the Person of Christ and the Trinity. Without openly informing him of their actions, his enemies procured his excommunication which was not recalled until 1575. According to his own declarations, he was farthest removed from Arianism, and believed unreservedly the doctrine of the Holy Trinity. In 1580 E. left Heidelberg and went to Basel, where he died, Jan. 1, 1583. E. is best known by his opposition to Church-discip. and the Presbyterian system. After his death the husband of his widow, published a treatise of his with the title: *Explicatio gravisrimæ quæstionis, utrum excommunicatio mandato nitatur divino, an excogitata sit ab hominibus*; to which Beza replied in his *De presbyteris* and *De excommunicatione*. His fame now reached England, where, in the 17th cent., arose a sect called Erastians. And to this day, both in England and Scotland, Erastianism is the name used to denote that system of thought which combats the autonomy of the Church and seeks to subject the Church to the State. E. himself regarded ecclesiastical excommunication as unscriptural and tyrannical,

and was afraid that Presbyteries, if permitted to exercise it, might become Romish hierarchies, or Spanish inquisitions. Accordant with his views was the rule in Zürich, where the Christian magistrate governed the Church in the name of the congregation. Comp. Vierordt, Hist. of Ref. in the Grand-duchy of Baden, 1847, pp. 456, 474.

LECHLER. — Ermentrout.

Ernesti, John Augustus, D. D., the distinguished founder of the grammatico-historical system of interpretation, was b. Aug. 4, 1707, at Tennstädt, Thuringia, where his father, John Christopher, was preacher and inspector. He took his university course at Wittenberg and Leipsic. In L. he was chosen corrector in 1731, rector of the Thomas-School in 1734, prof. of ancient literat. in 1742, of elocution in 1756, of theology in 1758, and subsequently canon at Meissen, and decemvir and president of the Jablonowski Scient. Assoc. He died Sept. 11, 1781. His chief strength lay in philology, but in this sphere we can only name his ed. of Xenophon, Homer, Tacitus, &c., especially that of Cicero (first at Leips., 1738), his *Opusc. oratoria* (Leyd., 1762), *Opusc. philol.-crit.* (1764), and *Initia doctr. solidioris* (Lps., 1736). Prominent among his theol. works is the *Instit. Interp. N. T.* (2d ed., 1765; 3d, 1774; 5th, by Ammon, 1809). He lays down the principle, that "the verbal sense of the S.S. must be determined in the same way in which we ascertain that of other books." But, somewhat inconsistently with this theory, he adhered to the Church doctrine of inspiration, and sought to defend other doctrines of his confession (Lutheran. See his *Opusc. theol.*, p. 1, 135). By his *Prousiones de theol. histor. et dogmat. conjungendæ necessit. et modo universo*, E. partly laid the basis of the science of *Doctrine-history*. His "neue," and "neueste theol. Bibliothek" (the former in 10 vols., Lps., 1760-9, 8vo., the latter in 4 vols., Lps., 1773-9), to which he was the largest contributor, anticipated later journalists, and did good service to theol. literature. Of his sermons, 4 vols. were printed, Lps., 1768-82. — (See TELLER, Ernesti's Verdienste. &c., Lpz., 1783; SEMLER, Zusätze zu Teller, Halle, 1783; S. v. VORST, *Oratio de Ernesti, &c.*, Bat. Lugd., 1804. On his *Interpres*, CLAUSEN, *Hermeneutik*, p. 291, &c. Upon his doctrinal position, BAUR, *Gesch. der Versöhnungslehre*, p. 558. Cf. also, *Biog. Univers.*, Ersch & Gruber, &c.).

HAGENBACH.*

Eschatology, in dogmatic language, means the doctrine of the last things. The phrase last things (*εσχατα, novissima*) includes every change, which conducts to the end of the period of this world, and of human existence connected with it. It has always been divided into the last things of the individual, and of this world. The immediate change of the individual, by which he is separated from the present course of the world, or passes over from the same into another mode of existence is death (see Art.), the dissolution of the earthly existence of the individual, a consequence of sin, of the voluntary disturbance of the communion of the human spirit with the divine, by which it becomes incapable of maintaining the natural material as its organism, and of perva-

ding it with the life of the spirit, and by which too this material, and the course of the world generally become foreign to it, and opposed to its spiritualization. To this succeeds a state, which in its relation to death on the one hand, and to the resurrection, or abolition of death on the other, is called the *middle* or *intermediate state* (see Art.). To think of this as a state of unconscious repose, or death sleep (*Weizel*, *Stud. u. Krit.*, 1836, p. 915), is at variance with the idea of spirit, and by no means requires the epithet, *κοιμησάμενος* (fallen asleep). Nor does the Pauline passage, 2 Cor. 5 : 3, refer to a perfect incorporeity, which is the case, too, with other passages cited for the purpose. Luke 16 : 23, on the contrary, indicates a corporeity, in its nature, of course, corresponding with the whole state. This, however, substantially must be defined by its twofold relation to man's previous earthly existence, and to that which will succeed the æon, to which he will be introduced at the resurrection. As the result of the past, it will be well or evil, and he will have a susceptibility, or insusceptibility, for the proclamation and offer of salvation, which are perpetuated in the place of the departed, in consequence of Christ's descent into hell; both, too, in very different grades, and with the conviction that they have their ground respectively in the moral relations, which obtained during their earthly existence, which presupposes a wakeful recollection, and a real identity of self consciousness, that is immortality. As the result of the other relations, the intermediate state, is to be thought of as an invigoration of the spirit on the part of those who have brought spiritual life with them,—as an inward sifting and purifying of such as are in want of it—as a ripening for a decision on the part of those who are yet undecided—and as an elaboration of those, who have been received there, in a good or bad direction, so that they may be prepared for a resurrection to life, or to damnation, and for the various grades of glorification, or the reverse. The resurrection, however, is not alone determined, either in the one way or the other, by subjective maturity, but depends also upon changes which affect the whole: the *first*, that of the righteous, will be consequent upon the coming of Christ, who will destroy the power of the antichristian world, restrain the influence of Satan, and bring about an ethico-physical state of this earthly life, that will be the prelude of the glorification, or restoration, by which those who have been faithful unto death, will be awakened to life, the saints who are then living will be changed as in the twinkling of an eye, and all will be caught up to Christ, that, in immediate efficient powerful communication with him, they may carry on and complete the further development of Christianity to perfection in all truth and purity and joy (1 Cor. 15; 1 Thess. 4; Rev. 20). The *millennium* (comp. *Chiliasmus*)—a period, which, by means of the powerful, uninterrupted, all-pervading influences of revelations and communications from on high, and the surpassing spread, and the universal, if even relative, perfection of Christianity (see Art.), will prepare the way for the last decision, just as the exten-

sive and intensive powerful working of the spirit will prepare the way for, and make possible the decision which must precede the millennium. This last decision, however, will follow the final reaction of the antichristian power again unbound, whose destruction and utter ruin will bring in its train *the end* of this æon, the close of this world period (*συντέλεια τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου*): the passing away of the old heavens and the old earth, and the coming of the new, and the spiritualization of the whole, by the full revelation of the power of the Lord, who, after the *general resurrection*, will hold the *final judgment*, and will determine the destiny of all the dead, and of all who may then be living, that in the new æon, they may either enjoy the happiness prepared for the saints in glory, or endure the pain of the wicked, who, with their head, will be cast into the lake of fire prepared for the devil and his angels (Matt. 25 : 41, 46; Rev. 20 : 15, comp. 10), both with corresponding corporeity.

Thus, the parts of the doctrine of eschatology are: 1) Death and the intermediate state; 2) the millennium and the first resurrection; 3) the end of the world, and the restoration with the general resurrection, and the final judgment, determining the destiny of the righteous and the wicked of that æon. In all three, however, there will be a manifestation of Christ, a *parusia*, or *epiphany*: in the death of believers (John 14 : 3) and in the middle state or *hades* (1 Pet. 3 : 19; 4 : 6), with continued efficiency; for the destruction of Antichrist, and the establishment of the Christocracy; and finally for the last judgment, with the twofold resurrection (John 5 : 28; Matt. 25 : 31). This manifestation will be partly in the invisible (death and *hades*) and partly in the visible world (in 2 and 3); the last the most glorious. As, however, in the O. T. prophecies, the coming of Christ in the flesh, and his coming in glory, or for the performance of the work of redemption in self-denials and humiliations, and for the establishment of his kingdom in glory, still flow into each other, so too in the N. T. prophecies, his future second coming for the establishment of his kingdom, and his third appearance for the final judgment, and, indeed, all his manifestations, as judge for the protection of his people and the punishment of his enemies, not excepting the judgment upon Jerusalem, are spoken of in such a mixed up way, that it was impossible to distinguish the different grades and periods until the apocalypse of St. John furnished the analogies, as was done previously for the O. T. by the prophecy of Daniel.

This view of eschatology obtained already substantially in the first century of Christian chronology, differently modified according to the theological tendencies (fanatical sensual Chiliasm on the one side, and Platonizing and Spiritualizing interpretations on the other). The second coming of Christ, with all that depended upon it, was generally expected and desired as near at hand, until, in the first place, the intrusion of the Roman empire into Christianity, and afterwards the Church and State construction of things, the Roman-Germanic Christocracy, the alliance of Popery with the

empire, pretending to be the government of Christ, forbade such hopes. This unfounded anticipation of the kingdom of Christ to be exhibited in Popery, or some such constitution, which, however, gave no satisfaction to spiritually minded persons, at length led to a reaction, and the expectation and longing for the establishment of Christ's kingdom were strengthened into prophecy, not, indeed, without fanatical excrescences (Joachim and the Franciscans). In the Romish Church, the middle state was interpreted and turned to account (see Purgatory) for the advantage of the hierarchy, and, as was often the case before, salvation or destruction were taught in the sense of churchly orthodoxy and ascetic holiness. In the time of the Reformation, the eschatological questions were again warmly discussed. The evangelical Church, occupying intermediate ground, rejected both Anabaptistic fanatical Chiliasm and the Roman doctrine of purgatory, and took, in regard to both questions, a decidedly negative position, but in it, as it regards the original question, was not altogether correct. Here, for evangelical Christianity, appropriating to itself the Word of God on all sides, there was a great temptation to fill up this felt and acknowledged deficiency, and to bring out the whole apostolical prophetic view, with all the slighter intimations, in regular connection. In this, mystical theosophic individuals and parties took the lead. The pietistic movement took this direction, partly in the way of ardent enthusiasm, as in the case of *Petersen*, the promulgator of the restoration of all things, partly in a quiet prudent way, as in that of *Spener*, with his Chiliasmic views, keeping aloof from everything fanatical. The Wurtemberg divine and theosoph, *Bengel*, went beyond this; unlocking the apocalypæ, he exhibited the millennium in a clearer light than any before him. *Oetinger*, in this respect, following *Bengel*, although as it regards the middle state, more of a Swedenborgian, has in a remarkable way thrown light upon every part of eschatology, and especially has brought out the ἀποκαταστάσις πάντων most satisfactorily, as well as it respects its accordance with the Scriptures, as its inward connection with saving truth. — Whilst rationalism fritters eschatology away in a naked immortality of the soul, and pantheism sets it aside, evangelical theologians have been preparing the way for a full and comprehensive exhibition of the doctrine. Men, such as *F. F. v. Meyer* (respecting Scheol), *Menken*, &c., pointed to theologians the way in which *Lavater* and *Stilling* brought out their rich, if even when sifted they are to some extent deficient, views. *J. P. Lange*, in his "Land der Herrlichkeit," and in his bibl. theol. Erörterungen, appears as a spirited champion of the realistic mode of thinking. In a very peculiar way *Dr. Rothe*, in his Ethics, has sought to bring the eschatological problem to a higher solution, and certainly has given a rich and valuable contribution to the thorough construction of the doctrine, and for the understanding of many scriptural thoughts and intimations more or less obscure, both as it regards the intermediate state, as the continued development and activity of the soul in the new æon.

Well worthy of notice, too, is the concise eschatological essay, at the close of the admirable, and too little known work of *Dr. Petersen* on the Church, and the statement of the doctrine by *Martensen*, theol. Stud. u. Krit., 1852. — Nor should we overlook the philosophical essays upon this subject, especially those of the younger *Fichte*, and of *Dr. C. F. Weise*, and also *Becker's*, excellent and instructive collection of views upon the state of the dead. — As regards the questions which relate to the eschatology of the whole, the doctrine of the millennium, and of all that, according to prophecy, has preceded, and must follow it, Prof. *Auberlen*, availing himself of ancient and modern investigations, and improving upon them, has, with remarkable thoroughness and clearness, discussed and answered them in his work, "The prophet Daniel in his relation to the revelation of St. John," in which he has given us a true and triumphant criticism upon old and new errors, and especially upon Hengstenberg's misplacing the millennium between the 8th and 18th cent.

If we compare the old and new methods of treating the eschatological doctrine, we will have the antithesis of abrupt immediate catastrophies and of more progressive development. The older view has its justification in the prophetic statement; the relative truth of the more modern rests upon the fact, that in the history of the kingdom of God, a careful investigation reveals connection and interposition. Faithfulness to the word of revelation, compels us to admit disastrous epochs, moments of new revelations and the introduction of new divine facts, just as all analogy and the sacred history itself requires the acknowledgment on every side of preparations and precedents, the harbingers of something greater which is yet to come, and subjective as well as objective interpositions and arrangements for the new. — It is not to be mistaken that, in our day, the eschatological investigation is pursued with greater earnestness and effort than ever before, and that the completion of the doctrine is pressing forwards — a proof amongst others, that we are "hasting to the coming of the day of the Lord." — (Besides the works cited, comp. also NITZSCH, Syst. der christl. Lehre. 4. Hauptst., § 209, &c. KRABBE, Lehre von der Sünde und vom Tode. BAUMGARTEN = CRUCIUS, Comp. der christl. Dogmengesch., Bd. 2, § 367, and others). KLING. — *Dr. Wolff*.

Esdrælon, *Jezreel*, Ἐσδρηλὼν or ὠμ (Judith 1 : 8 ; 4 : 6) ; later, Ἐσδράηλα, *Stradela* (itiner. hieros.) ; nearer the original form, Ἰεσραῖλ (LXX.) Ἰεσράηλα, and εἰλα (*Jos. Ant.*), Ἰεζραῖλ (Euseb.) ; furthest from the original Ἀζάρη and Ἀζάρου, and Ἀζάρου πόλις ; during the crusades *Gerinum parvum* in *Guil. Tyr.*, 22, 26. — 1) *The city of Jezreel*, in the tribe of Issachar (*Josh.* 17 : 16, 19 : 18. In 15 : 56 mention is made of a Jezreel in Judah, where doubtless Ahinoam, David's second wife, was born, 1 Sam. 25 : 43), became Ahab's residence (though Samaria remained the capital, 1 Kings 18 : 46 ; 21 : 1), hence the abode of Jezebel during her widowhood (1 Kings 9 : 15–37 ; 10 : 1–11). Euseb. (itiner. hieros., p. 586) says it lay between Scythopolis and Legio, 12 Rom. miles from S. (others say 10). Its present Arabic name is Zerim, or Zarasin. The

adjacent fountain, named in 1 Sam. 29 : 1. is probably the modern Tubania (*Guil. Tyr.*, 22, 26), called 'Ain Jâlûd (see ROBINSON, *Palest.*, II., 318; III., 163, &c.).—2) *The plain of E.*, on the E. side of which lay the city, resembles in outline, a right-angled triangle. The Kison flows down its centre from E. to W., and passes finally through a ravine formed by Carmel and the mts. of Galilee into the valley of Acre, and thence to the sea. The valley is about 24 m. long, and 12–15 broad from N. to S. Being watered by numerous streams it was once very fertile and beautiful; now it is an uncultivated waste. From its comparative extent, it is sometimes called *μέγα πεδίων* (*Joseph*). It bears other names, also, from corresponding points of interest in it, as the valley of Megiddo (2 Chron. 35 : 22, &c.); *campus legionis* from Legio Maximianopolis (el Lejjûn); in the middle ages, from the village and castle of Saba, *planum Sabæ*; the modern Arabs call it *Merj Ibn 'Amîr* (ROBINSON, II., 253). The boundary between Galilee ran through its centre; and the road from Gal. through Samaria to Jerusalem, passed through the valley in a S. course, whilst a little W. of this was the road from Damascus to Egypt. Hence the valley was the scene of many great battles; besides those mentioned in the Bible (Judges 6 : 33; 7 : 1, &c.; 1 Sam. 29 : 1; 31 : 1, &c.; 1 Kings 20 : 26, &c.; 2 Kings 9 : 17, &c.; 23 : 29; 2 Chron. 35 : 22; Judith 7 : 3) one between Vespasian and the Jews (*Jos. B. J.*, IV.), and the Crusaders and Saracens. Here, in 1799, 25,000 Turks were beaten by 3000 French soldiers under Bonaparte and Kleber.

PRESSEL.*

Esnik, or *Eznik*, an Armenian theologian of the 5th cent., distinguished for his steadfast opposition to the enemies of Christianity. Incited by the zeal of his Church during that period in the study of the more earnest Hellenic literature, especially the Church Fathers, E. made a patristic tour through Mesopotamia to Constantinople. He was active, as a Bishop, at the renowned Synod of Artaschast. He died, at an advanced age, as B. of Bagrewand. (See SOMAL, *quadrio della storia letter. di Armen.*, p. 22; NEUMANN, *Gesch. d. armen. Lit.*, p. 42–44).—Nothing remains of his pen but his "*Overthrow of Errors*," in 4 books. The 1st is against the advocates of materialism (*ὕλη*); the 2d against the religion of the Persians; the 3d against Greek philosophy; the 4th against Marcion and the Manichæans. The first original ed. appeared in Smyrna, 1762; far better that of Venice, 1826 (forming a part of the Armenian Classics). Portions have been given in "*ILLOEN's Zeitschr. f. d. histor. Theol.*:" Bd. 4 (1834), p. 71–79, and in the "*Bayerischen Annalen* v. 23. Jan., 1834. The work of LE VAILLANT DE FLORIVAL, "*Refut. d. différ. sectes d. païens par le docteur Ezniq*:" Par., 1853, 8vo., is defective.

GOSCHE.*

Essenes, one of the three principal Jewish sects in the time of Christ. The meaning and etymology of the name uncertain; called by Philo, *Ἐσσηνοί*; by Josephus, *Ἐσσηνοί*; by Pliny, *Esseni*. *Essa* (*Jos. Ant.*, XIII., 23) most likely derived from the Aræmaic *ܥܨܢܐ*, *medicatus est*,

"the curers" (*θεραπεύται*), so-called from the fact of their healing bodily ailments, and of their mode of life being a protest against the corruption of the world.—According to Philo (*l. c.*, 876) and Josephus (*Antiq.*, XVIII., 1, § 5), flourished in the time of Christ, in Palestine (*Philo, l. c.*, "*Παλαιστίνη καὶ Συρία*," to be read *Παλ. Συρίας*, comp. *Viger. ad Eus.*, H. E., VIII., 12), about 4000 in number, some of them separated from the rest of the Jews, and living in colonies on the Dead Sea (*Plin.*, *l. c.*, "*ab occidente lacus litora Esseni fugiunt usque quæ nocent*"), and others with them in cities and villages (comp. *Jos. de B. J.*, II., 8, § 4, and Philo in *Euseb. Præp. Ev.*, VIII., 11). Shut out from the temple on account of their rejection of sacrifices (*Jos. Ant.*, XVIII., 1, § 5), they formed a strictly exclusive order (*τάγμα*). A double noviciate preceded a reception into it. The applicant (*ὁ ζητών*, *Jos. de B. J.*, II., 8, § 7), who lived one year on the outside of it, had to practise its manner of life, and into his hands were put an axe (symbol of labor), an apron (a sign of purification), and a white garment (the usual dress of the order). The year past, and due proof of worthiness, being given, they were permitted to take part in the washings, but not in the repasts or meals. Another probation of two years over, and promising by affirmation to honor God, to practise justice, to hurt no one, to be obedient to their superiors and never to reveal the secrets of the order, they were received. The members were divided according to the time of their entrance into four classes (*Philo, l. c.*, p. 877—particularly *Jos. de B. J.*, II., 8, § 6, 10), which were separated from each other by an impassable gulf. The superiors enjoyed unlimited rule, no one being able to do anything, works of mercy excepted, without their command (*Jos. de B. J.*, II., 8, § 6). There existed also a special judicial tribunal which had to do particularly with the excommunication of unworthy members (*Jos. l. c.*, 8, 8).

They had all things in common, even the common treasury presided over by superintendents. Every town had a director to attend to the wants of strangers, and persons not of their number received support (*Jos. de B. J.*, II., 8, § 3). *Abstinence* and *labor* were the chief features of their life. Pleasure was regarded as an evil, luxury was condemned, anointing with oil looked upon as an unclean thing. Though the great majority of them abstained from marriage, they took the children of others and educated them in their system (*Jos. l. c.*, § 2, 3.—*Plinius, l. c.*: "*Gens sola, sine femina, omni venere abdicata*"—"ita per sæculorum millia, incredibile dictu, gens æterna, in qua nemo nascitur; tam secundu illis aliorum vitæ poenitentia est"). Some of them, however, allowed marriage under certain restrictions (*Jos. l. c.*, § 3). Agriculture and the peaceful arts constituted their chief pursuits; the making of warlike instruments, trade and commerce were discarded (*Philo, l. c.*, 876, sqq.). Slavery was prohibited; so, too, the taking of oaths, except in the form above-mentioned. Before the rising of the sun, they indulged in no secular conversation, and the day was begun by prayer. Then followed labor to the fifth hour, the holy ablutions in

cold water, and the meal, which was enlivened by prayer and religious exercises. Work again to twilight and another meal. The Sabbath they observed strictly, but allowed no bloody sacrifices (*Philo*, l. c., 876; *Jos. Ant.*, XVIII., 1, § 5; — comp. *DÄHNE*, *Hist. of Jew. Alex. Relig. Philos.*, I., 491).

According to *Philo* (l. c., 877), the Essenes, whilst ignoring the logical and metaphysical parts of philosophy, paid great attention to ethics (*Jos. de B. J.*, II., 8, § 7). In doctrine, they affiliated more or less with the Jewish-Alexandrian school, and the asceticism of the sects. The body they regarded as the prison-house of the soul; death freed the latter from its confinement, which winged its flight to heaven, whilst the matter of the former for ever perished (*Jos. B. J.*, II., 8, § 11). Great attention was paid to angelology (*Jos.*, I, c. § 7). They did not believe in an absolute fate, as *Gfrörer* supposes (II., 319); the passage in *Jos.* seeming to sanction it ("τὸ δὲ τῶν Ἐσσηνῶν γένος πάντων τῇ ἐμαρμένῃ κυρίαν ἀποφαίνεται καὶ μηδὲν ὁ μὴ κατ' ἐκείνης ψῆφον ἀνθρώποις ἀπαντᾷ," *Ant.* XIII., 5, § 9), must be explained by that in *Ant.* XVIII., 1, § 5, "Ἐσσηνοὶς δ' ἐπὶ μὲν θεῷ καταλιπεῖν φιλεῖ τὰ πάντα ὁ λόγος." Nor can it be said that their saluting the rising sun with prayers was derived from Parsism. They did not pay divine worship to the sun, but merely regarded it as a symbol of the divinity.—Whilst some have identified the Essenes and Therapeutæ, as *Bellermann* and *Gfrörer*, (the latter, however, admitting some modifications, whilst the former allows no difference), others can discover no relationship at all between them, as *NEANDER*, *Church Hist.*, I., 1, 73. The same tendencies and wants, however, which in Egypt established the religious philosophy of the Jewish-Alexandrine school and the Therapeutæ, gave rise to the Essenes in Palestine, who differed from the Therap. in this, that whilst the latter indulged in a merely contemplative asceticism, the former joined with it an active, laborious life.

The records touching the history of the Essenes are very meagre. According to *Jos. Ant.*, XIII., 5, § 9, they arose about the middle of the second cent., before Christ. The first-named member of the order is a certain Judas who lived in the age of Antigonos, about 110, B. C. (*Jos. Ant.*, XIII., 9). That Christ had any intercourse with them is a mere arbitrary hypothesis. Retiring towards the East, they came into contact with Christianity, and, in passing over to it, carried with them some of their peculiarities. Thus *Epiphanius* (*Hær.*, XIX.) makes mention of the Ossenes, a provincialism, no doubt, for Essenes. Though the pseudo-Clementines show traces of the Essene element, it is impossible to tell how far they may have been influenced by it. Later no vestige of its power can be discovered; the supposition of *RAUMER*, *Hist. of the Hohenstauffen*, I., 473 (from *VITRIAC. Hist. hier.*, 1062, and *BROCARDI. Descript.*, 23) that the kingdom of Jerusalem embraced Essenes, being erroneous.

Literature: — *Trium scriptorum illustrium de tribus Judæorum sectis syntagma* ed. *JACOBUS TRIGLANDIUS*, Delphis, 1703, II., fol. 4to. — *BELLERMANN*, *Hist. Acc. of Ess. and Therap.*:

Berlin, 1821. — *JOS. SAUER*, *De Essenis et Therapeutis disquisitio*: Vratislaviæ, 1829. — *GFRÖRER*, *Philo and the Alexandrine Theosophy*, II., 299. *A. F. DÄHNE*, *Hist. Ex. of Jewish-Alex. Religious Phil.*, I., 467, &c. — *CREDNER* on Ess. and Ebionites, in *WINER's Journal for Scientific Theol.*, I., 211. — *Sources*: — *PHILO's "Quod omnis probus liber"* ed. *HÆSCHELIUS*: Francof. 1691, p. 876, sq. — (ed. *MANGEY*: Lond., 1742, Vol. II., p. 457). — *EUSEBIUS' Præp. Evang.*, VIII., 77. — *Jos. de B. J.*, II., 8, § 2-13.; *Ant.* XIII., 5, § 9; XV., 10, § 4, 5; XVIII., 1, § 2-6; *PLINY's Hist. Nat.*, V., 17; *SOLINUS' Polyhistor.* XXXV., 7-12; *PORPHYRIUS de abstin. ed. Rhoer*: Traj., 1767, p. 331. *UHLHORN*. — *Ermentrout*.

Esther — the Persian name of the Jewish Hadassa, the wife of King Ahasuerus. After her marriage, her name, signifying a myrtle, was changed into the Persian, Sitareh, which, allied to the Greek, ἀστὴρ, designated the queen, by the epithet of the star. It is also the title of that canonical book of the Old Testament which narrates the delivery and preservation of the Jews, through her influence as queen on the Persian throne, in one of their greatest extremities.

This book opens with a scene in Shushan, the Persian residence of the king (1: 2). Ahasuerus, whose kingdom, embracing 127 provinces, extended from India to Ethiopia (1: 1), and received tribute from the isles of the West (10: 1), made a feast of 180 days' duration, for his princes and nobles, and this ended with one for all the people in his palace, which continued 7 days, whilst Vashti, the queen, entertained the women in like manner (1: 3-8). These festivities were suddenly interrupted by Vashti, who refused obedience to the king's command, that she should show her beauty before the people and the princes (1: 10-22). The king now looked round him for a new queen, and of all the women presented for his inspection, he selected Esther, who, her father and mother being dead, had been adopted as his own daughter by Mordecai the Jew. Her uncle, aware of the opposition that always obtains between a mere civil polity and a religious government, and yet indulging the hope that his niece might be of service to her people, cautioned her against any betrayal of her religion, and the better to accomplish his purposes, entered the service of the king (chapt. 2). A storm now began to lower over the Jews. Mord. had refused to bow the knee to Haman, the Agagite, who was the king's chief favorite (3: 2). The furious wrath of H. demanded satisfaction, and he obtained a decree from the throne that all the Jews in the land should be put to death (3: 15). Mord., fully conscious of the impending danger, rent his clothes, put on sackcloth with ashes (4: 1), and called upon Esther to intercede with the king (4: 8). Overcome by his entreaties and threats (4: 13, 14), after having, together with all the Jews in Shushan, fasted for three days (4: 15, 16), she appeared before the king, and found so much favor in his sight, that he promised to give unto her the half of his kingdom (5: 1-3). At the banquet which she had requested the king and Haman to attend (5: 4), Est. obtained a renewal of this promise, and the acceptance

of an invitation to another feast (5 : 8). Meanwhile, two events conspired to bring things to a crisis. Instigated by pride and the evil counsel of his wife, Seresh, H. erected a gallows, on which he expected to obtain the decree of the king, that Mord. should be hung (5 : 9-14). Ahasuerus, wishing to honor M. for discovering a conspiracy against his life, H. became an instrument for the elevation of the man he hated, as may be read in c. 6, whilst he himself was hung from the gallows his own hands had made (c. 7). Mord. now took the place H. had occupied (8 : 12), and Esther obtained for her people the privilege of defending themselves against their enemies (c. 8), many of whom were slain, whilst Haman's ten sons were hung (c. 9). The Jews celebrated their deliverance with great rejoicings, those in Shushan on the fifteenth of the month Adar, those in other parts, on the fourteenth. The festival of Purim, which commemorates this event, was established by Mord. and Esther (c. 9), and, though plainly to be distinguished from the great festivals which have reference to the divine origin of the Jewish nation and the sanctuary of Jehovah, must not be invested with a completely worldly character, as is done by *Buxtorff* (*Synag. Judaica*, pp. 554, 560, 561), *J. J. Rambach*, ad *Esth.*, 9 : 31, and by *Hengstenberg* (*Christol.*, II., 567), and *Luthardt* (*John's Gosp.*, II., 4), who also affirms that Jesus did not go up to the festival of Purim, though that mentioned in *John* 5 : 1, could not well have been any other. Whilst it must be admitted that the celebration of Purim frequently degenerated into riotous excesses, it may well and justly be asked, whether these were any worse, the Gospel being the criterion, than the Pharisaic rigorism not unfrequently connected with the keeping of the Sabbath. In its original institution, it was an expression of national joy, which showed itself in giving presents to the poor, and in the interchange of kindly offices (9 : 19, 22), nor was fasting altogether pretermitted (*Buxtorff*, I. c., p. 554; *Relandi*, *Antiquit.*, p. 498). When our Saviour went up to the feast of Purim, he wished to teach the Jews that their preservation as a nation, which was so providentially begun in the time of Ahasuerus, could only be completed and perpetuated by Him as the source of unending life. And so He healed the sick man at the pool of Bethesda, who was a representative of His people (comp. *Hengstenberg*, I. c. 2, p. 568).

In the way of reply to Oeder, Corradi, and Semler, who first threw suspicion on the historical character of this book (see *Baumgarten's Comm. de fide libri Estheræ*, p. 4, 5), to de Wette and Winer, who have done something towards vindicating it, and to Ewald, who regards it as a legend (*Geschichte Israels*, I., 254-256; III., 2, 258-263), it is to be said that the book itself not only refers to original sources (c. 9 : 20, 29, 30, 32; 10 : 2; comp. 2 : 23; 6 : 1), but is remarkable for accuracy and precision of statement (c. 1 : 16, 17; 2 : 3, 14, 21; 4 : 5; 7 : 9; 9 : 7-10), that a comparison of it with various apochryphal additions (comp. *Zunz*, *die gottesdienst. Vorträge der Juden*, pp. 121, 122; *Ewald*, I. c., III., 2, 264, 265) brings out in bold re-

gard., I. c., pp. 63-76), and that its account of Persian institutions and manners is so accurate that two most learned students of Oriental history, *Heeren* (*Ideen*, I., 1, 132) and *Rosenmüller* (*Biblische Alterthumskunde*, I., 1, 376), declare it a reliable source for Persian antiquities (comp. *Comment.*, pp. 77-113). Besides there is every reason to believe that modern researches into the antiquities of Mesopotamia will contribute to the vindication of this book. Of them can already be mentioned the deciphering of the name of Xerxes in the cuneated letters; which name, according to *Lassen* (see *die alt-persischen Keilinschriften von Persepolis*, p. 33) = *Kshârâs*, who adds the remark that the royal name of our book, Ahaschverosh, is a Hebrew softening of the original Xerxes, and thus seems to strengthen the supposition of J. J. Scaliger, that the Ahasuerus of Esther was the Xerxes of the Greeks (see *Comment.*, pp. 124-151). Another proof from the same source: it cannot be doubted but that in Esther, 6 : 8, the words "crown-royal" are to be regarded as a continuation of the preceding sentence, and must be referred to the horse, and yet, Aben Ezra excepted, all have supposed that the crown-royal must have been worn by the man himself. Now Layard has discovered that the horses on Mesopotamian memorials are richly and variously decorated — not simply horses used for wagons, but for riding, these latter having head-dresses (see *Nineveh and its Remains*, pp. 208, 472, Fig. XV.). Does not this go to prove the credibility of the book of Esther?

But if this book be considered a portion of the inspired literature of the Jews, all objections must be waived. What relation does it sustain to the divine revelation? Its chief characteristic seems to be the non-mention of the divine name. *Zunz* remarks: "Whilst it mentions the Persian king 1187 and his empire 26 times, it mentions not once that of God" (I. c. p. 15). Though Luther believed the history it contains (*Carpzov's Introductio in libros historicos*, V. T., p. 354), he still wrote of it: *quavis hunc librum habeant in canone, dignior omnibus me iudice qui extra canonem habentur* (*De servo arbitrio Oper. ed. Jena.*, III., 182). If we regard this silence as intended to glorify the works of God — and, indeed, the book itself forces this view on us — we can adopt *Carpzov's* explanation of it: *sileatur nomen dummodo Dei in libro opera, miracula, beneficia celebrentur, agnosci sane inde Deus poterit* (I. c., p. 358). — Our Lord crowned with honor the silent doing of duty (*Matt.* 20 : 6-13), and Peter recommends a quiet, meek spirit (*1 Pet.* 3 : 1-4). Is not this the character of the two persons who figure most conspicuously in this beautiful drama? whilst they exhibit an undying love for their people. M.'s inflexible opposition to Haman sprang from the fact that, whilst he himself stood related to the family of King Saul (see 2 : 5, comp. 1 *Sam.* 9 : 1; 2 *Sam.* 16 : 5), H. was a descendent of that Amalekite king whom Saul had been ordered to destroy (see 1 *Sam.* 15 : 20, 32), and so one of those people against whom Jehovah had declared eternal war (*Exod.* 17 : 15, 10; *Numb.* 24 : 20) — an Edomite (*Gen.* 36 : 12, 16), an original enemy of the Israelites

(Gen. 25:23). Espousing the cause of their nationality, their conduct must not be considered as the result of a revengeful spirit, but as a necessary self-defence. In not mentioning the name of that God in whom they trusted, they did but imitate Ilm who, in their circumstances, quietly fulfilled His purposes. Filled with the Spirit, the inspired writer of this book mentioned not His name. We cannot, therefore, agree with Hävernicks, who only recognizes in M. and E. an inferior order of piety (Einleitung, II., 1, 357, 358), nor with Hengstenberg (Christ., II., 567), who, because Christ and his Apostles never cited the book, disparages its canonicity. Their piety equalled their circumstances as fully as that of David those in which he was placed; and the divine silence which characterizes the book sprang from the same fulness of the Spirit from which were generated the holy sayings and signs of the Psalms and its Prophets. Nor is there need of much discernment to apprehend the immense benefit (Rom. 15:4; 2 Thess. 3:16) which has accrued to the Church in time past, and which must continue to accrue in time to come from a holy silence combined with the spirit and action of martyrs.

BAUMGARTEN.—*Ermentrout.*

Etheldrida (*Edilthryda*, *Ætheldritha*, *Edeltrude*), St., daughter of Anna, King of the East Angles, had made a vow of chastity, when she was compelled to marry Tondberten, a nobleman. At her entreaty he regarded her vow. He soon died, and then she hoped to be allowed to carry out her purpose of leading a retired religious life. But she was again constrained to marry Egfrid, son of the Northumbrian king. But as she maintained her vow in this case also, the marriage was dissolved by the advice of Wilfrid, B. of York. In 671 she retired to the cloister Coldingham, and thence to the island of Ely, where she founded a double cloister—partly for men, and partly for women. She died in 679.

HERZOG.*

Ethiopia, Church of.—To it belongs the Church of Nubia and Sennaar, that of Abyssinia from its origin to its separation from the Cath. Church, that of Adel, and, on account of its origin and relationship, that of S. W. Arabia. The oldest of these is the Abyssinian Church. That the Abyssinians had become Jews through the descendants of the Queen of Sheba, but had afterwards apostatized, is an unfounded report, owing its origin to the probably early immigration of the Jews, and to the practice of circumcision, which is still prevalent (LUDOLF, *Comment. ad hist. æth.*, p. 279). The Ab. Church did not originate in the Apostolic age. Even though the eunuch of Napata (Acts 8:27) brought the first light of the gospel to the country, we must still distinguish between Napata and Habesh, whence so early an origin of the church there is still in doubt (LUDOLF, *hist. æth.*, III., 2). Christian antiquity knew so little of such a church, that Jerome (*Catal. scriptor. eccl.*, I., 265) and Asseman (*biblioth. orient.*, III., 2, p. 592) regarded Arabia Felix as the home of the eunuch. The legendary history of the Apostle assigns to no less than three of them Ethiopia as a missionary field, viz.: to Thomas, Andrew, and to Matthew. But

these are all in Asia, viz.: in Colchis, in S. Asia, and even in India. Only one monument, an Ethiopic manuscript in Axuma, represents the eunuch as converting the land of Habesh. Ludolf, however, has refuted this legend (*Hist. æth.*, III., 2, § 19, etc.). In Nubia, where, from the age of Alexander the Gr., to that of Eusebius, the queens were called Candace, the monuments buried in the sand may still preserve information for us. It is certain, however, that under Constantine (about A. D. 330), Metrodorus, a heathen philosopher, returned from extensive journeys of discovery to Tyre, and incited Meropius to similar enterprises (RUFINI, *hist. eccl.*, I., 5, 9; THEODORET, *hist. eccl.*, I., 22; SOCRATES, *hist. eccl.*, I., 19). He was accompanied by *Fruementius* and *Ædesius*, and was wrecked on the coast of Ethiopia (India, say the ancients): the crew was murdered by the inhabitants, but the two young men were taken as slaves to the court at *Auxume*, where one of them became the treasurer, and the other the butler of the king. They were liberated by the king before his death. The queen, as guardian of her son, Aizan, retained them in high offices, of which they took advantage to introduce Christianity. They attracted Egyptian merchants, and the Christians obtained the right of immigration, with certain privileges. Under Aizan, *Ædesius* retreated to Tyre; *Fruementius* went to Alexandria, where *Athanasius* was patriarch, from whom he obtained priests for this new country. He himself was ordained Bishop, and was now called *Abba Salama*, the patriarch of Abyssinia (LUDOLF, *hist. æth.*, III., 2, § 31). The king and his brother were baptized, and Christianity spread rapidly. The Arian troubles reached hither also. After the expulsion of *Athanasius*, the Arian patriarch demanded of *Fruementius* to be ordained anew: this being refused, the Emperor *Constantius* wrote to the king to dismiss F., and to receive *Theophilus*, an Indian. The latter actually arrived at Axum, but had to leave shortly after (A. D. 356. LE QUIEN, *Oriens christ.*, II., 644); *CACHENUS* (*ad ann.*, 541, p. Chr.); *NICEPHORUS CALLISTI* (*hist. eccl.*, XVII., 32) and *PROCOPIUS* (*de bel. pus.*) give a different account of the founding of the Ethiopic Church; which, however, has been refuted by *Ludolf* and *Le Quien*. The patriarch of Abyssinia was always ordained by the p. of Alexandria. They had the rank, but not the power of a patriarch, were always foreigners, and could never have more than 7 bishops under them—so that their office could never be equal to an archbishopric. The other guardians of the Church were monks from Up. Egypt, of whom 9 are especially prominent as saints. They introduced monasticism, and built churches and hermitages. Through their efforts the Church seems to have spread to the interior of Africa, and towards the East and North. In the 6th cent. monasticism was already so highly esteemed, that King *Elasban* entered a monastery. After the chief seat of power was no longer at Tigre (Axum) but in the interior, the language became more African through the influence of the Galla-dialects. At this time the *Amharic* is spoken along with the modified Tigre language. The people no longer read the Bible:

and though some of the priests read it they do not understand it. Of equal authority with the Bible is the *Synodus* (Apostolic Constitutions and Canons). Hence 35 books of the N. T. are spoken of. Next in rank are the *Acts of the Synods* (those of Nice, Constantinople, and Ephesus, and several provinc. Synods), the *Liturgy*, the Hadschmanota Aban (creed of the Fathers, extracts from the homilies of Athanasius, Basil, the Gregories, Chrysostom, Cyril, and Ephraem). The other ecclesiastical literature consists in martyrologies, calenders of saints, hymns, and works against heresies (LUDOLF, *hist. æth.*, III., 4, § 41; *Isenberg and Krapff, Journals*, Lond., 1843, p. 230; *Combes et Tamisier, Voy. en Abyss.*, III., 348, etc.). When, in 451, the Synod of Chalcedon condemned Dioscorus, P. of Alexandria, as Eutychian, whence the Monophysites, the Eth. Church followed its patriarch. They were called Jacobites, after Jacob Baradaï. They always protested against the charge that they denied one of the natures in Christ, and asserted that they had only avoided Nestorianism. From this time the Jacobite or Coptic Patr. of Alexandria ordained the Abuna. After the Mohammedan conquest of Egypt, the separation from the Cath. Church was widened still more. It is unknown how far the missionary labors of the Eth. Church extended, towards the north their missionaries reached Meroë; but when and how Christianity was introduced there, is unknown. In the 10th cent. the Nubian historian, *Selim el Assuany*, tells us, that the inhabitants of the island of Alon (Metoë, Shendy) were Jacobite Christians, who obtained their bishops from Alexandria. *Elmacin* also (*hist. saracen. ed.* CAPENIUS, p. 99) speaks of all Nubia as a Jacobite Christian country in the 14th century. In the 16th cent. yet, the Mahomedans were merely tolerated, though pretty numerous. In the 16th cent. the coast was conquered by the Osmian Turks, and soon all Nubia was in their power. Christianity vanished, and Islamism prevailed. Abyssinia thus became isolated from the rest of Christendom. Northward was Dancalla, where there was an episcopal seat in the 10th cent. already. Still further north the Eth. missionary labors touched upon those of Egypt. There seems to have been no spread of Christianity towards the East. The Funga negroes remained heathens. Along the coast in the East, however, Christianity was prevalent, and we find there the bishopric of *Adule*. Along the coast of Arabia, among the Homerites, Christianity seems to have been advanced, though not planted, by Abyssinia, until it was extinguished by Mohammed; the influence of the Eth. Church reached as far as Kaffa and Narea, and perhaps even to the interior of Africa (*Isenberg and Krapff, Journals*: Lond., 1843, p. 13, etc.). Concerning its present condition, see Art. *Abyss. Church*. W. HOFFMANN.—*Reinecke*.

Ethiopic Version of the Bible.—In the ancient language of the Axumite kingdom, commonly called the Ethiopic, but by the natives the Geez language, there still exists a translation of the S. Scriptures, which has always been among all the tribes of Abyssinian Christendom the only authoritative one, and which still

maintains its ancient authority, though the Eth. language has long ceased to be spoken. Concerning its origin we have no historical information. The Abyssinians mention their first bishop, the Abba Salâma (Frumentius), or also the nine saints (see Art. Eth., Church of), as having translated the Scriptures from the Arabic into the Geez: but this is very improbable, since it presupposes an Arabic Bible in the age before Mahommed. Other reasons also make it certain that the translation was prepared from the Greek in the earliest times of the spread of Christianity in Abyssinia, or from the 4th to the 5th cent.; wherefore it is both the most ancient monument and also the basis of all Eth. literature. That it was made from the Greek, and according to the received text of the Alexandrian Church, is shown conclusively from a comparison of both texts. Several pseudepigraphic books, the Greek text of which is now lost, give additional evidence. All on this point, *e. g.*, that of *Renaudot*, that the translation was made from the Coptic, may therefore be regarded as antiquated. But its origin from the Greek is in turn of weight in determining its age; for translations from the Greek were made only in the first period of Eth. literature; whilst, after the Arabic language had forced its way into Egypt, it governed the literature of Eth. also. But conclusive in determining its age is the fact, that among no people can Christianity take permanent root, unless its chief source of nourishment, the written word, is given at the same time: wherefore in the conversion of a people it always has been and must be a first object, to translate the Bible for it. In the 5th cent. Christianity was firmly established in Abyssinia: in the 6th, the great poet and musician, *Jared*, originated the Ab. church music, which he could not have done without Scriptures. *Chrysostom* already (*hom. in Joh.*, II., § 2) seems to know of an Eth. version of the Bible (an Ethiopic version before Frumentius, however, as asserted of the O. T. by *B. Bruce*, and of the N. T. by *V. Cajetanus*, is altogether without foundation). Who was the author of the translation, cannot now be determined; internal evidence seems to imply a diversity of authors and successive periods of the translation. The translation itself is very faithful, generally a verbal reproduction of the Greek, even to the very position of the words, sometimes abbreviates what is apparently superfluous, and must be pronounced to be as a whole a very successful and happy one. Notwithstanding its adherence to the Greek, it is very readable, and, especially in the historical books, fluent, and in the O. T. often corresponds in a surprising manner with the sense and words of the Hebrew original. In all this there are, of course, different degrees in different books. The translators were certainly not learned men; nor do they seem always to have been master of the Greek. This becomes evident when unfrequent words, names of things, and terms of art had to be translated. Hence, besides the errors originating in the defects of the Greek manuscripts used, and the imperfections to be referred to the comparative poverty of the Eth. language, there are errors and misconceptions that can be

charged to the translators alone. But the course of time has subjected the old translation to many alterations also. In many of the variations now existing there is an evident effort to accommodate the original sentences and words, as adhering too strictly to the Greek, more closely to the Ethiopic, and to substitute current expressions for obsolete ones. The text has also been corrupted, more, however, in the last 3 or 4 cent. than before, by the carelessness and the arbitrary interpolations of readers and copyists. This is especially the case in those books which are read more than others, such as the 4 Gospels, where the corruptions in some manuscripts are such, that we would suspect a paraphrase rather than a translation, or a new translation instead of the old. It seems, indeed, not impossible that different readers and copyists remodelled some passages and books according to other, especially Arabic, translations; for the influence of Arabic literature was at certain times very strong. This is proven by the prolegomena to books of the N. T., translated from the Arabic; also by the Arabic titles of different N. T. books. The want of a more reliable text, as also a comparison of their Bible with that of other nations, gave rise subsequently to revisions of their Bible. That such revisions were actually undertaken, is certain. Hence, also, it is evident that the original text of the Eth. Bible can no longer be restored without critical care and caution. But since the Eth. Bible originated from the Greek in comparatively very early times, it is in turn important for the criticism of the Greek text; and as having also preserved thence other peculiarities and original features. The introduction into their more recent manuscripts of our divisions into chapters, seems to have resulted from their intercourse with Europe: formerly they had a division of their own. Its compass also seems to betray the origin of this Bible. It contains not only all our canonical books of the O. and N. T., but also all the Apocrypha of the Luth. Bible, besides several Pseudepigraphs. Nor is the difference between canonical and non-canonical books known. This seems to be a heritage of the Abyss. Church from its mother, the Alexandrian, in which the Apocrypha stood in high authority: but the entirely uncritical and credulous mind of the people had also undoubtedly its influence. The number of books is always given as 81, viz.: 46 to the O. T., and 35 to the New. In particulars the enumeration varies. The enumeration and division of the books given by *Ludolf*, is by no means a general one. Others are given, *e. g.*, in the *Cod. Æth.*, V. and XXXV. of the Brit. Museum. The canons of the Abyss. Church (*Fatha Nagast*, P. I., Cap. 2) give another. Sometimes the pseudepigraphs are enumerated among the 46 books of the O. T., and sometimes they are omitted. In the N. T., after an unvarying enumeration of our canonical books, follows the *Synodus* in 8 books, a collection of *canones*, beginning with their peculiar recension of the canon of the Apostolical Constitutions. (See *LUDOLF*, *hist. æth.*, III., and *Comm.*, pp. 295–298; the prolegomenon to the London Polyglott, No. 15; the preface of C. B. MICHAELIS to *BODE*, *evang. secund. Matth. ex*

vers. æth., 1749; *LE LONG*, *Biblioth. sacr. ed. A. G. Masch*, 1778, Tom. II., pp. 140–157 — what portions of this Bible were formerly published, is stated in the above *Bibl. sacr.*; in 1830 the N. T. was republished by *Th. P. Platt*, at the expense of the *B. & F. B. S.* It is better than the Rom. edition, but not free from errors and uncritical. By *Platt* was also published in 1834, a part of the *Synodus*, viz.: the *Eth. Didascalia*; by R. LAURENCE, the *Ascensio Jesajae*, 1819; the *Apoc. of Ezra*, 1820; the *B. of Enoch*, 1838. (*Dillman's* critical edition of the entire Old Testament).

A. DILLMANN.—E. W. Reinecke.

Ethnarch, a ruler of a nation or tribe. 1) several members of the Asmonean dynasty joined this title to the office of the high-priesthood. It is first applied to Simon Macc. (1 Macc. 14: 38, 47: 15: 1, 2), whom the Jews also styled "Benefactor" (*Jos.*, *Ant.*, XIII., 6, 6; see Luke 22: 25). In this sense the title is a translation of *נשיא*, for *נשיא ישראל*, is Simon's name on coins (*ECKHEL*, *doctr. numm. vet.*, I., 3, 468, 471). J. Hyrcanus also bore the title (*Jos.*, *B. J.*, I, 2, 8; *A.*, XIII., 10, 7). Aristobulus took that of king in its stead. But Pompey again applied it to Hyrcanus II. (*Ant.*, XIV., 8, 5), whom Julius Cæsar also styles "High-priest and Ethnarch" (10, 2, 3, &c.), whilst Antipater was merely called *προστάτης*, *ἐπιμελητής*, or *ἐπίτροπος* (8, 1, 3; 5, 9, 1). Herod the Great again assumed royal dignity, but Archelaus became simply an ethnarch, and was the last who bore this title; *βασιλεύειν*, Matth. 2: 22, is a general expression. An ethnarch occupied a medium position between a tetrarch and a king (*Jos.*, *B. J.*, II., 6, 3; *Ant.*, XVII., 11, 4).—2) In 2 Cor. 11: 32, an ethnarch of King Aretas (see *Art.*) is named. In this case the title is used (rather than *ὑπαρχος*, *ἐπίτροπος*, *διοικητής*), in imitation of the Romans.—3) The Jews in Alexandria obtained certain immunities from Alexander Max. confirmed by Jul. Cæsar and Augustus and Claudius (*Jos.*, *B. J.*, II., 18, 7–9; *C. Ap.* II., 4, 5; *Ant.* XIX., 5, 2), being allowed to have a sort of government of their own under the general government. In this respect they were under *ethnarchs* (*Jos.*, *Ant.*, XIV., 7, 2), to whom, also, the Jews in all Egypt and Cyrene were subject. These E. were also called *alabarchs* (XVIII., 6, 3; 8, 1; XIX., 5, 1; XX., 7, 3), a term of still doubtful import.

H. PARET.*

Euchology, *Εὐχολόγιον*, is the common name for the rituals and liturgies of the later Greek C. The Greek C. has been more fruitful in such works than the Latin. Even the Apostolic Constit. contain material upon which subsequent forms of the mass-service were constructed, under the name of distinguished Ch. Fathers. The term in this sense is first found in *Anast. Sinaita* (*quest.*, 141), in the 6th cent., then in the mystagogic and liturgical writings of the Byzantians, and *Suidas*. Such liturgical collections were numerous, and of various extent; some merely for private devotions. The MSS. in Vienna, Rome (*Bibl. Barberina*), Paris, Venice, the monasteries of Mt. Athos, of course differ in their contents. But usually the

larger euchol. contains both the mass-service of Chrysostom and Basil, and the so-called *missa præsantificationum* (τῶν προσηγιασμένων), i.e., the formula of those masses which were performed on Sundays during Lent, as a consecration of the elements of the Holy Supper, which might then be used during the week. Then followed evening-prayers, forms for administering the other sacraments, and a number of other prayers and consecrating addresses. — Among the best known ed. of the E. is that of *Venet.*, 1619, *apud Anton. Pinellum*. The best is that of J. GOAR, *Par.*, 1645. An abstract of the large E. is: *Σύνταγμα τινων ἀναγκαζων ακολουθιων*, &c., ed. curante EM. GLYZONIO, *Venet.*, 1595, *apud Fr. Julianum*. Extracts in A. DANIEL's *Cod. liturg. eccl. orient.*, &c., Lips., 1853. — (Comp. L. ALLATIUS, *De libris Græc. eccl. ed. A. Fabric. diss.*, I., § 17, p. 71; CAVE, *Histor. liter. Genev.*, 1699, II., *Append.*, p. 24; NEALE, the office-books of the holy Eastern Church, II., 819, &c.).

GASS.*

Eudists, missionaries of Jesus and Mary, so-called from their founder, *Eudes*. Eudes, b. 1601, at Mezera, Normandy, studied with the Jesuits at Caen, and joined the Oratorians, Paris, in 1623. At first he devoted himself mainly to those smitten with the plague, afterwards he prosecuted missions among the clergy. Subsequently he was induced to establish a congregation for the pursuit of missions among the clergy and the training of men for the ministry; but it never spread much. During the revolution it went down, but was revived in 1826. The Eudists have a college, St. Gabriel's, in Indriann.

HERZOG.*

Eudo, or **Eon de Stella**, a French fanatic of the 12th cent, probably connected with the Cathari. Once, on entering a church, he heard the words: "*per eum qui venturus est judicare vivos et mortuos*," he was seized with the notion that this *eum* meant himself. Accordingly he went forth proclaiming this conceit, and soon gathered many followers. Among other things he taught that baptism availed only for believers, that true baptism was conferred only by the laying on of hands, that the hierarchy was not of God, the Romish C. not the true one, as its priests led bad lives, that there was no resurrection of the body, and that marriage was no sacrament. His progress was opposed by arguments and by the sword. Many of his followers perished at the stake. The Synod of Rheims pronounced him mad, and ordered him to be confined. This fanaticism disappeared after E.'s death.—(See GIESSELER, *H. E.*, § 84.)

C. SCHMIDT.*

Eudoxius, the Arian or Semi-Arian, was the son of the martyr Cæsarius, of Arabissus, in Armenia, and B. in Germanicia, a city near Mt. Taurus. Philostorgius describes him as a ready man, agreeable and modest, but timid; Theodoret says he was ambitious and sensual (THEODOR. II., 20, 27; *Hær. fab.*, IV., 2; PHILOSTR., IV., § 4). After Leontius' death he seized the bishopric of Antioch, and began to assail the apostolic doctrine (Theod.). He, with others, had previously brought the longer Antioch formula of 345 to Italy (SOCRAT., II., 19). Expelled from Antioch he joined the Synod of Seleucia,

359, and the party of Acacius. He was deposed (SOCR., II., 40; SOZOM., IV., 12), but so wrought upon the Emperor that the reproach of being an Anomœan was transferred from himself to Aetius (THEOD., II., 27). The Acacians secured, 360, his elevation to the See of Constantinople. By means of duplicity he acquired greater influence. Socrates says of him: ὁ πατὴρ ἀσεβής, ὁ υἱὸς εὐσεβής. Subsequently he took bolder ground, baptized Valens, confirmed his Arianism, and defended his party against the Synod of Lampascus, 365. He died in the 19th year of his episcopate. (SOCR., IV., 14; SOZOM., VI., 7).

GASS.*

Eugendus, **Augendus**, Abbot of Condat in the Jura, founded by St. Roman and his brother, Lupicinus, c. 430. He entered the monastery in his 7th year, and, c. 480, succeeded Roman and Lup. as its abbot, but without becoming a priest. He practised the greatest simplicity in his manner of life, enforced the same upon his monks, and laid great stress upon learning. He died 510–17, without ever having left the precincts of his monastery.

KL.*

Eugenius, chosen by the Catholics, B. of Carthage, 480, under the rule of the Arian Vandals, was banished, 484, to the desert of Tripoli for his opposition to Arianism, by Hunneric. After H.'s death Gundamund recalled him; but his zealous efforts to have the eccl. property restored to the Catholic bishops, led Thrasimund to exile him again, 498, to Gallia, where he died 505. He wrote an *expositio fidei cathol.*, an *apolog. pro fide*, and an *altercatio cum Arianis*. KL.*

Eugenius, of Toledo was appointed, against his will, Archb. of Toledo, by King Chindaswinth. He took an active part in three councils held at Toledo, improved the Church-music, and died 658. He also rewrought a poem of Dracontius, of Toledo, upon the Creation of the world, added a hymn upon the Seventh-day, wrote an epigram, and a treatise *de resurrect. carnis, et beatitudinis statu*; — all publ. by J. SIRMONDE, Paris, 1619.

KL.*

Eugene I.–IV — I. The son of the Roman Rufianus, born Sept., 654, was made Pope by the people and clergy of Rome to succeed Martin I., who had been dethroned by the Emp. Constantine. Mild in disposition, he was disposed to yield to the Emperor and the Monothelites. The strange agreement with Peter, the Patriarch of Constantinople, who, for peace sake, was inclined to adopt three instead of one or two wills in Christ, was not calculated permanently to restore any good understanding between the Eastern and Western Churches. Died June 1, 657, and canonized; anniversary June 2. Of his writings, if he left any, none have been transmitted.—(See his life by ANASTASIUS and PLATINA, *Baron. Annal. h. annor.*; *Pagi Breviar.*, T. I.; BOWER, *Histor. of the Popes*). — II. (elected Feb. 14, 824, † in Aug. 827), born in Rome, where he had been presbyter and archpresbyter. Whilst E. coincided with the decision of the Frank Council which had been convened at Paris, Nov. 1, 825, at the instigation of Louis the Pious, touching the image-controversy, in practice he followed the ancient custom. The Romish Council, which the Pope convened on Nov. 1, 826, drew up excellent decrees for the restora-

tion of eccles. discipline, the advancement of theological literature, the founding of schools and cathedrals, and against the worldly spirit of priests. Anastasius and Platina praise E.'s zeal for the welfare of the poor, the widows and orphans of Rome.—(BARONIUS, *Annal. h. annor.*; BOWER, *l. c.*; ELLENDORF, *die Karolinger*, II., p. 28).—III., born in Pisa, a Cistercian and pupil of Bern., of Clairv., was raised from a low condition to the papacy, Feb. 27, 1145. Before Arnold of Brescia (see Art.), visited Rome the city was agitated by his antibierarchical sentiments. The spirit of old Roman liberty still survived, and was now being excited by fanatical appeals. Sword in hand the people demanded the Pope to renounce all temporal authority. Eugene fled by night, and took refuge with his court at Viterbo. There he received tidings of the fall of Edessa, and on Dec. 1, 1145, he called upon Louis VII., of France, to organize a new crusade (see *Crusades*).—Against the insurgent Romans he hurled a bann, and then compelled them to join their enemies, the Tiburtines, in a compact which dissolved the patrician dignity, and gave the Pope the power to appoint the Senate. He returned in triumph to Rome, but the state of feeling produced by Arnold's preaching, compelled him to flee again early in 1146. He went to Treves, where, at a Synod, in Bernard's presence, he approved the writings of St. Hildegard. Then, with Bernard still at his side, he went to Paris, and was received by Louis with pious humility (April, 1147). On his way thither Synods were held, matters of faith discussed, and controversies settled. He was honored everywhere except in Rome. On his return to Italy, Roger of Sicily, helped him to reduce the city to submission once more; but in 1150 the republicans again compelled him to leave, and thenceforth he lived mostly at Segni. Frederick Barb. promised, indeed, to aid him in subduing the rebels, but before this was done E. died, July 8, 1153, only 43 days before Bernard. (See JAFFÉ, *Regesta*, Baron. *l. c.*; NEANDER, *der h. Bernh., &c.*, 190–296; WILKEN, *Gesch. d. Kreuzz.*, III., Abth. 1; BOWER, *l. c.*).—IV. (in *minoribus* Gabriel Condolmiere) sprang from a Venitian merchant's family, related to the Corrari. Gregory XII. made him B. of Siena in his 24th year, and then, 1408, a Cardinal. On March 3, 1431, contrary to expectation, he was chosen successor of Martin V. He forthwith committed three indiscretions. First, by summoning the Basel Council (see Art.) which became a source of constant annoyance; and then by revoking the summons (Nov. 12). Next by exciting the relatives of his predecessor, the Colonna, against him, so that in his war against Milan and the Aragon dynasty of Naples, they joined his foes. During this struggle one province after another was lost, and even the populace of Rome became so unmanageable that he was compelled to escape in disguise, and even then was pelted with stones on his way out of the city. He transferred his court to Florence, and remained there 3 or 4 years dependent upon his confederates. During this time he was controlled by the tyrannical Vitelleschi, whom he had made a cardinal, but afterwards imprisoned,

and had poisoned, for treason. *Iudov. Scarampo*, the successful warrior, took V.'s place. The Pope's fortunes now rose. He opened a papal council at Ferrara, Jan. 8, 1438, afterwards transferred to *Florence* (see Art.). With the waning of the authority of the Council of Basel, and the anti-Pope Felix V., fortune smiled on the arms of Eugene, especially after he faithlessly turned against the republics. On Sept. 28, 1443, he returned to Rome. He died Feb. 23, 1447—just when the Basel Council and the anti-Pope were in their last agonies.—(See PLATINA. The references under *Basel Council*. RAYNALD, *Annal. annor.*, 1431–47. BLONDUS, *Histor. Dec.*, III., Lib. IV. S. ANTONIN., *Chron.* P. III., tit. XXII. BOWER, *l. c.*). VOIGT.*

Eugippius, (*Eugipius, Eugyppius, Egippius*, and, erroneously, *Egesippus*). The life of this man, though but little is known of him, is not involved in so much uncertainty as the divers opinions as to his place of birth and abode, would imply (HEROLD's *Thes. ex D. Augustini Opp.*: Basil, 1542. T. II., *Præf.*) Sigebert's discovery that B. Redux, of Naples, furnished (582) the treatise entitled "*Spirit*," from the works of Augustine, for the use of his Church, has misled some to distinguish between the author of that treatise and the author of the *vita S. Severini* (*Bolland.*, Jan. 8), which was certainly written in 511. But J. Basnage (ed. of *Antiq. lectiones*, of Canisius. I., 409, &c.) has shown that Redux may simply have copied an earlier work; also, that the dedication of the book points to the beginning of the 6th cent., that the author lived and died some time before 560, since Cassiodorus speaks of him (c. 560) as one whom he remembers having seen, and finally, that there is no reason for supposing that there was any other Eugippius besides the author of the *Vita S. Sev.*—The only original sources of his history to 500, are his letter to one Paschasius, a deacon, and P.'s reply (CANIS. *Lect. Ant.*, I., 411, &c. BARON., *Annal. Eccl.*, ad a., 496). E. had requested Pasch. to prepare a biography of Severinus. P. declines this, pronounces E.'s treatise satisfactory, and adds: *facilius virtutes magistrorum a discipulis exponuntur*. As he bases E.'s competency for the work upon his frequent *conversatio docentium*, he seems to imply that E. was an immediate pupil of Severinus. But S. first appears in Noricum, 454, and never left that country until his death, in 481. Hence E. must have lived in Noricum during that time. His activity as an author during 500–510, renders it probable that at S.'s death he was still a young man, had spent but a short time with that St., and learned his master's history from older disciples. He claims no more in his letter to P.: *ex notissima nobis et quotidiana majorum relatione composui*. This does not, as Basnage thinks, conflict with his personal connection with Sever., for at the close of the letter he says: *Hæc igitur sola, quæ retuli, quotiens de beati Severini patria sermo ortus est, etiam IPSO SUPERSTITE, semper audivi*. E. also requests Pasch. to introduce into the biography his accounts of the miracles which attended the removal of the remains of Severinus from Vienna to Italy, and calls the miracles events, *quæ FIDELIS PORTITOR filius vester*

optime novit. This *portitor* must mean E. himself, so that he must have been among those Romans who quit, 487, the monastery *prope Fabianus*, in the Danubian districts, and rallying around the relics of S. returned to Naples, and took up his abode in a monastery there. And there are no grounds for supposing that he ever changed this residence. Here Abbot Maximus urged him to prepare an abstract from Augustine's works. He never speaks of himself as Abbot; and Pasch., Fulgentius, and Cassiodorus call him presbyter. It is uncertain, therefore, whether, according to Greek custom, he merely was called Abbot complimentarily, or really became such late in life. The year of his death is uncertain, but must have been prior to 540.—In regard to E.'s connection with Severinus in Noricum, c. 480, we suggest, that he may have gone thither with Pirmenius, of whom mention is made in E.'s letter to Pasch., and who fled from Italy after the murder of Orestes (at the close of 476); that E. belonged to a family which found it expedient to leave Italy after Odoacer's victory.—E. seems to have held an honorable position in the Church and his native land. A letter of Fulgentius, of Ruspe, to E. (Basel ed. of F.'s works, 1587, pp. 535–46) indicates this. E. also sustains honorable scientific relations with Dionysius Exiguus, as the transl. of the *de opificio mundi* of Greg., of Nyssa, and the biogr. of Pachomius, proves. A. VOGEL.*

Eulalia, St.—Barcelona and Merida, near Badajoz, both revere martyrs of this name. They are probably identical. Prudentius praises her in his verses. Born of a respectable family she was ascetic from childhood. In her 12th year the Diocletian persecution broke out. Hearing the command to sacrifice to the gods, she escaped from her mother one night, resolved to brave the peril of a refusal, entered Augusta Emerita (Merida) at dawn, presented herself before the officer, and denounced the attempt to compel Christians to apostatize. The officer sought by mild words to persuade her merely to touch the salt and incense with the tip of her finger. But she threw down an idol, and spit in the officer's face. The flesh was then torn from her breast to the bone—but she praised God. Fire was then kindled around her and she perished. REÜCHLIN.*

Eulalius, was set up as anti-Pope to Boniface I., by a minority of the Roman clergy, and gathered a strong party around him. The Emperor Honorius convoked a council to settle the strife. Meanwhile both Popes were to leave Rome, and commit their affairs to B. Achilles, of Spoletum. Eulalius rejected this proposition. An insurrection followed, and E. was expelled from the city. Afterwards he became B. of Nepe, and remained quiet. When Boniface died the friends of E. again urged him to take the papal chair, but he declined. KL.*

Eulogia — *εὐλογία*. — This word in the N. T. (Greek) signifies praise (Rev. 5 : 12 ; 7 : 12), benediction (Heb. 12 : 17 ; James 3 : 10), the good conferred (Rom. 15 : 29 ; 2 Cor. 9 : 5 ; Heb. 6 : 7), or the thanksgiving with which the sacramental cup is received (1 Cor. 10 : 16). — It occurs but once in a bad sense (Rom. 16 : 18). —

The patristic and ecclesiastical use of the word became twofold. In the *first* place it was natural to apply it to the various clerical benedictions. This clerical blessing, according to the "Apost. Constit." (VIII., c. 28), could not be imparted by a deacon, a presbyter could receive it only from a bishop at his ordination, a bishop only from other bishops. The people receive it, on solemn occasions, from the bishop or presbyter (Constit. II., c. 57, *εὐλογεῖν τὸν λαόν*). The distinction made, III., c. 10, between *εὐλ. μεγάλη* and *μικρά*, refers not to its being dispensed by a bishop or presbyter, but to its being pronounced in public or private, or perhaps upon clergy and laymen. The term was also applied to the benediction pronounced upon the catechumens, competentes (VIII., c. 8, 15), sacramental elements (VIII., c. 29), and in later liturgies upon persons when married, monks at their assumption of the vow, &c. The rules of Basil made the withholding of the blessing one of the minor eccl. penalties.

The *second* familiar use of the term is the sacramental, based upon the opinion that in 1 Cor. 10 : 16, *εὐλογία* was synonymous with *εὐχαρίστια* in Matt. 26 : 26, 27. In the 3d cent. the *εὐλογία* had to precede the consecration and presentation of the elements (EUSEB., *H. E.*, VI., 43). Many passages in Cyril, of Alex., show that *εὐλογία* was then used of the Lord's Supper itself, or of the host (*lib. Glaph. in Levit.*, pp. 351, 367 ; in *Deut.*, p. 414, *Opp. Par.*, 1638. See SUICERI, *Thes.*). But another peculiar modification underlay this latter sense. As early as Irenæus it was customary for bishops, during festivals, to send the consecrated eucharist around among their various parishes, as an emblem of the communion of saints (EUSEB., V., 24) ; it was also sent around to the sick, &c. (JUSTIN., *Apol. I.*, 27 ; *Constit. Apost.*, VIII., 13). But the Council of Laodicea decreed that *τὰ ἅγια εἰς λόγον εὐλογιῶν* should not be thus sent out to other parishes (*Can. 14, 32*). From Augustine, however, we learn (*de pecc. meritis*, c. 26) that such *eulogia* (the name being Latinized) were offered even to catechumens and penitentes, who were not yet admitted to the sacrament. This explains some passages in later liturgical commentaries (*Nomocan. Cotelier.* n. 11, 224, 231. *Pachymer. lib.*, V., c. 4. *Maximus in Dionys. Hierarch. eccl.*, c. 3. *Socr.*, VII., c. 12). Accordingly this *εὐλογία* is not the consecrated host, but the bread brought for the use of the sacrament, from which the host was taken, and which was blessed, and thus offered as a sort of substitute to those who could not yet be fully admitted to the sacrament. This is the *panis benedictus* of Chrysostom's liturgy (DANIEL, *Cod. liturg.*, III., 371, 419). The same custom obtained in the Latin C. (*Conc. Nannent. can. 9, a. 890*). The Greek C. associated with this custom the peculiar one of the *missa præsanctificationum*.—(Cf. AUGUSTI, *Denkw.*, VIII., 31, 398 ; X., 185. BINGHAM, *Origines*, VI., 377. SUICER. *Thes.* DU CANGE, *Lex. med. et inf. Græc. s. v. εὐλογία*. PFAFF, *de oblat. Veterum euchar.*, 171). GASS.*

Eulogius, first a presbyter in Antioch, then (581–608) Patriarch of Alexandria. Pope Greg.

I. commends him highly for his controversies with the Nestorians, Severians, Theodosians, Cainites, &c. He died 608. **KL.***

Eulogius, of Corduba, chosen (858) Archb. of Toledo, but kept from his See by the Moors. He was a learned and bold defender of Christianity against the Mohammedans; also an admirer of the ancient heathen poets. He was greatly persecuted for his zeal, and finally beheaded, March 11, 859, for giving shelter to a Moorish maiden, Leocritia, who had been baptized and reared by Christian relatives, but was abused for her faith by her unbelieving parents. — His writings, first made known by **AMBROS. DE MORALES**, and publ. by **PETER PONT. LEO**, 1574, Complutum, — may be found in **ANDR. SCHOTT's** *Hisp. illustr.*, IV. The chief is: *Memor. sanctorum sive libri III. de marty. Cordubens.* — **Alv.**, of Corduba, wrote his biography. **KL.***

Eunomius and the Eunomians. — The history of E., the most prominent of the later advocates of strict Arianism, is involved in much uncertainty. Born in Dacora, Cappadocia, a town in the province of Cæsarea. Through the intervention of Eudoxus, Bishop of Constantinople, he obtained the bishopric of Cyzicum (*Theodor.*, II., 29; *Philost. Hist. eccl.*, VI., § 1–3), about the year 360. A full avowal of his views (comp. *Socr.*, IV., 7, and *Sozom.*, VI., 8), and an unwillingness to subscribe the formula of Ariminum and the deposition of **Ætius** (*Sozom.*, VI., 26; *Philost.*, VI., § 1), whose pupil and secretary he had been (*Theodor.*, II., c. 27; *Philost.*, VIII., § 20), led to his resignation. Now began his career as the avowed leader of a party. During the reign of Julian, in Constantinople, he and **Ætius** were busily engaged in gathering followers and ordaining bishops (*Philost.*, VII., 6; VIII., 3; IX., 4), who settled in Asia Minor, Syria, and Egypt (*Philost.*, VIII., 2; *Sozom.*, VI., 27). Valens recalled him from Mauritania and Illyricum, whither he had been banished, but his fate was finally sealed by Theodosius, who, in 383, rejected the creed of Eunom., and visited him with condign punishment (*Socr.*, V., 10, and *Sozom.*, VI., 17, and *Philost.*, X., 6). Captured in Chalcedon, he was sent to Halmyrus, in Moesia, thence to Cæsarea, in Cappadocia, and rested finally in the place of his nativity. His shorter compositions have survived his death, whilst his *Commentary on Romans* (*Socr.*, IV., 7) and *Letters*, highly prized by *Philostorg* (X., 6), and known to *Photius* (Cod., 138), are not to be found. His first Apology (comp. about 360, accord. to *Rettberg*, 365) was a reply to certain slanders and misunderstandings — the same combatted by Basilus, in the well-known five books. From this work is settled the text of E., which was given, in fragmentary form, by *Cave*, *Hist. lit.*, I., p. 171, and fully by *Fabricius*, *Bibl. Gr.*, VIII., pp. 262–305; improved editions followed (*Cunis. Lectt. ant. ed. Basn.*, I., p. 181, and at last, *Biblioth. dogm. curavit. Philo.*, II., p. 580). Of his second Apology — written before 379 — fragments can be gleaned from the reply of Gregory of Nyssa; collected by *Rettberg* (*Marcelliana*, p. 125). The Confession — *ἡ ἀποκρίσις* — he handed to the emperor, was given

by Valesius in the notes to Socrates (V., 10), by Fabricius, I., cp. 253, and by Rettberg emended (*Marcelliana*, p. 149; comp. *Mansi*, T. III., p. 645–49; *Basnage*, *Thes.*, I., p. 1, 178; *Biblioth. dogma.* II., p. 618).

Though possessed of talent, and an acute, fearless spirit, his immense pride blinded his eyes to the ability of those who differed from him, and made him appear, in the estimation of his enemies, an insolent fellow and a blasphemer (comp. *Theodor.*, II., 29), whilst his use of Aristotle's logic was calculated to bring down upon his head the reproaches of an age which did not appreciate it. The fundamental thought on which he based his system, was the absolute, independent being of Deity. According to Scriptures and the Fathers, God is the One Unbegotten. As His essence is commensurate with His eternity it is impossible to predicate of Him generation or a communication of His being. As nothing can precede the Unbegotten, so He cannot exist with another equal to Him, or generated by Him. The unity of the Divine being excludes diversity, whilst the words Begotten and Unbegotten imply difference of essence. If it be said that the name of Father indicates generation, it must be borne in mind that the understanding, or logic (*ὁ τῆς ἀκολουθίας*) forbids the use of this appellation beyond what its meaning or conception allows. Thus did Eunomius render intelligible the Deity as to His absolute aseity and simplicity. He even went so far as to assert the comprehensibleness of the divine essence especially (*Basil. adv. Eun.*, I., c. 13; *Theodore*, in *Dan.* c. 8; *Opp. ed. Schultze*, II., 2, p. 1220, *ὅς αὐτὴν εἶδέναι τοῦ θεοῦ τὴν οὐσίαν ἀρξομένους*, *Socr.*, IV., 7; *ὁ θεὸς περὶ τῆς ἑαυτοῦ οὐσίας οὐδὲν πλεον ἡμῶν ἐπιστάται*, *THEODORET.*, *fab. haer.*, IV., c. 3), and taught that the understanding should go beyond all secondary things, and grasp the first and highest. Touching the second and third Persons of the Trinity, he held that, as the Son derived not his being from an immanent generation, he must be regarded as a creature. As the First-born, by the immediate power of the Unbegotten, he stands above all created things which were made *by means* of Him, and accomplishes the work of redemption which the Christian faith ascribes to Him (*Schol. Eunom. in THEODOR.*, *Dialogo de Trinit. Opp.*, V., p. 957). Third in point of dignity and nature comes the Paraclete, the noblest production of the First-born, the source of all light and holiness. — The bulwark of E.'s argument was his assertion of an unconditioned and absolutely independent God; his error consisted in putting the second and third Persons of the Trinity between an abstract Deity and the world. It must be confessed, however, that his opponents did not succeed in refuting his *dogmatic* proofs, for, though Basil and Gregory attempted to conceive of non-creativity (Agennesie) as a mere hypostatic attribute of the Father, they could not make the Divine essence independent of that *ὑπεροχῇ* of uncreatedness, or self-existence, which, according to E., was absolutely necessary to the very idea of God. Of the later critics of E. we mention *Epiphani.* *haer.*, 76; *Theodore*, *fab. haer.*, IV., c. 3; *Theod. est*, *Philastr.*, *haer.*, 68; *Joh. Damas*

GREG. NAZ., *Orat. theol.*, I., *Epist. ad Nectar.*, and Chrysostom (*Fabric.*, *Bibl. Gr.*, VIII., p. 250; ed. Harl. IX., pp. 64, 207; X., 717; XII., p. 341). The second Ecumenical Council condemned his followers and those of Ætius, as heretics. After his death, they separated themselves from the communion of the Church. Some of them assumed the names of individuals, e. g., Eutychius, Theophronius (*Socr.*, V., c. 24). The Churchmen loaded them with nicknames, e. g., *ὀνοκιστὰι*, spadones (comp. *Barnage*, ap. *Canis.*, I., p. 174). According to *Socr.*, V. 24, they did not baptize in the name of the Trinity, but in the death of Christ. Inward dissensions and numerous transitions to the Catholic Church soon put an end to their existence as a body. Comp. *Klose*, *Gesch. u. Lehre des Eunom.*: Kiel, 1833; *L. Lange*, *der Arianismus in a. weiteren Entwickl.*; *Baur*, *Dreieingkeit.*, Bd. I. S., 365–87; *Dorner*, *Entwick.-gesch. d. Lehre v. d. P. Christi.*, Bd. I. S., 853; *Ritter*, *Gesch. d. christl. Philos.*, Bd. II. S., 63. GASS.—*Ermentrout*.

Euphemia, distinguished for beauty and Christian courage, was the daughter of Philophron, a respected senator of Chalcedon. In the persecution under Diocletian, her zeal outran the sympathy of her judges, who, charmed by her personal appearance, sought to save her. What fire, the rack, and a lion could not do—destroy her life—the bite of a bear effected. The church her parents built over her tomb she signalized by miracles. Taken to Constantinople and thrown into the sea, her body swam to the island Lemnos, and was again placed in Constant., where veneration for her memory continually increased. Several Latin poets of the middle age, Paulinus of Nola, Enodius, Venantius, Fortunatus, sang her praises, whilst in Chalcedon was erected in her honor a splendid church, in which an Ecumenical Council held its sessions.—Besides this one, legendary lore is enriched with several other Euphemias.

KL.—*Ermentrout*.

Euphrates.—For the geography of this river, see *Ritter's Erdkunde*, Bd. X. and XI. We will confine ourselves to the relation it sustains to the interpretation of the Bible. In Hebrew its name—פְּרָת; in Arabic, “sweet water;” in the Persian cuneated letters (*Benfey*, p. 76), Ufrātu—“the very wide,” from which the Greek Εὐφράτης. The Bible generally mentions it with the prefix, נְהַר פְּרָת (Jer. 46: 2, 6, 10), seldom without it (Gen. 2: 14; Jer. 51: 63), often “the great river” (Gen. 15: 18; Deut. 1: 7), or simply “the river,” נַחַל יְעֹזְבָן (Ez. 23: 31; Isa. 8: 7), without the article as a proper name (Isa. 7: 20; Micah 7: 12). It rises from two chief sources in the Armenian mountains (Plin. H. N., 5, 20), and uniting itself with the Tigris, about 30 leagues from the sea, both pour their waters into the Persian Gulf. Though the ideal-prophetic description of the Israelitish kingdom makes the Euphrates its extremest eastern boundary (Gen. 15: 18; Deut. 1: 7; 11: 24; Ex. 23: 31; Jos. 1: 4), it extended thus far only during the blooming period of the reign of David and Solomon, when, as the result of the glorious victories of the former (2 Sam. 8: 3; 10: 16), his son marched from Gaza to Thapsacus, and all

the princes “this side of the river” became his vassals (1 Kings 5: 1, 4; 8: 65). During the Assyrian monarchy the prophets used the Euphrates as the image of its power (Isa. 8: 7; 11: 15; Jer. 2: 18). In the age of Roman Imperialism, it was the eastern boundary of the Roman empire (Tac. Ann., 15, 17); hence, in Apoc. 9: 14; 16: 12, the enemies of Rome (the Partheans) are represented as coming over the Euphrates. The shores bordering its central course are uniform, and enriched with tamarinds and poplars, further down more fertile, with palm-groves and willows. Its width and depth vary according to locality and season. Here and there fords are met with; at other places it is crossed on rafts, or more recently by bridges; whilst lower down it is navigable for large vessels. The upper portion of the river is rapid, whilst below it moves slowly, except in April and May, when the melting snows of Armenia swell its volume, cause its banks to overflow and cover the flat land with its muddy but fertilizing waters, comp. Isa. 8: 7 (see Arrian. Alex., 7, 21, 2, 9; Tac. Ann., 6, 37). Its chief source of supply is the *Chaboras*, which empties into the Euphrates at Circesium, where lived the Prophet Ezekiel (1: 3; 3: 15; 10: 15), and, perhaps, a part of the Ten Tribes were transplanted by the Assyrians, (2 Kings 17: 6; 18: 11; 1 Chron. 5: 26, Comp. Thénius and Bertheau Comm.). Here Pharaoh Necho, 604 or 605, was defeated by the Chaldean Nebuchadnezzar, who became possessor of Syria, and, after his father's death, king of Babylon, Jer. c. 46; 2 Chron. 35: 20.—See *Winer*, *Lexicon*: Grotefend, in *Pauli's Real-Encyclop.*, IV., p. 283. RÜETSCH.—*Ermentrout*.

Euphrosyna, a saintly virgin of the 5th cent., according to *Acta Sanctorum*, the accomplished daughter of the rich Alexandrine Paphnutius, who, in order to escape a marriage repugnant to her feelings, disguised in man's clothing, entered a monastery, and was received under the name Smaragdus. The distressed father, who had gone for consolation to the abbot, was sent by him to Smaragdus, who, recognizing her father, comforted him with the hope that he would find his daughter. Thirty-eight years passed by, and Paphnutius finally recognized her in the dying Smaragdus. After her death he put on the garb of a monk, and lived 10 years in the cell his daughter had occupied. This narrative is contained in the *Acta Sanctorum*. Tillemont doubts its truth. KL.—*Ermentrout*.

Eusebius, of Alexandria.—Under this name antiquity read a number of *homilies*, which enjoyed a certain celebrity in the Eastern Church during the 6th and 7th centuries. They may be divided into two classes: those which treat of events in the history of our Lord, and those which deal with the practical, moral questions of the age. A majority appear as if they had been delivered to a congregation, but not a few, in both classes, have the form of answers to questions put to the speaker by a certain Alexander. Their origin is also obscure. From the titles, which they bear, their author must have been a monk or a high dignitary in the Church. He is called now bishop, now archbishop, and now patriarch or papa—most frequently, bishop

or archbishop of Alexandria, after Cyril. The succession of Alexandrian bishops, however, forbids the latter supposition, whilst the internal evidence, derived from language, style, and reference to historical events, points to a period not earlier than the close of the 5th cent. as the time of their production. The number, as yet discovered, amounts to 21. For their disinterment from the rubbish of antiquity, we are chiefly indebted to the labors of *Thilo* and *Cardinal Mai* (*Spicileg. Rom.*, IX., pp. 1 and 652). On the question of their authorship comp. *DÄHN* (*Erach and Gruber, allg. Encycl.*, Sect. 1, vol. 39, p. 194).

SEMISCH.—Porter.

Eusebius, surnamed *Bruno*, Bishop of Angers from 1047 till † 1081, has a twofold interest to the Church historian; first, as an ecclesiastical prince, who resisted the claims of the Pope, and refused to obey him, except so far as he represented the cause of Christ; and then, as a defender of the more ideal view of Berengar concerning the Lord's Supper, against the prevailing dogma of transubstantiation. Of his life before this, only one thing is certainly known, that soon after his succession to office he incurred suspension along with many other bishops, probably through suspicion of simony, from which charge, however, he was fully acquitted, since in the very same year (1049) he not only had a seat and vote in the Reformatory Council convoked at Rheims by Leo IX., but was one of the few prelates appointed to welcome the Pope in the name of the assembly. Elevated above the mass of his episcopal contemporaries by virtue of a clear understanding, an earnest love of truth, and a mild, pious disposition, it is no wonder that he felt inclined to side with Berengar in his view of the Lord's Supper. In a letter written from Rome he bitterly complains of the unworthy manner in which the Pope had treated Berengar, who was free from any doctrinal error (1049). B. himself counted him among his supporters (*Coen. sacr. ed. Visch.*, p. 52), and following his counsel, at the Synod of Tours (1054), resolved to parry off the oath imputed to him. So too the opposite party thought. Bishop Theotwin of Liege (*Galland, bibl. patr.*, XIV., p. 244), in a letter of the year 1051, mentions him expressly, along with B., as one of the advocates of the heresy, that in the eucharist there is nothing but the shadow and image of the body of Christ. But although E., enlightened by the study of the N. T. and the Latin Church-Fathers, saw how untenable the dogma was, he had not courage enough to wear the thorny crown of martyrdom. By the aid of the powerful Count Gaufried of Anjou, he was indeed able to stand up against the ban of the Church, but as soon as this valiant protector of heretics died (1060), his independence and his sympathy with Berengar both sank with him into the grave. Terrified by the blind fury of the people and the hierarchy, which threatened to overwhelm every one who held more spiritual views of the eucharistic mystery, E. gradually withdrew his support from Berengar. The most interesting memorial of this change is a letter, written some time between the years 1063 and 1066. B., provoked by opposition, accepted a challenge

to discuss the doctrine of transubstantiation, and invited his bishop to preside as umpire. This invitation E. coldly declined, and added various remarks defining his own position in regard to the question. As the Holy Supper was not a matter for logical dispute, but for pious faith, which held closely to the Scriptures, he wished to acknowledge once for all, that, by virtue of the power of the Creative Word active in the priestly consecration, the bread and wine became the body and blood of Christ. Without curiously inquiring as to the mode, we must simply adhere to the words of institution. Analogous to this miracle, wrought by divine power, is the incarnation of the Son of God, and the passing of the Saviour through closed doors. Little stress also is to be laid upon the writings of the Fathers, because of their ambiguity, and because they cannot take rank beside the Holy Scriptures.

The only accurate copy of this letter is given by MANARDUS (*Augustini c. Julian. operis imperfecti* 1, 2, priores, p. 499). Two other letters of Eusebius are found in SUDENDORF (*Berengar, Turon.*, 1850, pp. 202, 222). — For his biography, see *Histoire lit. de la France*, VIII., p. 99; LESSING (*Berengar Turon., Works by Lachmann*, VIII., p. 403); NEANDER (*Church Hist.*); SUDENDORF (*l. c.*, pp. 32, 140).

SEMISCH.—Porter.

Eusebius of Cæsarea, surnamed *Pamphili* (i. e., the friend of Pamphilus), † 340; b. 260 or 270, and most probably in Palestine. At least he spent his youth there, where he early met with Constantinus (*vit. Const.*, 1, 19), and received his first impulse to piety and learning. His biography by Acacius (*SOCRAT., H. E.*, 2, 4) being lost, we know but little of his education but what he himself incidentally reports. Thus he mentions among his teachers the learned and eloquent B. Meletius (*H. E.*, 7, 32). During a visit to Antioch he became acquainted with the presbyter Dorotheus, a distinguished Biblical scholar, whom he heard preach (*H. E.*, 7, 32). Nature and disposition inclined him to avail himself of all the rich treasures of learning for which Palestine was then pre-eminent: of the valuable eccl. libraries of B. Alexander of Jerusalem, and of Pamphilus of Cæsarea (*H. E.*, 6, 20; 7, 32). But he was chiefly attracted by the writings of Origen. This preference may be attributed as well to the influence of Pamphilus, as to allurements of Neo-Platonism for intelligent young Christians. It was at the school founded by Origen that E. made his first attempt at expounding the S.S., 305 (*de martyr. Palest.*, c. 4). During the imprisonment of Pamph. under the Diocl. persecution, E. spent days with him in preparing a eulogy and defence of Origen (*PHOT., cad.*, 118). In his last years yet, E. wrote with admiration of his martyred friend (*de martyr. Pal.*, c. 11, *H. E.*, 6, 32; 7, 32). E. himself had to flee before the raging storm. He went to Tyre (309), thence to Egypt, where he became a witness of the savage butcheries, and for a time a confessor (*H. E.*, 8, 7, 9). It was only through partizan suspicion, that a fellow prisoner, B. Potamon of Heraclea, charged him at the Synod of Tyre, 335, with having escaped from that persecution by foul means (*EPI*

PHAN., *Haer.*, 68, 7). It was, indeed, not E.'s nature fanatically to covet martyrdom; but he was too magnanimous and religious to betray his faith. Moreover in that age an apostate would not have been so soon entrusted with a bishop's staff (315); indeed we should hardly err in supposing that he became bishop in 313. (The statement of Athanasius (*Apol. c. Arian.*, c. 8) rests upon hearsay).

Until the breaking out of the *Arian controversy*, E.'s labors were chiefly private. The catastrophes which meanwhile overwhelmed the Church, only furnished him with material and incentives to new apologetic works. He entered the Arian contest against his will. When Arius, by messengers and letters, and then in person, sought his aid, E. hoped to reconcile the dispute by mutual concessions; his doctrinal views and disposition both led him to this middle course (EPIPHAN., *Haer.*, 69, 4; SOZOM., *H. E.*, 1, 15). He wrote two letters to Alexander, and a third to Euphrasion, to show that Arius was misrepresented (see fragm. in MANSI, *conc. coll.*, XIII., 316, &c.). At the Council of Nice, also, he stood with the mediating party. That he then enjoyed the honor of sitting at Constantine's right hand, and of greeting C. in the name of the bishop, is attested by Sozomen (*H. E.*, 1, 19), by the manner in which E. himself mentions the speaker on that occasion (*vit. Const.*, 3, 11), and by the fact that he pronounced his eulogy upon C. in the midst of "the servants of God" (*vit. C.*, 1, 1), during the *tricennalia* then celebrated. The assertion of Theodoret, that Eustath. of Antioch (*H. E.*, 1, 6), and of Theod. of Mopsuesta (in NICET., *thes. orth. fid.*, 5, 7), that B. Alexander in Alexandria, enjoyed this honor, must be attributed to the partisan zeal of the Athanasians. The respect entertained for E. had great weight in the discussion; though his own account of this may be deemed partial (SOCRAT., *H. E.*, 1, 8). After a stormy debate the Confession of Faith prepared by E. was approved, with the addition of the familiar clauses concerning the true essential divinity of Christ. He opposed the term *ὁμοούσιος* to the last, and does not mention it in any of his post-Nicene writings. The love of peace, and the Emperor's will prevailed over all his scruples. With mental reservations, therefore, and timidly, he subscribed the formula, still holding his place among the Arians. A treacherous test, however, was presented in the proffered patriarchate of Antioch, after the deposition of Eustathius (331). After a brief hesitation his better convictions triumphed, and he declined the dignity, partly because the deposition of bishops conflicted with Church order, but mainly because the sanguinary agitations in Antioch alarmed a man inclined to quiet literary pursuits (SOCR., 1, 24; SOZ., 2, 18, &c.). Constantine commended this rare declinature of eccl. preferment (*vit. C.*, 3, 61). E. participated, during the continuance of the strife, in the measures taken against the Nicene leaders. He seems to have presided at the Synod of Tyre (335), convened to try Athanasius (EPIPH., *Haer.*, 68, 7). At the dedication of the Church of the Holy Sepulchre (*vit. C.*, 4, 45), the Sabellianism of Marcellus of Ancyra was spoken of,

and he was appointed by the synodical committee in Constantinople to write a refutation of it (*c. Marcell.*, 2, 4). In 336, memorable for the tricennial anniversary of Constantine's reign, E. wrote his panegyric upon C. (*vit. C.*, 1, 1; 4, 46) which embodied his entire theology. After the Council of Nice the Emperor cherished the warmest regard for E., confiding to him even the secrets of his religious life (*vit. C.*, 1, 28; 2, 8, &c.). Inspired with high respect for E.'s learning, he entrusted him with the preparation of 50 parchment MSS. of the Bible, for the churches of the capital (*a.* 331, *vit. C.*, 4, 36; SOCR., 1, 9). Laying aside all other labors, E. addressed himself with untiring diligence to this work (*vit. C.*, 4, 35, 46), and in the midst of it, toiling to his last breath, died.

Eusebius combined many *excellent qualities of mind and heart*. In more quiet times, or away from the atmosphere of the court, his moderation, contentment, and peaceableness, would have made him one of the best of bishops. He did not lack resolution in sacrificing personal inclination to duty, but the systematic thought and firmness, so essential in his circumstances. It is especially significant that whilst in the controversy with Athanasius he betrays even extreme partizanship, he seems to verge on a sacrifice of the truth when arrayed against Constantine.—His theology, modified in all leading points by Origen, is characterized by the same empiricism. In erudition, Hellenic, and Christian, he surpasses all the Church Fathers, not even excepting Origen and Jerome. Neither is he deficient in some tact for distinguishing essentials from non-essentials. But in everything he is a compiler, hence he traverses Christianity rather than enters its inmost sanctuary. His considerateness, by which he stood in affinity with the theologians of Antioch, shows itself in his style also.—Two things cast a shadow upon E. from the start. First his *position in regard to Arianism*. Whilst zealots like Hilary and Jerome at once branded him as the standard-bearer of Arianism, and the 2d Council of Nice (787) summarily condemned him as such, others charged him with duplicity (SOCR., 1, 23). Few defended him as orthodox according to Nice (SOCR., 1, 23; 2, 21), among whom was Athanasius (*ep. ad Afros* c. 6: *de decr. Nic. syn.*, c. 3), on the assumption that E. turned from Arianism to the orthodox faith. The truth is, E. was neither Nicene nor Arian, but always adhered to his own form of the doctrine of the Trinity. He piously adhered to the Logos-doctrine of Origen, and desired to have the divinity of Christ expressed in simple Bible terms. But the apparition of Sabellianism drove him into the path of Arianism, the bearings of which he did not clearly see. Hence the apparent changeableness of his delineations of the doctrine of Christ.—He places the origin of the Son in a casual connection with the existence of the world. The world as a vast body, of innumerable parts, needed a head to arrange and govern all, and to keep it from wandering too far from God. The Father could not be this head, because the glory of his unlimited deity would be too great for created things to endure. When, therefore, his love determined to create the world in order

to impart to it the life of that love, he first begat the Son, not from any necessity of his nature, but freely. As a kind of intermediate being between the perfect first source of all things and frail creatures, he should be the foundation of all that might be created, and the organ (*ὄργανον*, *ἐκπύρετης*) and living norm, who should combine all existing things into unity. To call him a creature, and suppose him to have sprung like other creatures *ἐξ οὐκ ὄντων*, would deny his divinity; for only the begotten is like him that hath begotten, and the Son was continually with the Father, before all time. But the nature of this begetting, as the entire relation of the Son to the Father, is beyond human conception. The nearest similitude is that of the odor of flowers. Thus the Son is the sweet odor proceeding from the Father—his perfect image, his essential glory—*αὐτόθεος*, *αὐτοζών*, *αὐτοαγαθόν*, superior to all creatures. To the only begotten Son alone does the Father sustain this specific, and, as the name implies, physical relation. But this origin involves the reality of his Sonship, as a being hypostatically distinct from the Father. And as the Father is the only unbegotten absolute first cause, the Son finds the ground of his own existence first in the Father. Hence the Son does not possess equal majesty (*ἰσότης*) with the Father, though before all time he is not without beginning or eternal (*ἀπλῶς ἀίδιος*); the idea of the Father's existence precedes that of the Son. The Son, as a second God subordinate to the Father, must also worship the Father. This unity of the Father as the sole first cause of all things, is the root of the unity of the Trinity. For we cannot conceive of three hypostases in a monad, excepting the triad spring from the monad. The being of God is independent of the Trinity; this, therefore, is not immanent in his being, but the product of a free act of the Divine will.—Thus in the theory of Eusebius subordination and omousianism are constantly checkmating each other. Through all his expressions of divine dignity, &c., applied to the Redeemer, we may often see the lineaments of the Arian subordinate deity. No wonder that he is still regarded by some as Arian, by others orthodox. (The chief passages on the subject are: *Demonstr. Evang.*, 4, 1–6; 5, 1. *Theophan.* 1, 4, 15, 21, &c.; 2, 3, 24; 3, 19, 39. *H. E.*, 1, 2; 10, 4. *Theol. eccl.*, 1, 2, 6, 8–13, 2, 6, &c., 23. See MÖHLER, *Athanasius*, &c., II., 36, &c. BAUR, *d. Lehre v. d. Dreieinigkeit*, I., 472, &c. HÄNELL, *de Euseb. relig. christ. defens.*, 1843, p. 42, &c., 67, &c. DORNER, *d. Lehre v. d. Person Christi*, 2. Aufl., I., 2, p. 792, &c. NEANDER, *Ch. Hist.* KLOSE in *Niedner's Ztschr.*, &c., 1846, p. 395, &c.).

It is more difficult to decide upon the merits of E. as the author of the *life of Constantine* (see Art.), as to which he is open to the reproach, not merely of exaggerated panegyric, but of misrepresenting facts. But here we must make allowance for the influence of the pragmatism of the historical writings of that age, for the fact that to the hierarchical episcopacy of that period Constantine seemed to be God's honored instrument for the spread of the triumphs of Christianity, that E. wrote, not a succinct biography of C., but simply a sketch of his merits as a Chris-

tian Emperor, that his bombastic style was that of the Byzantine court, and finally that E. sustained relations of intimate personal friendship for Constantine. That the book was not written for flattery, or personal aggrandizement, is evident from its having been composed after C.'s death, and that the author ever showed himself superior to such selfish motives.

Eusebius owes his chief ecclesiastical importance to his writings, which may be divided into four classes. I. HIS HISTORICAL WORKS.—1) The *ἐκκαταστατική ιστορία*, in 10 books, undertaken with a full sense of the difficulties in the way, and yet with the use of all available helps, is limited to a selection of the material to a. 314. With all its merits it has many and grievous faults. It is neither organic nor uniform. Essentials are barely mentioned, trifles enlarged upon. The fidelity of the narrative is sometimes invalidated by inaccuracy and credulity, sometimes by being fitted to the procrustean bed of theological prejudices. The frailties of Christianity, the worldliness of bishops, &c., are concealed (8, 2). Doctrinal considerations obscure, and narrow, his historical horizon. Even chronological mistakes abound. Altogether it exhibits the Church as a petrification, shows us what the organic original was. And yet it cannot be overestimated for its thorough conformity to the authorities consulted. The narrative is also enriched by old traditions, information obtained from parties to the transactions or contemporaries, and personal knowledge. The nature of the authorities consulted, whether oral, written, or traditional, is carefully stated, and when the narrative lacks satisfactory authorities it is expressly acknowledged (4, 35).—The principal editions of his history are: DU VALOIS: Par., 1659, fol. (the ed. of 1672 is defective); HEINICHEN: Lps., 1827, 3 T., with a crit. suppl., 1840; BURTON: Oxon., 1838, 2 T.; manual ed. by SCHWEGLER: Tubing., 1852. *German transl.*: STROTH: Quedlinb., 1776; CLOSS: Stuttg., 1839. *English transl.*: HANMER, 1584: Cambridge; T. SHORTING, c. 1690; CRUSÉ: Philadelphia and Boston, 1833–6.—Upon the *historical credibility* of the work: MÖLLER: Havn., 1813; DANZ: Jena, 1815; KESSNER: Götting., 1816; *Illgen's Ztschr.*, &c., 1839, II. 2, p. 10, &c. Also Cf. BAUR, *comparatur Eus. hist. eccl. parens cum parente hist. Herodot.*: Tub., 1834.—As a sort of basis to his history E. previously wrote 2) his *Chronology*, *χρονικά συγγράμματα*, *παραδοτική ιστορία*, for centuries the standard. It is in two parts: a) an outline of the hist. of the world to A. D. 325, often copying from Jul. Africanus; b) a tabular abstract of this, carried down to 378 by Jerome (the best recension by SCALIGER, *thes. tempor.*, 1606; Amstel., 1658, fol.). An Armen. transl. was discovered in Constant., 1792, with many improved readings, and some additional sections (the best ed. by Mai: Ven., 1833. See Abhandl. d. Berlin. Akad. d. Wissensch., &c., 1820).—3) The *Life of Const.*, in 4 books, written after 337. Ed. by Heinichen: Lps., 1830.—4) *Eulogy upon C.*, of 336.—5) The tract on the *Martyrs of Palestine*, 303–310, now usually publ. as the 8th b. of the Hist.—6) Part of a letter to Constantine, upon the likenesses of Christ.—7) *Lost* are: the collection of the ancient Mar-

tyrologies (*H. E.*, 4, 15; 5, 4, 21); the life of Pamphilus, 3 books (*libri elegantissimi*, says Jerome); the account of the Church of Jerusalem (*vit. C.* 4, 46); the work on the Passover, Easter (*vit. C.* 4, 35).

II. Second in rank, as well as to contents as literary merit, are the *apologetic writings* of E., two works, composed before 324 (*præp. ev.*, 15, 1, 62), *demonstr. ev.*, 1, 1; 3, 3), and consisting of: 1) *προπαρασκευὴ εὐαγγελικὴ* in 15 b., a negative argument based upon the insufficiency of the Hellenistic religion, and even of Judaism; 2) *ἀποδείξεις εὐαγγ.*, positive proofs, &c., in 20 b., now but 10. (Both publ. by Gaisford: Oxon., 1843, 1852); 3) the contents of both works are well reproduced in the *Theophany* (*libri* 5 in Hieron., *vir. ill.*, c. 81), rescued from the darkness of a Nitrian monastery by Tattam, in a Syrian version (ed. by Lee: London, 1842. In English, &c.: Cambridge, 1843). 4) *ἐκλογαὶ προφητικαί* (*H. E.*, 1, 2), the argument from prophecy, which is scarcely broached in the preceding works; 5) the less important treatise *adv. Hierocles* (*Phot. cod.*, 39), a refut. of the parallel between Christ and Apollon. of Tyana, probably written before 312; 6) the *Apology for Origen*. See Jerome, *apol.*, 1; *adv. Rufin.*, II., p. 135; *apol.* 2, p. 148. The 6th b. written after the death of Pamph. Only the 1st b. remains in the unreliable transl. of *Rufin.* (in Origen, *Opp. de la Rue*, IV., 17, &c.; Greek portions in *Photius*, *cod.* 118; comp. *Socr.*, 3, 7); 7) *Λεστ.* excepting the titles, are: the 2d b. *ἐλέγχου καὶ ἀπολογίας* (*Phot.*, *cod.*, 13) against heathen objections; 25 or 30 b. *adv. Porphyry* (Jerome, *vir. ill.*, c. 81; *ep. ad Magnes.*, 84); finally the *ἐκκλησ. προπαρασκευὴ* (*Phot.*, *cod.*, 11), and *ἐκκλησ. ἀποδείξεις* (*Phot.*, *cod.* 12).

III. The feeblest of E.'s works are the *doctrinal*. 1) *Κατὰ Μαρτέλλου*, 2 b. — 2) *Περὶ τῆς ἐκκλησ. θεολογίας*, against Marcellus; both works composed after 336. (Publ. by Gaisford, Oxf., 1852).—IV. Equally inferior are E.'s *exegetical works*, from his ignorance of the Hebrew, and adherence to Origen's style. Preserved are most of the comm. on the *Psalms*, to Ps. 118, the 10 b. on *Isaiah*, not composed before 324. A small remnant upon *Canticles* (see these ed. in MONTFAUCON, *coll. nov. patr.*, 1707. MAI gives Luke in *scriptt. vet. nov. coll.*, I., 1, p. 107, &c. *Cat. patr.*). But E.'s *exegetical introductions* have attracted general attention. 1) *περὶ τῶν τοπικῶν ὀνομάτων ἐν τῇ θείᾳ γραφῇ*. The 1st, lost part, contained the topography of Palestine; the 2d, revised by Jerome, an alphabet. list of places named in the Bible, &c. (The Greek by BONFRÈRE: Par., 1631, rev. ed. by CLERIC., *onomast.*, &c.: Amstel., 1707, fol.).—2) The 10 *Evang. canons*, prompted by the gospel harmony of Ammonius. The ep. to Carpius stands in front.—3) *Ζητήματα καὶ λύσεις*, 3 b. (*demonstr. ev.*, 7, 3), a solution of the seeming contradictions occurring in the first and last chaps. of the Gospels.—4) *περὶ τῆς τοῦ βιβλίου τῶν προφητῶν ὀνομασίας*, fragm. by J. Curterius, 1580.

Biogr. of E.: MART. HANKE, *de Byzant. ver. scriptt. graec.*: Lps., 1677. Du VALOIS, *de vita scriptisque E.*, &c., also in Hein., I., XXXIII., &c. FABRICIUS, *bibl. graec. ed. Harles VII.*, 335, &c. STROTH, introd. to his transl. of the *H. E.*

MÜHLER, *l. c.* DÄHNE in *Ersch and Gruber Encycl. Sect. I.*, Vol. XXXIX., p. 179, &c. KIMMEL, de *Rufino E. interpr.*, 1838). SEMISCH.*

Eusebius, *B. of Emesa*, Phoenicia († c. 360), was descended of a noble family in Edessa, where he laid the basis of biblical and secular learning, and then visited the eccl. schools of different countries. Eusebius of Cæs., and Patrophilus of Scythopolis were among his instructors in the Bible. The principles of interpretation adopted by the rising school of Antioch especially suited his practical understanding, and there his own views were methodically systematized. His desire to secure a philosophical basis for his system, and also to escape the priestly ordination urged upon him by B. Euphronius, led him to visit Alexandria. But c. 340 he was again dwelling in Antioch. Then already his talents as an exegete and orator, seemed to point the Synod of Antioch (341) to him as Athanasius' successor in Alexandria. But E. knew the attachment of the people for the martyr of omousianism, and doubted his qualifications for so perilous a post. He preferred the humbler bishopric of Emesa. But the Emesans were afraid of his astronomy, which, in that age, involved astrology and magic, and they opposed his induction. E. escaped to Laodicea. The Patriarch of Antioch settled the disturbances, and E. was allowed to enter upon his duties. But, either because the suspicions of the people prevented full fellowship with him, or he preferred quiet scientific pursuits, his last days were spent in Antioch, where he taught Diodorus of Tarsus. His skill in astrology made him a favorite of Constantius, whom he often attended during his campaigns. His theological views were shaped by the training to which choice and circumstances subjected him. Their fundamental traits are simplicity and conformity to the S.S., to which his mind, ever open to new peculiarities, but shy of the narrow formulas of the recent doctrinal terminology, the more firmly adhered, as he saw that pride of opinion and love of logomachy were the chief cause of the distractions of the Church. Hence his affinity for semi-Pelagianism, and his intimacy with many of its leaders. But his *relation to the school of Antioch* exhibit him in a loftier position; as one of the most influential predecessors of the masters of that school, he prepared the way for their labors. This is clear, not only in his style of expounding the S.S., which distinguished carefully between subjective opinions and the truth revealed, and uniformly followed the grammatical and historical sense of the language (*Jer.*, *vir. ill.*, c. 91), but still more in his manner of harmonizing the doctrine of the two natures in Christ: the Logos assumed flesh, the Logos dwelt in the body. And whilst laying full stress upon the impassibility of the divine nature, he held that even the compassion ascribed to Christ was to be thought of analogically. That which made E.'s writings so popular especially with those who made oratory a profession, was their truthful natural simplicity with all their artistic elegance.—Among his *many productions* Jerome mentions as chief those against the Jews, the heathen, and the Novatians; 10 b. of comm. on Galatians,

and short homilies upon the Gospels. Others, preserved by the Syrian C., may yet be discovered in transl. or reproductions. Besides the two against the Marcionites and Manicheans (THEOD., *fab. hæc.*, 1, 25, &c.), *Ebed Jes.* knew (ASSEM., *bibl. or.*, III., 1, p. 44) the questions upon the O. T., and a discourse upon Stephen, *Xenias* (ASSEM., II., 28) a work upon faith, and other discourses. Of all only brief fragments remain (doctrinal in THEOD., *dial.* 3, ed. Schulze et Nösselt, IV., 258, &c.; exeget. in Cat. Patr.; polemic. *opusc.* 14 ed. Sirmond., 1643, and *opp. var.*, I., 1, &c.). The homilies of E. publ. by Gagnée, Par., 1547, more complete by Fromy, Par., 1575, and often since, are unquestionably spurious. — (Sources: the biogr. of B. GEORGE in Laodicea, is lost. From it SOCR., *H. E.*, 2, 9; SOZ., 3, 6. AUGUSTI, *Euseb. Em. opusc.*, &c.: Elberf., 1829 (this last criticized by Thilo, Halle, 1832). SEMISCH.*

Eusebius, B. of Laodicea, in Syria, † 269, by birth an Alexandrian, is a bright example of primitive love, self-denial, and zeal in deeds of charity, qualities which he displayed amid the persecutions which then raged, and especially during a fearful plague which swept over the empire under Gallus. In 263, when civil war distracted the Alexandrians, he interceded effectually with the Roman general, for the relief of the thousands perishing of hunger. In 264 the disturbances caused in Syria by the errors of Paul of Samosata induced E. to go abroad. He attended the Synod of Antioch as delegate, and took the place of the aged and infirm B. Dionysius, and made so favorable an impression that he was appointed B. of Laodicea. As such he is reckoned among the most prominent teachers of the Church (JEROME, *Chron. ad. a. 2. Aurel.*). His successor was his excellent and cherished friend Anatolius. Nothing is reported of E. as an author. — (See EUSEB., *H. E.*, 711, 21, sq., 32). SEMISCH.*

Eusebius, of Nicomedia, the leader of the Eusebians in the Arian controversy, called by his party *the Great* († 341). His unbounded ambition, reckless of means, and prizing the episcopate only for its worldly glory; his courtizan worldliness wedded to zeal for forms of doctrine and a nice psychological instinct which enabled him keenly to measure arguments, men, and circumstances; his tact, combined with learning and eloquence; all show how he could play the part he performed both as court-bishop and partizan leader. Ammianus Marcell. (hist. 22, 9) says that being related to Julianus, E. sprang from one of the first families of the empire; an advantage which placed him near to Constantine, and favored his lofty schemes. At first he was B. of Berytus in Phœnicia. But this secluded sphere did not suit him, and ere long, probably through Constantia, who placed unbounded confidence in him, he secured the See of Nicomedia, where he intrigued for Licinius (*Theodor.*, 1, 19), but on his defeat quickly made favor with the victor. When Constantinople was built as the capital, E. schemed, despite Church laws, for his own transfer to the new court, and in 338 succeeded by the authority of Constantius. Thus he was the first to set the contagious example of hierarchical hanker-

ings after the See of the capital, that from such central point the Church also might be controlled. Like Arius, and other coryphæi of the Arian controversy, he had once sat at Lucian's feet in Antioch, where a christology obnoxious to the orthodox faith had taken its rise (EPIPHAN., 69, 5; PHILOSTORG. 2, 3, 15). Hence he also held subordinationism, so that Arius might well reckon upon that sympathy and aid which E. so zealously rendered (SOCR., 1, 6; SOZ., 1, 15; THEOD., 1, 5. ATHANAS. *de Synod. Arim. et Seleuc.*, c. 17). At the Council of Nice he, indeed, through selfish prudence, signed the orthodox confession, but nothing could induce him to acknowledge the anathemas (SOZ., 1, 20, &c.; THEOD., 1, 6, &c., 19). Soon after this the arrival in Nicomedia of an embassy of Egyptian Meletians, afforded him an opportunity of strengthening Arianism by a league with those schismatics (ATHANAS., *apol. c. Arian.*, c. 5; EPIPH., *hæc.*, 68, 5, &c.). — Contradictory reasons are reported for E.'s subsequent banishment to Gallia. The tradition in Philostorgius (NICET., *thes. orthod. fid.*, 5, 8) that immediately after the Synod he retracted his signature, and thus displeased the Emperor, is refuted by the chronology; for the banishment was not imposed until three months afterwards. Another report (SOZ., 2, 21) says he bribed some one to strike out his name from the signatures, and publicly opposed the homoousian dogma, even before the Emperor. It is most probable that his treatment of the Alexandrian agitators, whom Constant. had sent to Nicomedia, exasperated C. (SOZ., 2, 21; THEOD., 1, 19). But the recall of Arius was soon followed by that of E. (328). The ostensible ground for this was a letter addressed by E. to the principal bishops, in which he avowed his adherence to the Nicene faith, and abhorrence of all heresy. Restored to his dignity, and to the Emperor's favor, he toiled zealously to establish Arianism. The crafty scheme was adopted of effecting the downfall of the chief Nicenists, E., meanwhile, accommodating his language to the views of semi-Arianism (PHOT., *cod.*, 257). The first blow took effect; Eustathius of Antioch (see Art.) was removed (THEOD., 1, 20). In Constantinople Euseb. was at the head of those bishops who effected the expulsion of Athanasius by political accusations (336, SOCR., 1, 35; SOZ., 2, 28). And the pomp with which E. required Alexander to readmit Arius into Church-fellowship, was doubtless with a view to obtain the See of the capital for himself (cf. SOCR., 1, 37; SOZOM., 2, 29; EPIPHAN., *hæc.*, 69, 10; ATHANAS., *ad episc. egypt.*, c. 19). — The last remarkable act of E. was his participation in the manœuvre to ensnare the Western C. with Arianism, by procuring a sentence of condemnation against Athanasius, and, this failing, his share in the settlement of semi-Arianism in the symbols of the Council of Antioch (341). SEMISCH.*

Eusebius, from 361 to † 379 Bishop of Samosata, on the Euphrates, was under Valens the chief bulwark of the orthodox church in the East against Arianism. After a long dispute the Arians and Nicenists at the Synod of Antioch (361) had united in the choice of Meletius as Patriarch, because each party thought him

favorable to their views, and the certificate of election duly signed by both was placed in the hands of E. (THEODORET., *H. E.*, 2, 27). But the first sermon of M. destroyed the hopes of the Arians. He boldly proclaimed in the ears of Constantius his belief in the perfect Godhead of Christ; whereupon an imperial envoy was sent to Samosata to obtain again the certificate. E. refused to part with it, because it would be a breach of covenant so to do, without the consent of all the subscribers. To a second envoy, who threatened, in case of continued refusal, to lop off his right hand, E. stretched out both hands and declared he would rather have them both cut off than surrender the document. This manly firmness had its effect upon Constantius (*Theod.*, 2, 28). After the death of Julian the Apostate, he aided in the passage of a decree reaffirming the Nicene faith at a synod held in Antioch in 363 (SOCRATES, *h. e.*, 3, 25. *Mansi*, *Concil. coll.*, III., p. 372). The persecutions under Valens, from 364, taxed all his energies for the maintenance of the orthodox party. Disguised as a soldier, he travelled through the dioceses of Syria, Phœnicia, and Palestine, in order to ordain clergy in congregations deprived of their pastors (*Theod.*, 4, 12). At an election for bishop in Cappadocian Cæsarea (370), where the Arians labored to secure a man of their own views, he raised his voice in favor of Basil. An intimate friendship was the result (BASIL, 58, 69). At length the storm broke over his head (373). The Emperor issued against him a decree of banishment. His first thought was the safety of the messenger. In the silence of the night he departed. The prayers of his people, who hastened after him as far as Zeugma, that he would not leave them defenceless, he answered by reminding them of his duty to obey (*Theod.*, 4, 13). From Thrace, his place of banishment, he kept up an active correspondence with Basil and Gregory Nazianzen concerning all the more important affairs of the Church. After the persecution had subsided on the death of Valens (378), he was empowered by a council held at Antioch (379) to reorganize the shattered dioceses of Syria by the appointment of orthodox bishops. In the execution of this work he reached Doliche, a little town in the province of Comagene, when a stone, cast at him by a woman of the Arian party, put an end to his life. Whilst dying, he exacted a promise from the bystanders not to persecute the murderers (*Theod.*, 5, 4). Except that his name is found among the martyrs on the Roman calendar of saints for June 21, and on the Greek for the day after, Eusebius has almost vanished from the memory of posterity. And yet the Epistles of Basil and Gregory Nazianzen are filled with praises of his wisdom, his piety, his orthodoxy, and the diligence with which he discharged the duties of his office.

SEWISCH. — Porter.

Eusebius, *Archbishop of Thessalonica*, about the year 600, distinguished himself as a learned antagonist of Monophysitism, whose adherents and conventicles had spread secretly over the diocese of Illyria. The Romish bishop, Gregory the Great, informed of the fact, and concerned for the unstained purity of the Bride of Christ,

took occasion, as metropolitan, to enjoin upon E. the duty of completely extirpating the heretics (*Epist.*, 10, 42; 11, 74). But the latter preferred the pen to such severe measures, and provoked by the somewhat petulant attack of Andreas, a monk, wrote 10 books against the error of the Aphthartodocetans. Photius gives us a summary of their contents (*cod.* 162).

SEWISCH. — Porter.

Eusebius, *Bishop of Vercelli*, in Piedmont († 371), one of the triumvirate, who, under Constantius in the West endured so many trials and sufferings in behalf of the Nicene orthodoxy, was born in the island of Sardinia, and is said by tradition to have been placed by his mother, Restituta, who settled as a widow in Rome, in the hands of Pope Eusebius to be educated, and that he was baptized and named by this pontiff in 311 (BARON., *Annal. ad a.* 311, N. 42). For a while a lector in Rome under Pope Sylvester he was unanimously chosen by the people and clergy as Bishop of Vercelli (AMBROS., *Epist.*, 63, 2). From the obscurity of this diocese the necessities of the Church called him to do battle against Arianism. At the request of the Roman bishop, Liberius, he had, along with other papal deputies, persuaded the Emperor Constantius, then in Gaul, to convoke a *Synod in Milan* (355). The motives on both sides were wholly antagonistic. The Western Catholics wished to redeem the honor of Athanasius, disgracefully condemned by the Council of Arles (353); the Emperor, to have this solemn decision repeated, with the idea, that thus the chief hinderance to the conversion of the West to Arianism would be removed. E., foreseeing the issue, resolved to remain away. But a name of such weight, which could turn the scale on either side, was indispensable to both parties. Orthodox and Arians, and the Emperor himself, sent letters urging him to attend (BARON., *Annal. ad a.*, 355, N. 2, sqq. *Mansi*, *Concil. coll.*, III., p. 236). At length he yielded. And yet a minority of the Arians resisted his admission for ten whole days. On his proposing that an agreement as to the true faith should precede any action concerning Athanasius, the Emperor, who so far forgot his dignity as to come forward in his own person as the accuser of Athanasius (ATHANAS., *hist. Arian.* c. 76), tore in pieces the Nicene symbol laid down for signature, with the declaration, that nothing of the kind should be done (HILAR., *ad Constant. Aug. Col.*, 1617, p. 99). Against the Catholic bishops, who replied that it was contrary to ecclesiastical law to condemn any one without a hearing, he thundered out the despotic answer: "What I wish, that shall be the law" (ATHANAS., *hist. Arian.* c. 33). And when they besought him not to force the Arian heresy upon the Church, reminding him of the limits of civil authority and of the judgment of God, dumb with rage at this unwonted language, he grasped his sword (ATHAN., *l. c.* c. 34). But such means of terror had no effect upon Eusebius. Whilst hundreds of faint-hearted bishops signed the anti-Nicene edict of Milan, the exhortation of the emperor, to restore peace by compliance, was wasted upon him (BARON., *l. c.* N. 16; *Mansi*, *l. c.*, p. 328). Hence, after

the first bloody thoughts of the monarch had subsided, he was banished to Scythopolis, in Palestine. Here he was hospitably welcomed by an eminent Jew, Josephus (EPIPHAN., *hær.*, 30, 5). The faithful, far and near, vied with each other in soothing the sorrows of his exile. He was even comforted by an embassy, letters and gifts of affection from Vercelli. Meanwhile, just as the hope of winning him over to a renunciation of his faith by mild measures sunk, the severity against him increased. He was separated from his clergy, his dwelling was broken into and plundered, and he himself dragged naked through the public streets, and thrust into a gloomy dungeon. When even this brutality could not shake his steadfastness, he was transferred to Cappadocia (HIERON., *vir. ill.*, c. 96), and thence to the Thebaid (SOCRAT., *H. E.*, 3, 5; SOZOM., 5, 12). Liberated after the accession of Julian, he went first to Alexandria, in order, by the help of Athanasius and the Alexandrian Synod (362), to labor for the restoration of the Oriental Church. The Synod commissioned him to heal the divisions caused by Miletus at Antioch. He was indeed the right man for the work, but the undue haste of Bishop Lucifer of Cagliari, who, blindly interfering, had ordained the no less eccentric priest, Paulinus, as Bishop of the Eustathians, rendered the breach incurable. E. left Antioch without deciding for either party, and after travelling through the East to the great comfort of many distracted churches, he passed over Illyria (363), and entered the borders of Italy (SOCRAT., 3, 9; SOZOM., 5, 13). On his arrival all Italy, says Jerome, laid off her robes of sorrow. From this time he kept two things chiefly in view. What he saw in the East having strengthened his opinion, that the perfection of the Christian life culminates in monachism, he devoted himself with his parochial clergy to such a cause. Thus he was the first man in the West, who united the ascetism of the cloister with the duties of the priest (AMBROS., *Epist.*, 63, 66, 70), and became a model to Augustine, and the ages after him. His second care was to continue the battle against Arianism. Encouraged by political circumstances, Arianism in Milan had raised its head with new power under Bishop Auxentius (see Art.). In order to assail it in its stronghold, E. appeared suddenly in Milan (364). But an order from the Emperor Valentinian I., who sympathized with Auxentius, drove him back to his diocese. A life of so much self-sacrifice could not fail of the crown of martyrdom. An epitaph praises him as a martyr in acrostic verse. According to tradition he was stoned to death by the Arians. As a martyr, therefore, he has his place in the pantheon of saints. In the older martyrologies the day of his birth into the higher life was Aug. 1; now it is Dec. 16. But of this, neither Ambrose (*Epist.* 63, 2), who lived so near in time and place, nor Gregory of Tours, who celebrates the praises of the confessors (*de glor. confess.*, c. 3), make the least mention.

Of the writings of E., the epistles extant treat partly of the dogmatic controversies of the century, and partly of his sufferings in prison. They are: 1) *ad Constant. Aug. una* (MANSI,

III., p. 237): 2) *ad presbyteros et plebes Italiæ*; 3) *libellus facti ad Patrophilum*, both from Scythopolis; the latter to his jailor, the Arian bishop; 4) *ad Gregor. episcop. Spanensem Bäticum*, from the Thebaid of the year 359 (in HILAR., *fragm.*, p. 136). Published in GALLAND., *bibl. patr.*, V., p. 78, sq.; *bibl. patr. max.*, V., p. 1227. According to Jerome (*adv. Vigilant. epp.* 75; *vir. ill.*, c. 96) E. had translated into Latin the Commentary of Eusebius of Cæsarea on the Psalms, with the omission of the heretical passages. Whether the ancient Codex of the Gospels preserved in the Cathedral of Vercelli is from the hand of E., we may at best only believe, but cannot prove. An old, legendary *Biography* by UGHELLI (*Italia sacra*, IV., p. 747), may be compared with *Acta sancti.*, Aug. I., p. 340. Some biographical matter occurs also in the panegyrics of MAXIMUS TAURINENSIS (*opp. Rom.*, 1784; *homil.* 77, sqq.; *serm.* 81, sq.; and, in addition, *Serm.* 20-23), in AMBROSIIUS (*opp. Bened. serm.*, 56, sq.; IV., p. 577, sq.), and in MURATORI (*anecdol.* IV., p. 77, sq.). — Conf. also BARONIUS (*Annal. ad a.* 355-371); GRUBER (*allgem. Encycl.*, sect. I., vol. XL., p. 444); and MÖHLER (*Athanasius der Gr.*, II., p. 121).

SEMISCH.—Porter.

Eustachius, *Martyr and Saint*, to whom one of the principal churches in Paris is dedicated. Our accounts of him are derived from the 8th cent.; from these we gather (apart from legends and traditions) that before his baptism he was called Placidus, and, with his wife, Tatiann (afterwards Theopista), embraced Christianity. Under Hadrian (c. 130) they and their two children are said to have suffered martyrdom. Since the 6th cent. his martyrdom was commemorated at Rome, and Celestine III. is said to have built a crypt or chapel, and dedicated it to E. From an account of Philip Augustus, of 1194, it may be concluded that the relics of E. were sent to France under Celest. III., where they were preserved in the abbey of St. Denis, and then given to the church bearing his name. —(See his *Acta* in COMBEFIS' collection: *Illustr. Chr. martyrum lecti triumpho*: Paris, 1660, 8vo. Also in the BOLLAND., Oct. 20; comp. *Biogr. univers.* T. 63). S.*

Eustathius, made by the Synod of Nice, in 325, *B. of Antioch*, previously B. of Beröa, distinguished himself, both at the above Synod, and by writings, as one of the most zealous opponents of Arianism. In 331 the Arians, who hated him, instituted a Synod at Antioch. Here, on account of some obscure and incautious expressions, he was accused by Eusebius of Nicomedia, who had incited Eusebius of Cæsarea also against him, of Sabellianism, and of having committed carnal sins. The Synod deposed, and the Emperor exiled him to Thrace, where he seems to have died prior to 360. This degradation produced a great excitement in the Church of Antioch; his adherents, called *Eustathians*, separated from the Arian bishops, and continued as a separate party until the 5th cent. Of the works of E., only one remains: *κατὰ Ὀρίγονος διαγνωτικὸς, εἰς τὸ τῆς συλαστικῆς θεωρίας*, *Crit. Sacr.*, T. VI., in which he refutes the opinion of Origen, that the witch of Endor (see Art.) had really raised the spirit of Samuel.

E. rejected in general the allegorical exegesis of Origen, and is therefore cited by Neander, *C. H.*, II., 748, as representative of the school of Antioch. Of his lost works, fragments are given by FABRICIUS, *bibl. Græc.*, Vol. VIII.; (see, also, HIERON., *Catal. c.* 85; SOZOMENUS, II., 19; PHILOSTORGIUS, II., 7; FABRICIUS, *l. c.*).

Eustathius, after 350 *B. of Sebaste*, in Armenia, a Cappadocian, was held, on account of his vacillations amid the controversies of his age, in low estimation. He was successively Nicene, Arian, Semiarian, and last, Eunomian. († 380.) He enjoyed for a long time the friendship of Basil the Gr., but afterwards separated from him. He was condemned by several Synods, and lost the confidence of all parties. He merits praise, however, for erecting in Sebaste a hospital for strangers and the sick. He also introduced monasticism into Armenia, Pontus, and Paphlagonia, and gave rise to the fanatical ascetic party of the *Eustathians*, who maintained that no married person could be saved, and hence would have communion with no priest who had been married before ordination. Touching his relation to *Ærius*, see Art.—SOCR., *H. E.*, II., 43; SOZOM., *H. E.*, III., 14. H.—Reinecke.

Eustathius.—This celebrated commentator on Homer, long already an important authority in philology, has latterly, by the publication of his minor works (*Opusc. e codd. Basil. Paris. Venet. nunc prim. ed. Th. L. F. Tafel. Francof. ad. M.*, 1832), and later supplements (*Tafel. de Thessalonica*: Berol., 1839, p. 401), obtained an interesting and respectable position in the theological literature also of the Greek middle ages. He lived during the reign of Manuel Comnenus, Andronicus, Alexis Comnenus, and Isaac Angelus; an age of some pretension to literature, but spiritually impoverished and morally degenerate. He was born at Constantinople, in what year, is uncertain. According to Demetrius Chomatenus (*ap. Leunclav. in Jure Gr. Rom.*, lib. V., p. 317), he was probably a monk in the monastery of the Church of Florus, afterwards deacon in the Church of St. Sophia, at Byzantium, and teacher of rhetoric. His other title, *ὁ ἐπὶ τῶν δεήσεων*, designates an office at court; of which he seems to have made use, when, during a great scarcity of water, he presented a petition of the citizens to the Emperor (*Supplic. Manuelli imp. oblat.*, *Tafel. Thessal.*, p. 433). His philological works, the commentaries on Homer and Dionys. Periegetes, perhaps also on Aristophanes, belong to this period. In 1174 or 1175, he became Bishop of Myra, in Lycia, an event which he celebrates in a panegyric to the Emperor of historical importance, (*Thessal.*, p. 401). His consecration, however, was not consummated; for the Emperor appointed him Metropolitan of Thessalonica, where he continued till his death, about 1194 (*Thessal.*, p. 368). He was highly admired by his contemporaries. Nicetas Choniates (*Hist. ed. Bonn.*, p. 399) describes him as distinguished for virtues, eloquence, penetration, and experience, and as excelling all others in his knowledge of sacred and profane literature. The letters of Mich. Acominatos, contemporary Archb. of Athens, manifest the greatest admiration of him

(*Elissen, M. Acom. v. Chonæ*: Gött., 1846, p. 58). In his monody upon the death of E., he calls him a "sun of the priesthood, a king of knowledge, a father of eloquence, a shining example in life and science." The letters of M. Psellus (*Thess.*, p. 361), and the funeral discourse of Euthymius of Neopatra (*ib.*, p. 394), manifest personal friendship and esteem. On several occasions E. took a bold position. When, in 1180, the Emp. Manuel protested, in a lordly manner, against a form, in which the catechumens were required to renounce the god of Mohammed as *θεὸς ἀλόγιστος*, and caused it to be stricken out as blasphemous, E. opposed him at a Synod, and defended the true meaning of the anathema. The displeasure of the emperor on this occasion (*Nicet. Chron.*, p. 278: see GASS, *Gennadius and Pletho*, I., p. 140) did not compromise the standing of E. at court, and the latter pronounced a eulogy on the death of Manuel (*Opusc.*, p. 196). Somewhat later, E. was involved in political troubles. The revolt of the Greeks against the tyrant Andronicus, occasioned in 1185 the invasion of the Normans under William II. of Sicily; Thessalonica, also, was given up to the wildest rapine. E. continued faithfully with his congregation, obtained milder measures from the Latin generals, and maintained the Greek worship against the interference of the strangers. In his own work (*De Thessal. urbe a Norm. capt. narr.*, *Opusc.*, p. 267) he describes the sufferings of the city, and his own course (see, also, *Nicet. Hist.*, p. 392). He seems also to have been expelled once from his office: it is certain, at least, that he had to contend with enemies.—Of more account than this is the position of E. in morals and the Church. As monk, bishop, theologian, and author, he showed the spirit of a Byzantine; but he elevated himself above the common form of it: even his Byzantine style is peculiar and refined. He felt both the moral earnestness of Christianity and the diseases of his age, and contended vigorously against the monastic pomp and outward ascetism, which were threatening to change religion and virtue into mere appearance. His excellent work, *περὶ ὑποκριτικῆς* (*Opusc.*, p. 88), exposes this prevailing vice in all its degrees and forms as a caricature of the most holy things. Especially important is his work: *ἐπίκαιρος βίου μορμαχικὸν* (*Opusc.*, p. 214—transl. and publ. with comm. by G. L. F. Tafel: Berl., 1847). Though heartily favorable to the "divine and heavenly" monastic state, he chastises its awful degeneracy, its mendacity and sloth, and advises moderation in mortification, in order to restore honesty of purpose. Salutary employment are recommended, and monastic ignorance deprecated. Everywhere he applies *most earnestly* the idea, which he unfolds from Ps. 49, that within the sphere of this earthly life eternal treasures may be obtained, if, for the hope of the eternal, the flesh is mortified by labor and struggles (*Opusc.*, p. 9).—His works, not above mentioned, consist of sermons and discourses on various occasions, a commentary on Pindar, a dialogue, and letters to various persons. Some of them, as the commentary on John of Damascus, are still in manuscript. See: *Fabricius, Bibl. Gr. ed. Harl.*, XI., p. 222;

Le Quien, Oriens. Christ., II., p. 48; *Oudin, Comm.*, II., p. 1539; *Neander, Karakt. des E. v. Th. in seiner reform. Richt. (Abhandl. d. Berl. Akad. d. W.*, 1841; *hist. Abth., auch in Neander's Wissensch. Abhandl., herausg. von Jakobi.*: Berl., 1851, p. 6). GASS.—*Reinecke.*

Euthymius, Zigabenus (rather *Zygadenus*), belongs to the most notable Byzant. theologians of the 12th cent., whose few excellencies and many infirmities he fully exemplifies. He flourished under Alex. Comnenus, c. 1118, and was monk of a monastery of the B. Virgin, called τῆς περιβλήπτου, near Constantinople. In the sense of his age and associations he was a man of learning and polemical skill (*Anna Comm. Alex.*, XV., 387, Ven., 1729). Of his works a Comm. on the Psalms was publ. in Latin, at Veron., 1530, per *Philippum Saulum*, and often afterwards, the whole in Gr. and Lat. in l. IV., *Opp. omnia Theophyl.*, Ven., 1754–63. His more important comm. on the Gospels was most carefully ed. by *Chr. F. Matthäi*, with proleg. showing its great value (*Comm. in IV. evgl. Gr. et lat.*: Lps., 1702, 4 vols.; cf. *Prolegg.*, p. 38, &c.). Other exeget. works upon the Paul. and Catholic epp. are still in MSS. As a comm. E. may stand next to Theophylact. As a rule, also, he follows the old masters, especially Chrysostom. His explanations of words are often excellent. Sometimes allegorical and mystical hints are borrowed from Maximus et al. The interspersed anthropological and moral observations betray the synergism of R. Simon (II., 1037). His Πανοπλία δογματική (τῆς ὁδοῦ πίστεως ἢ τοῦ ὑπλοῦς δογμάτων), written at the request of Alexius, consists of two parts, and 24 sections, treating of as many heresies. The omissions in the several editions prove that whoever assails too many heresies, will not be altogether welcome to any class. In the older Lat. ed., studio, &c., P. FR. ZINI, Ven., 1555 Par., 1556, Bibl., pp. max. XIX., 1–235), sect. 2 and 13, against the Pope and Italians, are omitted, though Usserius, *de symb.*, p. 25, gives them. The only, and rare Gr. ed. (Tergovist, Vallachia, 1711) lacks sect. 24, against Islamism. PETAVIUS has quoted some passages in his *dogmat. theol.* It may be considered a continuation of Epiphanius, only in a stiff external form. — (See FABRIC., B. G., VII., 461; CAVE, *Hist. lit.*, II., 198; OUDIN, *Comm.*, II., 979; CHRÖCKH, K.-gesch., XXVIII., 306; *Stud. u. Crit.*, 1833, p. 647). GASS.*

Eutychianism is that form of the ancient Christology, in which the Alexandrian doctrine of a single incarnate nature of the God-logos advances to a docetic magical absorption of the human into the divinity of Christ. It is hence the exact counterpart of Nestorianism (see Art.), just as the Eutychian controversies are essentially a continuation of the Nestorian. The peace of 433, a politic contrivance of the State-church, which, in its deceptive indefiniteness, betrayed itself to be the abortion of both dishonest and short-sighted proceedings; had not reconciled the deep antagonism between the Egyptian and Oriental Church. It had been agreed upon by both parties merely in the hope that the opposite principle had retired to the hostile camp. Cyril of Alex. had the satisfac-

tion of condemning Nestorius, without recalling his anathemas. The Antiochians could interpret the sharply-defined distinction of the two natures as a concession to them. But for this very reason the more rigid of both parties rejected the peace as an unprincipled artifice, or even doctrinal apostasy. The intolerance displayed in forcing it upon the churches of Asia; the expulsion of the recusant bishops, some of whom were honored as ornaments of their churches, and whose places were filled by servile adherents to the court doctrines; the intrigues woven in the East against the orthodoxy of Diodorus and of Theodore of Mopsusta; and the violent measure of the State against all suspected of Nestorianism, kept all minds in a feverish excitement, which, in many dioceses of Asia, produced revolts and schisms. In the doctrinal position of the conflicting parties, nothing had been changed. For if the doctrine of the two natures was charged by the Egyptians with Nestorianism or Photianism, the Alexandrian doctrine was suspected by the Antiochians of Apollinarianism and docetism. After the peace of 433, Cyril, in direct conflict with its very words, had limited the duality of the natures to a difference between the divine and human attributes; and had taught that the distinction, which he could not deny to be founded in the natural difference between the divinity and humanity, was abolished in such a way that, after the incarnation, the two natures could, indeed, be distinguished in thought, but that in reality only the one incarnate nature of the God-logos remained as the psychical unity of the two properties (MANSI, *Concil. coll.*, V., pp. 137, 143, 320). And whilst trying by a strained sophism to reconcile this adherence to his former position with the subscribed confession, he took for granted, with much simplicity that his views and those of the Antiochians were the same. Less cautious adherents exposed the secret of the school by speaking of a mixture or transubstantiation of the two natures, whether of the nature of the God-logos into the flesh, or the destruction of the reality (*Isidor. Pelus. ep.*, I., 496). In their struggles for supremacy, in which the most equivocal measures were employed, the Egyptians leaned upon the favor of the court and the reputation of the monks; whose theology, that of the feelings, was particularly inclined to the mystic-supernatural in the Alexandrian view of Christ. In Dioscurus, Cyril's successor, hierarchical jealousy of the court-bishop entered more largely into the controversy. The Antiochians, being now the vanquished or tolerated party, had to content themselves with written defences of their doctrine, but showed themselves in this superior to their opponents. When, therefore, Theodoret (447), in his Eranistes, defending with talent and learning the Antiochian doctrine of the two natures as held together in Christ in personal unity, but continuing nevertheless in their concrete peculiarity, threw down the glove to the whole party of Cyril, we see in it the consciousness of their spiritual superiority, as also of the injury done them by this long opposition. Thus we find everywhere in the Church the materials for a new outburst of the contro-

versy; the premonitory symptoms of which, the bold intrigues of Dioscurus against Theodoret, the imperial order that Theodoret should remain within his own diocese, and that every one should deliver up his books to be burned, and the conspiracy of Syrian monks and priests against Ibas, B. of Edessa, gave cause for the most serious apprehensions. Filled with hatred of the Antiochian theology, which, by a customary trick, he pronounced identical with Nestorianism, *Eutyches*, a monk from early youth, for more than 30 years Archimandrite of a monastery near Constantinople, now 70 years old, had often expressed to visitors of his cell opinions concerning the divine human nature of Christ, which gave offence even to those like minded. From all that we know of him he was honest and versed in the Scriptures; but, like other monks of his cast, ignorant and unskilled in logical thinking, and therefore stubbornly adhering to what was learned, and fond of controversy. A nimbus of monastic humility, his connection, as god-child, with Chrysaphius, imperial chamberlain and most potent minister, and his position as head of the wide-spread and firmly organized monk party of Cyril, elevated him in the estimation of his adherents far above his merits. Grown gray, as he himself tells us (MANSI, VI., 641) in battle against the heretics and in confessing the truth, he served in the general Synod of Ephesus already (431) the cause of Cyril most effectually (MANSI, VI., 628, 631). Perhaps he was also one of the leaders of the procession of monks, which passed the palace of the Emperor, Theodosius II., in order to force him to take part for the Alexandrian doctrine (MANSI, VI., 713). His word, listened to with reverence as to a voice from heaven, was at least used to inveigle the conscience of the highest state officers into the same party net (MANSI, V., 989). Dioscurus, too, knew his man. Being soon entirely under the influence of the latter, Eutyches wrote, even previously to 448, in order at first to sow merely the seeds of an indefinite suspicion against the Antiochians, to Leo, B. of Rome, that the Nestorian heresy was, by the efforts of some, again beginning to flourish (*Leo ep.* 20, in MANSI, V., 1323). It was therefore only a necessary art of defence, that Domnus, Patr. of Antioch, laid before the Emperor, A. D. 448, against these secret machinations, the charge, that Eutyches, who ventured to anathematize such pillars of the truth as Diodorus and Theodoretus, himself renewed the heresy of Apollinarius; that he asserted a mixture in the nature of the Only Begotten, as if his divinity and humanity were melted into one; and that he attributed the salutary passion to the divinity (*FACUND., defens. trium capital.,* 8, 5; comp. 12, 5). This charge sufficiently portrays the leaders of the Syrian Church. But, as might be expected, it produced no results. A more effectual one was soon to follow from the camp of Cyril himself. *Eusebius, B. of Doryläum*, in Phrygia, intolerant and violently inclined to defend his convictions to the last, moved perhaps by revenge, but honest in his zealotism even; a man whom neither fear nor nobler impulses could subdue, had gained for himself in the Nestorian controversy already a name as a

kind of Herostratus of the Church. For once when Nestorius in a sermon, about A. D. 430, denied to Mary the title, *θεοτοκος*, saying that Mary had not born the God-logos, but the man who was inseparably united with the logos, E. tumultuously interrupted the patriarch, crying out that the eternal logos himself had subjected himself to a second birth (*EVAGR., H. E.,* I., 9; MANSI, VII., 1061). He also soon after denounced at Constantinople the doctrine of Nestorius, by comparing it to the heresy of Samosatianism (*MARIUS, Mercat. ed. Garn.,* II., 18). He filled at this time an inferior State office. His reward for this act of faith was a bishopric, to which, however, he also did honor by his theological learning. If at the Synod of Constantinople (448) he confesses himself warmly to the doctrine of Athanasius, the Gregories, Cyril, and Proclus, it is in the sense that their christology must be defined by the creed of the Syrians — subscribed by Cyril and the basis of the peace of 433 — as an equally true expression of orthodoxy (MANSI, VI., 651, 657). For his theology placed him in the ranks of the Alexandrians, though he had not carried out their Monophysitism to its last consequences. From the character of Eusebius it is improbable that he was used by the Syrians, as accuser of Eutyches, merely to pay back the stroke of their antagonists. That the tract of Theodoret (the *Erastianes*) is nearly contemporaneous, proves but little for this view. For Eusebius was still an active adherent of Cyril under wholly changed circumstances; since, at the Synod of Chalcedon, he at once consented to the first sketch of a symbol which inclined to the Egyptian doctrine. To labor for the ruin of a man like Eutyches, at a time when the latter enjoyed the entire favor of the court, required a fervor of piety compared with which, as Flavian says of Eusebius, fire itself is cold. An immediate occasion was given to Eusebius, by a visit to the monastery of Eutyches, his old friend. As Eutyches did not hold back his christological excesses, and would listen to no admonitions, Eusebius felt it his duty as champion of the truth to oppose the spread of the new heresy. The matter was expedited by the *Home Synod* (*συνodus ἐνδημοῦσα*, 448), which was just in session at Constantinople under patr. Flavian. The accusation was, that Eutyches taught blasphemously and contrary to the fathers concerning the person of Christ (MANSI, VI., 652). *Flavian*, a moderate Antiochian (MANSI, V., 1352; VI., 425), but who also tried to conciliate the Egyptians by saying, that by means of the union of the two natures Christ was one and the same (MANSI, VI., 541), wished to avoid a discussion, from which he foresaw new and fearful disturbances: for he knew, better than Eusebius, the state of affairs, and Chrysaphius was his personal enemy. He therefore advised a private agreement. But Eusebius, deaf to all conciliation where a question was to be decided which he thought of importance to orthodoxy; conjured the fathers that they would not leave a matter of such moment without investigation. He gained his request. Eutyches was cited, but appeared only after the third summons. A confession of faith, which he had meanwhile

circulated among the neighboring monasteries for subscription, was intended perhaps to stir up a tumult of the monks and people. In order to provide for his safety, the State had given him a military guard accompanied by high civil officers and numerous monks. A special imperial commissary was also appointed to attend the sessions, since matters of faith were to be decided. Both these humiliations were greeted by the more than devoted Synod with applause to the highpriest-emperor, the guardian of the faith. *Eutyches pressed to his defence*, showed no effrontery, but still bore himself as a man who, though threatened, knew who sustained him. He spoke in broken sentences, but more from self-restraint than embarrassment, and sought to avoid the question by pretending that he could not venture an analysis of the divine nature. To the conflicting tradition of the Fathers, he preferred the Scriptures as a more certain source of faith; which did not prevent him, however, from quoting to excess those sayings of the Fathers which favored his views. He denied that he taught that the God-logos had brought his pre-existent body from heaven. Christ became really incarnate from the womb of the virgin, not merely as a docetic phantasm. But since he liked to regard the body of Christ as the body of God, and from this view supposed that this body could not be of the same nature as the body of all other men, he defined the body of Christ to be human in a mediate sense, viz.: that Mary, the mother of God, had a body in all respects perfectly human. That the divine human nature of Christ consisted in the personal union of the two natures, was taught neither in the Scriptures nor the Fathers: that before the union our Lord had, indeed, consisted of two natures; but after the union of one only, viz.: that of the incarnate God. To anathematize this doctrine as heretical, was anathematizing the Fathers also (Mansi, VI., 700, 728, sq.; 741, 744, sq.). In all this Eutyches went beyond Cyril only in denying that the body of Christ was the same in its nature as the body of all other men. But the light in which the transcendental essence of the one incarnate nature was to be viewed; whether as a transformation of the humanity into the divinity of the logos (Theodoret); or as a chemical combination of the divine nature with the human, which still in some manner remained (Dorner); or as a mere co-existence of the human attributes and of the divine substance which comprehended them (Baur); such subtle speculations were beyond the horizon of the unspeculative Eutyches. His contemporaries suspected docetism. The Synod, itself allied to the Antiochian tendency, suspected Valentinianism and Apollinarianism; and excluded the incorrigible Eutyches from the priesthood, his office as archimandrite, and the communion of believers. With this anathema the entire Egyptian party was placed in a state of war: for although the name of Cyril had been prudently spared by the Synod, yet in Eutyches the Alexandrian doctrine was directly condemned. An effort from the opposition was therefore unavoidable. Eutyches, encouraged by Chrysaphius, in his antagonism to Flavian and the Synod, obtained from the Emperor a re-

vision of his trial. The commission appointed for this purpose (449), showed that the proceedings of the Synod had been altogether regular, a few minor points excepted. But Eutyches, and especially Dioscurus, who took the entire matter into his own hands, and by his violent proceedings threw everything into disorder, aimed from the beginning towards an Œcumenical Synod. Eutyches, therefore, wrote a series of letters to the Emperor, to the bishops of Rome, Ravenna, &c., but calculated still more upon the effects of his manifesto, posted at the corners of the streets of Constantinople. Dioscurus, utterly disregarding of all law and order, on his own authority reinstated Eutyches in his office as presbyter. In vain did Flavian and Leo endeavor to prevent the council. Leo, to whom both parties had appealed, issued a mandate, that the controversy should be finally adjusted by a doctrinal epistle of his own. This is the celebrated epistle to Flavian (ep. 28, June 13, 449, in Mansi, V., 1366), in which with caution and tact, though in rather inexact doctrinal formulas, he tries to unfold from the Scriptures the mystery of the incarnate divinity of Christ as the personal union of two natures, unchanged in their substantial attributes, but always operating in harmony with each other. All this was defeated by Dioscurus, who now proceeded to deal his long meditated stroke against the Antiochians. At the *Robber Synod* of Ephesus (Aug., 449), over which he presided, the canonical restoration of Eutyches and the condemnation of the Antiochians, was carried through by artifice and force. It characterizes the spirit of this Synod that Flavian, the chief aim of their party rancor, died shortly after, either from injuries received during the Synod, or as exile in Lydia. Eusebius of Dorylæum escaped a like fate by a precipitate flight to Rome. Flattery readily obtained the sanction of the resolutions from the weak Theodosius. Dioscurus seemed to have gained his end, and the Egyptian doctrine to be the established orthodoxy. Dioscurus was at liberty to fill the eastern sees with his minions. Leo tried in vain by every effort to have the resolutions of Ephesus annulled. Only the sudden death of Theodosius (450) gave hopes of better things. The general opposition, long suppressed, could now make itself heard before the throne; and the disposition of the new rulers gave assurance that the development of doctrine would return again to its natural channel. The Empress Pulcheria, and her husband, Marcian, both orthodox in the sense of the R. Church, desired first of all to restore the peace of the empire, by establishing a new symbol to reconcile ecclesiastical antagonisms. Hence the thought of a *fourth Œcumenical Synod*, which was to serve also as a counterpoise to the increasing power of the R. bishop, into whose hands the decision of the whole question seemed ready to fall. But even before the Synod met, the exiled and deposed bishops were restored to their sees; Eusebius alone by the Synod itself. The bishops of the party of Dioscurus obtained pardon on condition of repentance. The majority of them readily veered with the wind which had now set in. The Synod met at *Chalcedon*, in October, 451. Leo, also, sent dele-

gates, when he saw that it was impossible either to invest his letter with symbolical authority or to bring the Synod to Italy. Dioscurus was condemned without difficulty; for, having exhausted all his artifices, and being overwhelmed by the terrible accusations which the secular and clerical representatives of Alexandria heaped upon him, he absented himself from the sessions of the Synod (MANSI, VI., 1004). In order not to offend the monophysite members of the Synod, he was deposed, not on account of heresy, but on account of his violence at Ephesus, and his contumacy to the Synod. The Emperor banished him to Gangra, where he died soon after. But almost the entire Synod was opposed to the construction of a new symbol: it was thought unnecessary, as the older symbols and the writings of the Fathers were sufficient to decide all questions of faith. The Romans insisted upon the acceptance of the letter of Leo, which a majority of the bishops had already subscribed. After the Synod had nearly wrecked upon the first draft of a formulary containing strong Alexandrian elements, which, though generally acceptable, was strenuously opposed by the Roman and Eastern members, it was resolved that the draft should be modified according to the letter of Leo. The result was the well-known symbol of Chalcedon; which, basing itself upon the old traditional creed as the proper mean between the extremes of Nestorianism and Eutychianism, wished, in its new definitions, also, merely to confirm the one truth, unchangeable from the beginning. Besides the letter of Leo, the two doctrinal letters of Cyril to Nestorius and the Eastern Church also obtained symbolical authority. The chief christological decision was, that in Christ two perfect natures were to be recognized, a divine and a human, but without mixture, change, or separation, both penetrating each other in personal unity, but without destroying their substantial difference, so that each nature retains its own properties (MANSI, VII., 113, 116). The formulary was unanimously accepted as apostolical in authority. The imperial sanction of the decree also forbade future discussions of religious questions. Eutyches, who, previous to the Synod, had been a second time excommunicated by Anatolius, Patr. of Constantinople, and sent away from the capital by Marcian, was not condemned by name. Leo advised that he should be sent to a remote exile, in order to prevent communication with his followers, and the spread of his doctrines (MANSI, VI., 117, 289). Nothing is known of his subsequent fate. It is probable that his great age did not long endure the grief caused by his unexpected calamities. Notwithstanding civil penalties decreed in 452, his party still continued in considerable numbers for some time.

Sources: *Synodicon adv. tragöd. Iren.* (MANSI, V., 731, sq.); *The acts of the Counc. of Chalced.* (MANSI, VI., 529, sqq., VII.); *Letters of Leo the Gr.* (MANSI, V., 1323, sq., VI., 7, sq.); [*Gelarii?*] *brevicul. hist. Eutych.* (MANSI, VII., 1060, sq.); *Literat. breviar. caus. Nestor. et Eutych.* c. 11, sq. (MANSI, IX., 674, sq.)—*Treatises*: WALCH, *Hist. der Ketzereien*, VI., p. 3, etc.; SCHRÖCKH, *christl. K. G.*, XVIII., p. 433,

etc.: NEANDER, *Ch. Hist.*; BAUR, *Lehre v. d. Dreieinigk.*, I., p. 800, etc.; DORNER, *Lehre v. d. Person Christi.*, 2d ed., II., p. 99, etc.

SEMISCH.—Reinecke.

Evagrius, Ponticus, son of a presbyter, born at Iberis, on the Black Sea. Basil made him a lector in Cæsarea, and Gregory, of Nyssa, a deacon. He received his theological training chiefly under Greg. of Naz., who, c. 379–80, made him Archdeacon in Constantinople. There he took sides with Origen. He fled from the domestic jealousy of some civil officer there to Jerusalem, c. 385, accompanied by Greg. of Naz., and was led by his predilection for a philosophical life to join the Nitrian monks, where he remained as the pupil of Macarius. Theoph., of Alex., offered him a See which he declined (Soz., VI., 30; Socr., IV., 23; III., 7; CASSIOD., *Hist. trip.*, VIII., 1; PALLAD., *Hist. Laus.*, 86; NICEPH., *Call.*, II., 42). But for his adherence to Origen, E. would have enjoyed the undivided regard of his cotemporaries; for this he was not merely reproached by Jerome (*Ep. ad Ctes. c. Pelag.*), but condemned by the Church (EVAGR., *Schol. Hist. eccl.*, IV., 38). He was widely acknowledged as a man of learning, judgment, and modesty (GENNAD., *De vir. ill.*, 11). His doctrinal-ascetic bent is to be traced to his Cappadocian teachers (see Socr., IV., 23). His style of thought is related to that of Macarius, but less mystical. The following works, mostly in short sections and sentences, are known to be genuine: 1) *Μοναχὸς ἢ περὶ πρακτικῆς*, gr. et lat. in *Cotel. Monum. Gr.*, III., 68. — 2) *Ἀντιβιβλικὸς περὶ τῶν ὀκτὼ λογισμῶν*. PALLAD., *Vita Chrys. ed. Bigotius*, 349. — 3) *Lib. de ver. monachal. ration.* Gr. et lat. ap. *Cotel.*, III., 103. — 4) *Schol. de tetragramm. Dei nom.* *Cotel.*, III., 116. — 5) *Στιχηρά, sentent. libri and capitula*. SUARES, *Opp. Nili*, 613, 626. *Bibl. Patr. Lugd.*, T. XXVII. Some others (*sermo dogm. de trin. instit. ad monach.*, are partly mixed up with the works of Nilus or Basil, and partly in fragm. in Maximus and the Cat. patr. Lost: *Γνωστικὸς ἢ περὶ τῶν καταξωδίων τῶν γνώσεως*.—The only collect. of E.'s works is in GALLANDI, *Bibl. Patr.*, VII., 551–81.—(See OUDIN, *Comm.*, 883. TILLEMONT, *Mem. pour l'hist. eccl.*, X., 368. FABRIC., *B. G.*, VIII., 364, ed. *Harl.*, IX., 284–86; VII., 434; X., 10, 99, 137. FESSLER, *Institt. patrol.*, I., 656).

GASS.*

Evagrius, the Church Historian.—But little is known of his life. According to Valesius he was born at Epiphania, Coelos., c. 536–7, enjoyed a good education, lived mostly in Antioch, as an attorney (hence called *Scholasticus*), and was intimate with Gregory, whom he aided in writing letters, &c., and defended against the accusations issued from Constantinople. For E.'s professional skill Tiberius made him Quæstor, and Mauricius gave him the *δύλτος ἐπάρχων*. Some collections of acts, decrees, &c., which he made were early lost (EVAGR., *H. E.*, VI., 24, sub fin.). But his valuable history remains (first publ. by R. STEPHAN.: Par., 1544; Geneva, 1612; improved, with comm. by VALESIIUS: Par., 1673; Fref., 1679; Amstel., 1695; and in *Hist. eccl. scriptt. cum notis VALES. et READING*: Cantabr., 1720, 3 T.). E. closes the concatenation of authors who carried out the history begun by

Eusebius. Taking up the thread with the Council of Ephesus, 431, he pursues it in six books to the 12th year of Mauricius, 594. His work is the main authority for the doctrinal development of that period, describing the Nestorian and Eutychian controversies, &c. Political facts were derived from profane writers, ecclesiastical from many reports and original sources. He is careful, impartial (IV., 30, 32), and fluent, though sometimes diffuse (cf. Phot., cod. 29), and credulous (IV., 26; I., 13; II., 3). His vindication of Constantine against Zosimus is remarkable (III., 40, 41, *cum. n. Vales.*). Photius, and many others, commend his orthodoxy. And yet he speaks tenderly of those holding different and even antagonistic views, and endeavors to show what good results flowed from the otherwise unhappy distractions of the Church (II., 11).—(See VALESII *præf. in Evagr. Fabric. B. G.*, VI., p. 126, *ed. Harl.*, VII., 432. STAUDLIN, *Gesch.*, &c., d. K.-gesch.—publ. by Hemsen, p. 79, &c.). GASS.*

Evangeliarium, *sc. volumen*, or *Evangelarius*, *sc. liber s. codex*, was, in the ancient C., the book containing the Gospel lessons appointed to be publicly read. The *Epistolarium* was that containing the selections from the Epp. Both together were called *Lectonarium*, or *Lect. plenarium*, though the latter oftener designated all the selections from the O. and N. T. In the Gr. Oriental C. the former was called *Εὐαγγέλιον* (i. e., *codex in quo descripta sunt Evang., quæ primum locum dignitate et officio inter lectiones Missarum occupant. Leo Allat.*). The *Εὐαγγελοσταβιον* was a sort of appended index, &c.—In the ancient C. great care was taken of the church Bibles, and especially the evangelaria. Chrysostom complains that more zeal was displayed in having them splendidly adorned than devoutly read, especially that women and children wore them as phylacteries around their necks instead of studying their contents (cf. JEROME, *Comm. in Matt.* 23 : 5). Copies were also provided for special occasions (see *Ambon. Cf. HAUG, Alterth. d. Chr.*, Stuttg., 1785, p. 328. AUGUSTI, *Denkw.*, &c., VI., 140, &c., 165, 206; X., 56; XII., 288, &c.). S.*

Evangelical Alliance, the, took its rise in 1846, in England, although the first impulse to the movement was received, not in England, where sects abound, but in *Scotland*. The original call of Aug. 5, 1845, gives prominence to the necessity of counteracting the spread of Popery and Puseyism. A deeper reason for the movement may be found in the breach between *established* and *free* C., which impressed reflecting Christian men with the importance of some bond of union between Evangelical Churches. Blessed schism, which led to a union so important and comprehensive! Upon a constitutional question Evang. Christians had separated, *ecclesiastically*, from Ev. Christians; but both parties being *true* Christians, they felt that they could separate only *ecclesiastically*, not as *Christians*—that they could extend hands to each other over the walls of external organization.—But this first movement called forth a loud response from various quarters. A number of gentlemen of *different* denominations in Scotland, issued a call Aug. 5, 1845, for closer fraterniza-

tion. The measure found favor in *England*. A preparatory meeting, held in Liverpool, Oct. 1–3, 1845, was attended by 216 members, of 20 different denominations, and a general meeting was resolved upon. The first general convention was held in Freemason's Hall, London, from Aug. 19 to Sept. 2, 1846. It was composed of 921 delegates from all Christian countries, including 47 from the continent of Europe, and 87 from America. Fifty Ev. communions were represented, many of which, however (as in the case of Reformed and Lutherans) differed only *locally*. Some colored ministers were present. The meeting was opened with earnest prayers. Sir Cullen Eardly Smith was chosen chairman, and has since stood at the head of this great Ev. league. The Evang. Alliance is not a *union*, neither does it propose to effect a union of the various denominations, but simply their fraternal co-operation against common foes, and dangers. And the *means* of doing this is not an official, or semi-official eccl. confederacy, but by the combination of *individual* Christians—it is “not a league of churches but of Christians.”—This being the case the Ev. Alliance has nothing to do with distinctive denominational confessions, but simply requires agreement in fundamentals. Hence it became necessary to give these fundamentals a definite form. This was done upon the motion of Dr. Bickersteth, and after mature deliberation the following articles were unanimously adopted on the 24th of Aug.:

The parties composing the Alliance shall be such persons only as hold and maintain what are usually understood to be Evangelical views, in regard to the matters of doctrine stated below, as follows:—

1. The Divine Inspiration, Authority, and Sufficiency of the Holy Scriptures.
2. The right and duty of private judgment in the interpretation of the Holy Scriptures.
3. The unity of the Godhead, and the Trinity of the Persons therein.
4. The utter depravity of human nature, in consequence of the fall.
5. The incarnation of the Son of God, his work of atonement for sinners of mankind, and his mediatorial intercession and reign.
6. The justification of sinners by faith alone.
7. The work of the Holy Spirit in the conversion and sanctification of the sinner.
8. The immortality of the soul, the resurrection of the body, the judgment of the world by our Lord Jesus Christ, with the eternal blessedness of the righteous and the eternal punishment of the wicked.
9. The divine institution of the Christian ministry, and the perpetuity of the ordinances of Baptism and the Lord's Supper.¹

¹ To these articles were added the following declarations: 1) “That this brief summary is not to be regarded, in any formal or ecclesiastical sense, as a creed or confession, nor the adoption of it as involving an assumption of the right authoritatively to define the limits of Christian brotherhood, but simply as an indication of the class of persons whom it is desirable to embrace within the Alliance; and that the selection of certain tenets, with the omission of others, is not to be held as implying that the former constitute the whole body of important truth, or that the latter are unimportant.—2) That this Alliance is not to be considered

On Sept. 2, the Alliance was organized. The organization of branches in the following districts was recommended: the 1st, Great Britain and Ireland; 2d, the United States of N. A.; 3d, France, Belgium, and French Switzerland; 4th, North Germany; 5th, S. Germany and German Switzerland; 6th, British N. America; 7th, the W. Indies. All these were subsequently formed.

It has been strangely objected to this Alliance, that it has no practical aim. This objection has been chiefly pressed by those (especially in Germany) who have been very energetically aiming at the reverse of what is contemplated by the Alliance, viz.: to keep the several denominations as far apart as possible, to emphasize their points of difference, to effect an approximation to Rome, and to establish a theology of the Bible as expounded for Christians, and not to be expounded by them. Had the Alliance no further object than to counteract this disease of insular and continental Puseyism, its efforts would be practical enough. But there is reason for devout gratitude that still other practical objects have been aimed at and secured. Eminent servants of the Lord have become acquainted with each other, and formed lasting Christian friendships. A more general and accurate knowledge of the outward and inward condition of the various denominations represented has been secured. By the publication of the periodical by the British Branch-Alliance—*EVANGELICAL CHRISTENDOM, its state and prospects* (London, Partridge and Oakey, Paternoster Row)—an important statistical organ, in the highest sense, has been established. Besides these there have been specific single ends gained, as through the influence of the action of the Alliance upon the subject of slavery, the spread of the Gospel in Rom. Cath. countries, the

an alliance of denominations or branches of the Church, but of individual Christians, each acting on his own responsibility.—3) That in this Alliance, it is also distinctly declared, that no compromise of the views of any member, or sanction of those of others, on the points wherein they differ, is either required or expected; but that all are held as free as before to maintain or advocate their religious conviction with due forbearance and brotherly love.—4) That it is not contemplated that this Alliance should assume or aim at the character of a new ecclesiastical organization, claiming and exercising the functions of a Christian Church. Its simple and comprehensive object, it is strongly felt, may be successfully promoted without interfering with, or disturbing the order of, any branch of the Christian Church to which its members respectively belong.—5) That while the formation of this Alliance is regarded as an important step toward the increase of Christian union, it is acknowledged as a duty incumbent on all its members, carefully to abstain from pronouncing any uncharitable judgment upon those who do not feel themselves in a condition to give it their sanction."

The objects of the Alliance are thus stated in the resolutions of the IVth division of the official report: 1) (This resolution expresses a deep sense of the general neglect of our Lord's new commandment—"to love one another").—2) "That the great object of the Evangelical Alliance be, to aid in manifesting, as far as practicable, the unity which exists among the true disciples of Christ; to promote their union by fraternal and devotional intercourse; to discourage all envyings, strifes, and divisions; to impress upon Christians a deeper sense of the great duty of obeying their Lord's command, to "love one another;" and to seek the full accomplishment of his prayer: "That they all may be

energetic and efficient aid extended to persons persecuted for Religion's sake (as in the case of the Madiai), &c. — (See Conference on Christian Union. Narrative of the Proceedings of the meetings held at Liverpool, Oct., 1845: London, Nisbet, 1845. Evang. Alliance. Report of the Proceedings of the Conference held at Freemasons' Hall, London, from Aug. 19 to Sept. 2, 1846. Published by order of the Conference: London, Partridge and Oakey, Patern. Row, 1847. Dr. MASSIE, *The Ev. Alliance, its Origin and Development*: London, John Snow, 1847).

DR. EBBARD.*

Evangelical Church-Conference, the German, is a periodical convention of delegates of the Ev. churches of Germany, "for the free discussion of questions most nearly affecting the true life of the Church, for the settlement of some bond of unity, and to promote their common interests." The first movement in this direction was made in 1845, almost simultaneously with that in Scotland, which led to the formation of the Ev. Alliance, and originated with King William of Würtemberg; and pursuant to an invitation issued from Berlin, in connection with Stuttgart, to the eccl. authorities of S. Germany, and in connection with Hanover to those of N. Germany, the first conference was held in Berlin, in Jan, 1846, at which all the chief churches of Ev. Germany were represented, excepting those of Austria, Bavaria, Oldenburg, and the free cities. The deliberations then extended to questions concerning management and business of subsequent conferences, a confession, liturgy, hymn-book, and Church constitution; but as one government desired the proceedings to be kept secret, they were not officially published; and became known, in an unreliable way, through a North German

one, as thou, Father, art in me, and I in thee; that they also may be one in us; that the world may believe that thou hast sent me."—3) That in furtherance of this object, the Alliance shall receive such information respecting the progress of vital religion in all parts of the world as Christian brethren may be disposed to communicate; and that a correspondence be opened and maintained with Christian brethren in different parts of the world, especially with those who may be engaged, amidst peculiar difficulties and opposition, in the cause of the Gospel, in order to afford them all suitable encouragement and sympathy, and to diffuse an interest in their welfare.—4) That, in subserviency to the same great object, the Alliance will endeavor to exert a beneficial influence on the advancement of Evangelical Protestantism, and on the counteraction of infidelity, of Romanism, and of such other forms of superstition, error, and profaneness, as are most prominently opposed to it, especially the desecration of the Lord's day; it being understood that the different organizations of the Alliance be left to adopt such methods of prosecuting these great ends, as may to them appear most in accordance with their respective circumstances, all at the same time pursuing them in the spirit of tender compassion and love.—5) In promoting these and similar objects, the Alliance contemplates chiefly the stimulating of Christians to such efforts as the exigencies of the case may demand, by publishing its views in regard to them, rather than accomplishing these views by any general organization of its own.—6) That reports, minutes, and other documents, in promotion of the above objects, be published by the Alliance at the time of its meetings, or by its order afterwards; and that similar documents may be issued from time to time by its various organizations, on their own responsibility.

journal. In 1846 it was determined to hold a second conference in Stuttgart, in 1848. The Revolution of that year interfered, but served to expose fully the religious and moral necessities of the times, and to demonstrate the importance of a general understanding among all Ev. churches. At the Stuttgart Church Diet of 1850, the eccl. officers of the different countries were convinced, upon consultation, that the idea of the Berlin Conf. should be revived, and conferred upon the best method of doing it. The matter was again confidentially discussed at the Diet of Frankfurt, 1851. A programme was then drawn up and submitted to other eccl. authorities, on the basis of which *propositions* were prepared during the Elberfeld Church-Diet, Sept., 1851, by twelve members of German Ev. Church establishments, for a connection between the highest authorities of the different Ev. State-churches of Germany, and especially for the institution of a central organ for the interchange of their respective eccl. regulations. These were submitted to the several eccl. authorities, and approved by nearly all of them. In accordance with these propositions the German Ev. C-conference met in Eisenach, June, 1852, and during the same year was started the "Allgemeine Kirchenblatt für das ev. Deutschland," edited by Prelate v. Moser, of Würtemb., and published by J. G. Cotta, Stuttgart. The first fruits of this Conference was a general Ev. Hymn-book. The consultations had upon the necessity of reforms in public worship led to the liturgical conference of Dresden, composed of delegates from the Lutheran churches of Saxony, Bavaria, &c., which took action upon matters of importance, and has furthered, what was deemed impracticable, a harmonizing of the divers confessions of that denomination. — (See the "Allg. Kirchenblatt," &c.). GRÜNEISEN.*

Evaristus, St., of Antioch, who succeeded Clemens as B. of the Church in Rome, c. 100, is honored as a martyr by the Romish C., although there is no historical account of his martyrdom. Trajan issued no decree for the persecution or extermination of Christians as such, but only insisted upon prohibiting secret associations. Hence the leaders of such societies would be likely to meet with opposition, and even at times suffer the penalties of the law, or violence of the populace, though without bodily harm. — The ecclesiastical division of Rome into parishes is traced to E. (?). He died c. 109. The letters ascribed to him are spurious. S.*

Eve, עֵוָה, Eua, the name of the first woman.

According to Gen. 2 : 20, God desired to provide a help meet for man. The Hebrew עֵוָה, however, means: suited to a place before him, i. e., not simply to be at hand, as an outward assistant, but to be about him in bodily and spiritual fellowship. While Adam was sleeping, therefore, God took a rib from him (see HOFFMANN, Weiss. u. Erfüll., I., 65. BAUMGARTEN, Comm. z. Pentat., I., 47. DELITZSCH, Genesis, 2 ed., p. 152. NAGELSBACH, d. Gottmensch, I., 287. Upon similar profane accounts. KLEUKER, Zendavesta, I., 20; III., 83. PLATO, Sympos., 189, &c.). Adam called the woman,

whom God brought to him, חַוָּה, which is her generic name as distinguished from man, as *vira* from *vir* in FESTUS (ed. O. Müller, p. 261), and *ἀνδρίς* from *ἀνρ* in SYMMACHUS (Jerome supposes: *quæst. Hebr. in Gen. ad h. l.*, that S. desired to retain in Gr. the etymology IS and ISSA). As חַוָּה has no feminine form, it is used of both Adam and Eve (so *homo*, ἀνδρῶν). But Adam called the woman *Eve* to designate her relationship to the race. It is, therefore, not an appellative, but her proper name, and has not merely a natural, but a historical signification, connected with the history of redemption, for Adam gave it to her immediately after the curse was pronounced, as a new additional name (Gen. 2 : 23. SYMN. renders ζωόνομος). Delitzsch properly pronounces this an act of faith on Adam's part. From the words of the curse: "in sorrow thou shalt bring forth children," A. derives the consolation that the curse of death should not prevent new life and salvation from issuing from the womb of Eve. — (See BAUMGARTEN, l. c. 61, &c. Upon the various Gnostic-Jewish fables connected with the name of Eve: FABRICIUS, *Cod. pseudepigr.*, V. T., 95–104). NAGELSBACH.*

Evilmerodach succeeded (B. C. 561) his father Nebuchadnezzar, upon the Chaldean throne, but, on account of his voluptuousness and tyranny, was murdered (559) by his brother-in-law, Neriglissar (BEROS., ap. Joseph. c. Ap. 1, 20. EUSEB., *præp. ev.*, 9, 40). How Jos., *Ant.* 10, 11, 2, can assign to his reign 18 years, or ALEX., *Polyhist.* (ap. Eus. chr. arm., p. 21), 12 years, is inexplicable, and must be an error, as the fixed chronology of later Chaldean princes allows of only 2 years for E. What Jerome says, on Is. 14 : 19, of E.'s regency of 7 years during his father's insanity, and of his subsequent imprisonment, during which he formed a friendship with the captive Jehoiachin of Judah, whom he subsequently released, &c., is a rabbinical invention woven out of the statements made in Daniel 4. (Cf. 2 Kings 25 : 27, &c.; Jer. 52 : 31). The name of E. is variously written. Its Hebrew form points to the Chald. god *Merodach* = Mars (see *Chaldeans* and BELSHAZZAR). DUNCKER, *Gesch. d. Alterth.*, I., 475). RÜTERSCH.*

Exactions (*tallie*) are extraordinary assessments or taxes, being either entirely new levies, or an increase of old ones (c. 13, X.; III., 39; c. 15, X., *h. t.*). Such taxes were *per se* illegal (3d Council of Toledo, 589, c. 6, *Can. X.*, *qu. III.*, Leo IV., c. 62, *Can. XVI.*, *qu. I.*, 853). Hence Alex. III. reiterates the principle at the Lat. Council, 1179: *Prohibemus, ne ab abbatibus vel episcopis, aliisve praelatis novi census imponantur eccl., nec veteres augeantur, nec partem reddituum suis usibus appropriare presument* (c. 7, X., *de censibus. c. eod.*, &c.). Still they were sometime allowed upon valid reason being given (c. 6, X., *de cens.*; Clem. I., *de magistris*, V., 1; *Conc. Trident.*, s. V., cap. 1, *de ref.* See *Collections*). JACOBSON.*

Exclusiva is the right pertaining to some Roman Cath. powers, of excluding an obnoxious Cardinal from nomination for the papacy. The

Emperors of Rome early acquired great influence upon the choice of an incumbent for that See — and this less through their own love of power than ambition and contentions in eccl. parties and aspirants. This interference, at first incidental, gradually acquired the force of a prerogative, and became the subject of various official transactions between Emperors, Popes, and Councils. (See STAUDENMAIER, *Gesch. d. Bishofswahlen*: Tüb., 1830. The decree of Honorius, 420, c. 8, *dist. LXXIX.*, and c. 1, 2, *dist. XCVII.* The decree of a Rom. Synod under Symmachus, 502, c. 1; § 7, *dist. XCVI.*, c. 23, *Can. XVI.*, qu. VII. ANASTASIUS, *biblioth. in vita Agathonis*, c. 21, *dist. LXIII.* LIBER DIURNIS, c. II., ed. Garnerii: Par., 1680, 4to.; and in C. G. HOFFMANN, *coll. nova scriptt.*, &c., T. II.: Lps., 1733, 4to.). This same prerogative was exercised by the Frankish and German Emperors (STENGEL, *Gesch. d. fränk. Kaiser I.*, 102, &c. STAUDENMAIER). But Hildebrand (Greg. VII.) persuaded Nicholas II., 1059, to confer the right of electing a Pope upon the College of Cardinals, "*salvo debito honore et reverentia dilecti filii nostri Henrici*" (IV.) etc., (c. 1, *dist. XXIII.*). Thenceforth the Emperor possessed simply the right of confirmation; and even this was not long retained. For the Lat. Conc. of 1179, under Alex. III. (c. 6, X., *de elect.*, I., 6) conferred the election of a Pope unconditionally upon the Cardinals. But then national party interests began to appear in the College of Cardinals, and thus the choice of a Pope to depend upon national politics. As the Pope was claimed to be the supreme civil potentate, also, no appeal could well be any longer made to temporal rulers, to decide when the elective college could not agree. Hence the right of exclusion, exercised by the Cardinals themselves was substituted in place of the earlier imperial prerogative of confirmation. When this right was first exercised is unknown; no existing regulations for the election of a Pope show any trace of it (cf. *Constit. Greg. XV.*: *Æterni patris*, of Nov. 15, 1621, found in P. J. a. RIEGGER *Corp. jur. eccl. noviss.*: Viennæ, 1725, p. 361. PÜTTER, *Literatur d. Staatsrecht*, III., 864-5. HAMMER, *de jure principis cathol.*, &c.: Bamberg, 1744. SCHMIDT, *thes. jur. eccl.*, III., 685, &c. G. L. BÖHMER, *principia jur. can.*, ed. VII., § 495).

JACOBSON.*

Exegetical Collections. — From the beginning, the teachers of the Christian Church devoted themselves to the interpretation of the SS. The N. T. soon took its place beside the Old, and both were diligently studied. In this way a fund of exegetical matter was soon created, although very much scattered. After the extraordinary literary activity of Origen and the Greek Church until its golden age in the middle of the 5th cent. — after the labors of Ambrose, Augustine, and Jerome in the West, it accumulated to such a degree that it became necessary to epitomize, sift, and arrange in the manner of the ancient scholiasts. The collections, which thus arose were called, by the Greeks, *ἐπιτομαὶ* (*συλλογαὶ, συναγωγαὶ*) *ἐρμηνειῶν, ἐρμηνεῖαι συνερωνισθεῖσαι, ἐξηγήσεις συλλεγεῖσαι*, and the like; by the Latins, simply *glossæ, postillæ*. The commentaries which bear the name of *catenæ* (chains,

expositions arranged after each other chain-wise) are of later origin. The first of them are usually ascribed to Cassiodorus in the West at the close of the 5th cent., and Procopius, of Gaza, in the East, in the 6th cent. But this is incorrect, for the works of these men did not possess the proper character of *catenæ*, which are so constructed, that the exposition either stands on the margin beside the text, or more commonly, follows after detached verses or short passages. The exposition itself is merely an extract from some exegete, whose name is added. The compiler allows himself no judgment in the case, and only occasionally hazards the insertion of a brief remark. His work is simply to collect and arrange — having liberty to abridge or alter only where necessity requires. The choice of the Fathers, from whom extracts were made, was accidental — a matter of taste; of course, the more eminent were preferred — Origen, Chrysostom, Theodoret, and Cyril, in the East, and before all, Augustine in the West. Heretics were also used, but with a word of caution. From these *catenæ* proper are to be distinguished those exegetical works, in which the author chooses one or more authorities, whom he epitomizes with more or less freedom, exercising his own judgment and adding his own thoughts. Such are the writings of Procopius, Cassiodorus, Primasius, Florus Magister, Bede, Rhabanus Maurus, and others, which no doubt form the link of transition to the *catenæ* proper, whose antiquity we cannot place later than the 9th cent. The preparation and transcription of *catenæ* continued through the whole of the Middle Ages, and far into the 16th cent. Hence their number is great and only a small portion have been printed (see J. A. FABRICII, *biblioth. gr. cur. Harl.* VIII., p. 637; J. A. NOESSELT, *De catenis patr. gr. in N. T. in his Opuscul. ad hist. eccles. fasc.*, III.: Hal., 1817, 8vo., p. 321). Few are independent works, most of them being copies with capricious variations and numerous blunders.

The value of the *catenæ* is no longer exegetical, but literary and historical. They are not only important as monuments of the age in which they flourished, but they convey to us also treasures from the ancient Church. The extracts given from works, which we possess through other channels, serve the ends of criticism. Besides this, they contain fragments of lost works, especially of the Greek Fathers, and in such abundance that some of them have thus in a great part been recovered. And here lies the chief value of the *catenæ*. Of late years Cardinal Mai has accomplished much in this almost unbroken field. The use of the *catenæ*, however, demands the utmost caution, not because of any intentional falsification, but because the names of authors are here and there omitted, or put in the wrong place, and since they are generally abbreviated, different men of the same name, as Gregorius, Eusebius, Theodorus, Heyschius, or of similar names, as Severus and Severianus, are confounded with each other. The text also is frequently very corrupt through negligence.

For the reason before given, the Latin *catenæ* are of minor value; but the Greek, hitherto published, are too important to be passed over with-

at notice. For the Octateuch, we possess a very copious one (edited by the Greek *Nicephorus*: Lips., 1772, 73, 2 T., fol.); for the Ps. (Gr. et Lat. d. BALTH. CORDERIUS: Antw., 1643-46, 3 T., fol.); for Job (Gr. et Lat. Patr. ed., JUNIUS: Lond., 637, fol.); for Canticles (J. MEURSIUS: Lugd., 1617, 4to.); for Jerem., Lam., and Bar. (Gr. et Lat., MICH. GHISLERIUS, as a suppl. to his Comment.: Lugd., 1633, fol.); and one for Daniel, by AUG. MAI: *Scriptur. vett. nova collect.*, T. I. On the N. T. have appeared two *catenæ* for Matthew (Gr. et Lat., edited by *Petr. Possinus*: Colon., 1646, fol., and by *Balth. Cord.*: Antw., 1647); and two for Mark (one, Gr. et Lat., published by *Petr. Possinus*: Romæ, 1673, fol.; the other by *Ch. F. Matthæi*: Mosqu., 1775, 1 T., 8). The commentary published under the name of *Titus Bostrensis*, in the Auctar. biblioth. patr. ed. *Fronto Ducaes*: T. II., and in the Bibl. Patr., Paris, T. XIII., is a *catena*; for similar passages from another for Luke, see *Aug. Mai*: *Scriptor. vett. nov. coll.*, T. IX. For John, BALTH. CORD. published one (Gr. and Lat., Antw., 1630, fol.), and CH. F. MATTHÆI Rigæ., 1782, 8vo), for the Catholic Epistles. This literature has been greatly enriched of late by J. A. CRAMER, who by using various MSS., has issued *catenæ* on the entire N. T.: Oxon., 1838-44, 8 T., 8. The exegetical work on the Acts and Epp., usually ascribed to CECUMENIUS, Bish. of Tricca, is only an epitomized *catena*, with which he had nothing to do.

With the vast accumulation of material after the revival of the 16th cent., new collections appeared. They were of two kinds; those which contained the remarks of select commentators, revised but unabridged, or those in which a greater number of expositors were epitomized. The most important works of the former class are: *Biblia magna* ed. J. DE LA HAYE: Par., 1643, 5 T., fol.; *Biblia maxima*: Par., 1660, 19 T., fol. (Catholic); Annot. upon all the books of the O. and N. T.: Lond., 1645, 3d ed. 1657, 2 vols., fol. (English); and *Critici sacri s. clariss. viror. in Biblia annot. atque tract.*: Lond., 1660, 9 T., fol., ed. by J. PEARSON, et al.; ed. II. *correctior* (by NIC. GÜRTLER), *Francof. ad M.*, 1695-1701 (Amstel., 1698), 9 T., fol. (both Catholic and Reformed). To the other class belong *Synopsis criticor. aliorumque scr. s. interpretum et commentatorum* by MATTH. POLUS: Lond., 1669, sq. 5 T., fol.; *Francof. ad M.*, 1678, sq., ed. rec., 1712, Ultraj. (ex. rec. J. LEUSDENII), 1684, sq., 5 T., fol. The Apocrypha is omitted. Here too belongs CHRISTOPH. STARCKE: *Synop. biblioth. exeget.* O. T.: Leipz., 1741, sq., 6 vol. 4to. (Apocrypha omitted); N. T., 1733, sq., 4 ed., 1758, &c., 3 vols. 4to., and the compilations of the English exegetes: the O. and N. T. from the French (Hague, 1742, sq. 4), with copious notes by ROM. TELLER, J. A. DIETELMAIER, and J. BRÜCKER: Leipz., 1749-70, 19 vols., 4to. Many modern commentaries contain a mass of exegetical matter, heaped together with almost no elaboration, so that they bear the character of *catenæ*. This is particularly true of those produced by Catholics, as, for example, the works of FRANC. HARREUS, JAC. TIRINUS, COM. A LAPIDE, J. St. MENOCHIVS, and AUG. CALMET, on the whole

Bible, and many commentaries on particular books.

O. F. FRITZSCHE.—Porter.

Exemption is the setting aside of the proper jurisdiction over a person or case, and subjecting them to another, especially a superior court. Instances of substituting a *forum exemptum* for a *f. competens*, early occurred; indeed eccl. jurisdiction properly rests upon an exemption of the Church from that of civil judges. Each exemption seems an exception, to be justified, like all departures from the rule, upon special grounds, although sufficient justification was not always given. The constitution of the Church involves the union of individual members with their bishop, and of the several congregations with each other, and of all under common spiritual rulers. This principle was early recognized, and schisms were accordingly forbidden (see *Schisms, Dismissorials*). The first example of formal exemption is that of monasteries from episcopal jurisdiction (THOMASSIN, *vet. ac nov. eccl. discipl. circa beneficia*, P. I., lib. III., c. XXVI., &c.). The Council of Chalcedon, 451 (in Can. IV., c. 12; Can. XVI., qu. I., c. 10; Can. XVIII., qu. III.), expressly decreed the subjection of monks to episcopal authority; and subsequent eccl., as well as civil, enactments confirmed this (Nov. 123, c. 21 of JUSTIN.: 546). But when the bishops became oppressive the monasteries sought protection from their tyranny, of Synods (*Conc. Nerdense*, a. 546, c. 3, c. 34, Can. XVI., qu. I.), Roman bishops (*Greg. I.*, a. 601, in c. 5, Can. XVIII., qu. II.), and kings (*Roth, Gesch. d. Beneficialwesens*. Erlang., 1850, pp. 262-3). In the last named case some became *monast. regalia*, and obtained, usually, the free choice of their abbots, and control of their property; in matters of discipline the bishops were required to adhere strictly to the canons (WALTER, *corp. jur. Germ. I.*, 287, &c., 531, &c.; MARCULFI, *formulae*, lib. I., f. 1, &c.). But when the bishops tried to bring the monasteries into greater dependence again by corrupting the original records (ROTH, l. c. 259, 451, &c.), these sought more complete freedom from the authority of the bishops, and, in some instances, the Pope exempted whole orders (see *Cistercians; Clugny*). The superior of such, therefore, became *prælati nullius dioceseos, prælati cum jurid. episc. vel quasi*, over the territory of their monasteries (see *Tit. de regularibus*, X., III., 31; *Lib. VI.*, III., 14; *Clem.*, III., 9, &c.). This led to complaints from the bishops which resulted in the abolition of some of these exemption rights (as by Martin V., at Costnitz, 1418; and Leo X., at the Lat. C. of 1515; see J. H. BOEHMER, *jus eccl. Prot.*, l. III., tit. XXXV., § 34, 35). The evil, however, was not fully remedied, and the commission of Cardinals appointed, 1538, by Paul III., was occasioned especially by exemption abuses still existing (LE PLAT, *monumenta ad hist. Conc. Trid. amplissima*, T. II., 601). Hence also the action of the Council of Trent upon the subject (SARPI [*P. Soave Polano*], *hist. Conc. Trid.*, ed. 1622, l. VIII., pp. 886-7; *Conc. Trid.*, s. XXV. c. 12, 13, *de regular.*; s. XXXIII., c. 15, *de ref.*; s. XXIV., c. 4, *de ref.*; s. V., c. 1, 2, *de ref.*; s. VI., c. 3, 4, *de ref.*; s. XXII., *decr.*

de observ. in celebr. missæ, in fine; XXV., c. 14, *de ref.*). But most of the exempted monasteries were afterwards dissolved in consequence of their secularization. Besides these *regular* exemptions, special ex. were obtained by secular clergy (but see *Conc. Trid., s. VII., c. 14, de ref.*), bishops, and even laymen.

Exemptions could be granted only for good reasons. They rest upon a papal privilege (c. 10, *de priv.*, in VI^o, V., 7; *Bonif., VIII.*), but this not conveyed by an ordination performed by the Pope (c. 7, X., *de majoritate et obedientia*, I., 33; *Innoc. III., a. 1206*), or upon a prescription of 40 years, presuming a titular right (c. 15, 18, X., *de præscr.*, II., 26; *Innoc. III., a. 1202, 1208*; c. 7, *de privil.*, in VI^o, V., 7; *Bonif., VIII.*), or without a title and irrespective of prescription. In recent times, however, civil governments have required the approval of the State.

In the *Protestant C.*, the only occasion for exemptions arose from the relations sustained to the *Romish C.* According to the principle: *quidquid est in parochia est etiam de parochia* (*Tit. X., III., 29*), priests were allowed to exercise eccl. jurisdiction over Protestants within their parish. It required long struggles to get this abolished; indeed the *Rom. C.* has never surrendered the principle, and in some cases the independence of Protestants has been only recently secured.—(Cf. *Art. Consistorial Constitution*).

JACOBSON.*

Exorcism, ἐξορκισμός—the formal expulsion of evil spirits from *persons* or *things*. From Luke 11: 19, 20, it appears that persons possessed of such spirits were common among the Jews at the time of Christ. According to Matth. 10: 8; Luke 9: 1; 10: 17, 19, power was given to the disciples “to cast out devils,” although they sometimes failed (Matth. 17: 19; Luke 9: 40). On the other hand, we are told (Luke 9: 49) of one who cast out devils in the name of Jesus, without belonging to his disciples; and a similar case occurs in Acts 19: 13. If now the name of Jesus had such power with unbelievers, how much more with believers! Hence *Tertullian* (*Apologet.*, c. 23) declares it certain that one possessed “*a quolibet Christiano loqui jussus*,” must obey the command and that every Christian as such, has power over demons. Likewise, *ORIGEN* (*Contra Celsum*, VII., 334) mentions it as a well-known fact, that not a few Christians, without any knowledge of the formulas of exorcism, being in general a plain, unlettered people (ἰδιώται), cured demoniacs by prayer alone, and simple adjuration. This gift of healing, therefore, was esteemed a *charisma*, which, though pledged to bishops and teachers, was bestowed also on particular persons out of their ranks. Hence these persons, who, though not ordained to the work by the laying on of the bishops’ hands, yet needed his approval, were styled (*Constit.*, VIII., 26) *exorcistæ per gratiam*, to distinguish them from those *per ordinem*, who were received by ordination into the ranks of the clergy, as we find it in the West as early as the middle of the 3d cent. Bishop *Cornelius* of Rome (251), at least, expressly names *exorcists* as one of the four *inferiores ordines ecclesiæ*. Room was made for them in connection with

the rite of baptism. As he who had not Christ for his Lord belonged to the devil, every catechumen was required publicly and solemnly to renounce the devil, before baptism. For those to be baptized on Easter, the Sunday *Oculi* was appointed for this “*ab renuntiatio*,” hence called *Exorcism-Sunday*, and with reference to this ancient Christian custom, the Gospels for the first three Sundays in Lent are chosen, that they all refer to the superiority of Christ over the devil. Even in the case of children, such a form of renunciation could not be laid aside, since, on account of original sin, they were regarded as the property of the devil until baptized; and it seemed also right and proper for the priest, or the assisting exorcist, to drive out the impure spirit of sin from the infant by the breath (*exsufflatio*), and by a second breathing upon it (*insufflatio*), to symbolize the entrance of the Spirit, as is still the practice of the *Rom. Church*. “*Sacerdos*,” so it stands in the Ritual, “*exsufflat ter in faciem Catechumeni, semel dicens: Exi ab eo (ea), spiritus imunde, et da locum Spiritui Sancto Paraclito. Illic in modum crucis halet in faciem ipsius et dicat: Accipe Spiritum bonum per istam insufflationem, et Dei benedictionem. † Pax tibi*.” Besides this, in ancient times, the so-called *energumens* (ἐνεργούμενοι sc. ὑπὸ πνευμάτων ἀκαθάρτων), were intrusted to the care of the exorcists, and whilst the bishop or priest at every public service offered the prayer prescribed for these unhappy creatures, the former laid their hands on them daily with prayer. (Cons. the 4th Conc. of Carthage (398), c. 90, *Omni die exorcistæ energumenis manus imponant*). Although these *energumens*, in the course of time, became more and more rare, and baptismal exorcism, especially in smaller churches with only one priest, fell upon the officiating priest, yet the *Roman Church* never gave up the order of exorcist. To this day every clergyman, before he is ordained as a priest, receives the consecration of the four lower *ordines*, i. e., he is ordained first as *ostiarius*, then as *lector*, then as *exorcist*, and then as *acolyth*. Touching that of exorcist, the 4th Conc. of Carthage (can. 9), decrees: *Exorcista, quum ordinatur, accipiat de manu episcopi libellum, in quo scripti sunt exorcismi*—at present it is generally a missal, which the ordaining bishop hands to each of the candidates to touch—*dicens sibi episcopo: Accipe et commenda memoria, et habeto potestatem imponendi manus super energumenum, sive baptizatum sive catechumenum*. As cases of possession rarely occur now-a-days, this general authority does not suffice. It is the duty of the priest to prepare himself specially by fasting, prayer, confession, and the eucharist, for his work, which is to be performed in the church, the sacristy, the house of the priest, or if need be, in that of the sick man, yet always in the presence of witnesses. Here, arrayed in robe, cope, and a blue stole, he first sprinkles the subject with holy water, and, kneeling down, prays the All Saints’ litany, the Lord’s prayer, and Ps. 53, *Deus in nomine tuo* (in our vers. Ps. 54); then two prayers in which, making the sign of the cross over the patient, he commands the evil spirit to depart, by virtue of the mysteries of the incarnation, the suffering and death,

the resurrection and ascension of Christ, the sending of the Spirit, and the coming again to judgment. Thereupon follows the lesson from John 1. *In principio erat Verbum*, with Mark 6: 15-18, and Luke 10: 17-19. Then he lays both hands upon the head of the energumen, saying: *Ecce crucem Domini: fugite partes adversæ: vicit leo de tribu Juda*, and the prayer follows, with the proper formula of exorcism: *Exorcizo te, immunde spiritus*," the priest meanwhile making three crosses, in the name of the Trinity, on the brow and breast of the energumen. If the evil spirit does not depart, all these ceremonies must be repeated. In regard to the exorcism of things, the view of St. Paul, that every creature of God, used with thanksgiving, is good, stands true at all times. But in consequence of the curse, which the first sin brought upon all nature, it seemed necessary to exorcise beforehand things designed for sacred use, such as the water and salt, required for holy water. Beasts also, horses, fields and fruits are so treated, more frequently in the Greek Church than in the Roman. In Russia there is a special festival for the consecration of fruits by the priest, and before that day no one durst eat; after, he may devour ripe and unripe indiscriminately, and if any one becomes dead-drunk he has the consolation of knowing that it was not caused by demoniacal influences.

In the Evangelical Church, the question, whether exorcism should be retained or not, was discussed, only however in its connection with baptism. Since *Zwingli* and *Calvin* (Instit., IV., c. 15, 19) were decidedly adverse, it soon disappeared among the *Reformed*. There is no trace of it either in the *Augsburg Agenda* of 1537 and 1545, the *Strassburg Church Discipline* of 1543 and 1598, that of the *Palatinate*, or that of *Swabian Halle*, 1543.

On the other hand, Luther and Melancthon had approved of it, and their example was followed by the other Lutheran theologians. First in 1583 *Heshuss* ventured to take ground against it, but was answered by *Just. Menius*. It thus became a point of difference between the two churches, and any one among the Lutherans, who spoke in favor of setting it aside, was accused of "Calvinism." Hence, when the *Prussian K. O.* of 1558 dropped it, the estates complained bitterly that a new baptismal office was forced upon them which could only lead to Calvinism. The controversy grew still more violent when Nic. Krell, the privy counsellor of the Elector Christian I. of Saxony, a decided friend of the "Philippists," who were suspected of Crypto-Calvinism, ordered (1591) the Saxon preachers to omit it in baptism; but the elector died soon after, when K. was condemned to ten years' imprisonment, and peace restored through the revival of exorcism by a Diet held at Torgau in 1592. Of later theologians, *Gerhard*, *Quenstedt*, and *Hollaz*, declared its use or disuse a matter of indifference; *Baier* and *Baumgarten* favored its abolition, as also *Reinhard* and his school still more strongly. Since that time it has gradually fallen into disuse in the Lutheran Church.

II. A.—Porter.

Exsuperius, Bishop of Toulouse, c. 390-410. *Jerome*, who dedicated his Comm. on Zachar.

to E. especially commends his beneficence, a virtue for the exercise of which that age of rapine, perpetrated by Vandals, Alani, and Suevi, afforded ample opportunity. He imitated, says Jer., the widow of Sarepta, feeding others whilst fasting himself. To aid the destitute he sold, not only all his own goods, but the sacred vessels, also, carrying the body of Christ in a wooden tray, and the blood of Christ in a glass vessel. He also assisted, pecuniarily, the numerous monks of Palestine, Egypt, and Lybia. He is said to have completed the basilica of St. Saturnine begun by his predecessor *Silvius*. — (BOLLAND. ad 28, Sept., de s. *Exsuperio*, *Tillemont Mem.*, X., p. 617 et 825). P.*

Ezekiel, the Prophet.—I. His name signifies "God strengthens," referring not merely to him whom God strengthens, but rather to him whose being is a personal proof of the strength of God. Ezekiel was the son of Busi and belonged to the sacerdotal family (Ezek. 1: 3; cf. 1 Chron. 24: 16). His abode during the whole period of his activity as a sacerdotal prophet, was at the river Chebar (LXX., *Χοβάρ*) among the captives (1: 1). This was doubtless the Chobaras which took its rise in Mt. Masius, and, after receiving the Mygdonius near Circesium, empties into the Euphrates. It is altogether probable that he was among the eminent Jews taken captive to Babylon with King Jehoiachim (1: 2; 26: 1; 30: 20; 31: 1; 32: 1: 40: 1; 2 Kings 24: 14-16). He calls the locality a part of the Babylonian empire (1: 3). Here we find him settled with his own family (3: 24; 24: 18). As he was first called to the prophetic office in the 5th year of the captivity of Jehoiachim (1: 2), internal probability favors the statement of Josephus (Ant. 10, 6, 3) that E. was removed from Jerusalem to Chebar in his youth. His official labors seem to have lasted 23 years, viz., from the 5th to the 27th year of the captivity (29: 17). Beyond this we have no account of him. For the opinion that E. was carried away to Chebar with exiles of Israel, before the captivity of Jehoiachim (*Winer*, Lex.; *Hävernick*, Comm. on Ez.) is unfounded.

II. Ezekiel was called to the prophetic office under circumstances which render his case altogether peculiar. For although those of his contemporary Jeremiah somewhat resemble Ezekiel's, still Jeremiah prophesied in Jerusalem and within the limits of the Holy Land, whilst E.'s sphere was in a foreign country. In this respect Daniel comes nearest to him, of whom also E. had knowledge (14: 14; 28: 3). But Daniel was properly, a world-prophet, not a prophet of Israel (see Art.). Between Ezra and Ezekiel, furthermore, there was this difference, that Ezra was a learned scribe who derived his knowledge from the study of the law of Moses, whilst E. was prophetically illumined by the Spirit. And there is a striking significance in this peculiarity of Ezekiel, that God should raise up such a prophet out of the midst of a captivity which has continued to the present day, and will last until the general conversion of Israel. It was E.'s mission to furnish his people with a prophecy adapted to these circumstances from first to last. And the manner in which he was called to the office corresponds with the nature

of his mission (1 : 33 ; 11 : 22, 23). How clearly this indicates, that God now began a new mode of revelation to his people, one which demonstrated that he could carry forward his purposes concerning them, independently of the temple and its priests! (Comp. 11 : 16-23). In fact E.'s prophetic position and activity, seem to be a new beginning of internal development: he appears to be a religious and spiritual central point, around which those captives who had hitherto rejected all guidance, gather for counsel and comfort (8 : 1 ; 11 : 25 ; 13 : 24 ; 14 : 1 ; 20 : 1 ; 24 : 19 ; 33 : 31, 32). This was the sacred and the divine beginning of that development of religious life in Israel which has been more or less maintained in the services of the synagogues to the present day, and will continue until Israel has experienced in heart what it confesses with the mouth in the usages and formularies of the synagogues (see VITRINGA, *De synag. vet.*, 332, &c.). To start this was no easy work, which any one might have successfully undertaken, but we see in advance the centuries of God-opposing obstinacy and deadness, which has ever combined with this apparent life among the dispersed of Israel; and the prophet everywhere anticipated and counteracts this opposition to the plans of God (12 : 21-28 ; 13 : 10, 16-23. Comp. Jer. 6 : 14 ; 29 : 8, 9, 15). But although the prophet's mission was a difficult one, in view of the perverseness of the people, he was confirmed in it, by the fulfilment of his prophecies against the temple (9 : 6), Jerusalem (chapt. 4), the people of Israel (c. 5) and the holy Mt. (c. 6). Naturally, the day of such fulfilments was a notable one for the prophet (24 : 1, 2), for it would dissipate the delusion of the people, and awaken deeper respect for the prophet. We may assume that the events exerted a still more salutary and wide-spread influence upon those who survived; for soon after the exile the Jews finally renounced idolatry, and they have persevered in this until the present day. But this beginning of the conversion of Israel (Zach. 1 : 6), being mistaken for the completion of that conversion, became the occasion of an evil more dangerous than open idolatry had been. They imagined that because they now shunned all the abominations of idolatry, they had attained to the purity and holiness required, and thus fell into the snare of self-righteousness and hypocrisy, which would once show itself in blasphemies and persecutions against the Son of God, and his anointed messengers. Hence E.'s denunciation of this evil (12 : 2 ; 14 : 1-3 ; 20 : 3 ; 33 : 31, 32 ; comp. Is. 6 : 10), and call for a new heart and a new spirit (18 : 5-9, 30, 33) ; comp. 11 : 14 ; 36 : 26). In these passages we discern essentially the same tone of doctrine and exhortation met with in our Lord's sermon on the Mt., and in the Ep. of James—all intended to work proper humility in the self-righteous, self-deceived Israelites.—Having such difficulties to meet we can readily perceive why he needed a forehead like adamant (3 : 8, 9), by which, however, is not meant insensibility to the miseries of the people, but invincible firmness of spirit (9 : 4, 8 ; 10 : 13 ; 21 : 11, 12 ; 24 : 17-27 ; 32 : 18 ; 2 : 5, 7 ; 3 : 11, 27). Hence he ranks with

Isaiah and Jeremiah as one of the three great prophets of Israel. For as it was Isaiah's mission to proclaim the word of the Lord to Israel at the moment when the necessity of the judgment of the captivity became most apparent, and Jeremiah's to prophecy when the judgment fell upon the city of Jerusalem and the house of David, so it was Ezekiel's mission to lead the rebellious house of Israel into the wilderness of the heathen, for its long probation. And notwithstanding the hardness of their hearts and their obstinacy, they could not, in their captivity, wholly resist the impression which E.'s divine mission and authority made upon them. They not only rallied around him as their spiritual centre and refuge, but his name and reputation rose high among them (comp. Wisdom 49 : 10, 11), and to this day they honor his supposed sepulchre (Hortinger, *Thes. phil.*, 475; Ausland, 1853, No. 40, p. 957).

III. Although E., as a prophet, exerted immediate influence upon the people, his work was intended to reach beyond his own age and relations. His prophecies therefore were committed to writing, to be handed down to more appreciating generations, not only in the succession of Israel, but among the Gentiles. This was intimated even in the manner in which the first portions of his prophecy were set before him (2 : 9 ; 3 : 3). And the Synagogue seems to have apprehended this more extensive design of the book, for it was forbidden to be read by persons under 30 y. of age (ZUNZ, *l. c.*, 163). Hence the duty of the Gentile Church, upon which the spirit of understanding prophecy has fallen, to search into the meaning of this book, and unfold it to the blinded Jews. This is especially claimed by the last third of the book, containing the prophecies concerning the Mis. and house of Israel (c. 36, 37), concerning Gog and Magog (c. 38, 39), and concerning the new sanctuary and city of Jehovah (c. 40-48).—(Besides the standard commentaries, see HESS, *Briefe über d. Offenb. Johannes*, 131-136).

BAUMGARTEN.*

Ezion-geber, is mentioned as one of the last stations of Israel on the journey through the desert, whence they journeyed towards Moab (Numb. 33 : 35, &c. ; Deut. 2 : 8). It was near Elath, in Edom. Solomon's fleet started for Ophir from E., and there Jehoshaphat's ships were broken (1 Kings 9 : 26 ; 22 : 49). It was, consequently, a harbor, but its precise locality has not yet been ascertained, although strong probabilities favor *Ewald's* suggestion (*Gesch. Isr.*, III., 1, p. 77), that it was only the harbor of Elath.—(See WELLSTED, *Travels in Arabia*; SCHUBERT, *Reise*, II., 379 ; BURCKHARDT's *Reisen v. Gesenius*, II., 831 ; RÜPPELL, *Reise in Nubien*, &c., 251, &c. ; RITTER's *Erdbk.*, XIV., 53, 167, 229, 284, 366, &c. ; ROBINSON's *Palest.*).

RÜTSCHE.*

Ezra and Nehemiah.—The book of Ezra consists of the following parts: I. Chpts. 1-6 : 22, embracing the period preceding Ezra's time (subdivisions: 1-4 : 7 (Hebrew) ; 4 : 8 ; 6 : 18 (Chaldaic) ; 6 : 19-22 (Hebrew.)) II. Chpts. 7-10 : 44, embracing the time of Ezra (subd., 7 : 1-11 (Hebrew) ; 7 : 12-26 (Chaldaic) ; 7 : 27-10 : 44 (Hebrew)).—In determining the author-

hip, date, and integrity of the book, everything depends upon the question whether Chronicles, Ezra, and Nehemiah were not the production of one person (see Art. *Chronicles*).—The following are the most conclusive reasons against the unity of the three books. Neh. 1:1, clearly announces a new book, distinct in its authorship from the Chronicles. And why, but on this supposition, would 1 Chron. 9, be repeated in Neh. 11, where the list more properly belongs? If Ezra and Nehemiah were not, written long prior to the Chronicles, it cannot be conceived why these should not have been taken up into the canon before those. Ezra 2 (comp. Neh. 7) was derived by the author from an original document at hand; so 4:8–6:18, from an Aramaic document discovered by the author. The latter section was written by an eye-witness (5:4, which is not contradicted by 6:14). All, therefore, in P. I. which is not copied from primitive sources, was written by one author (even including 6:19–22). In P. II., 7:26–9:15, is certainly by Ezra; and although in 7:1–11, and chapt. 10, the author speaks in the third person, this does not prove another origin (see KEIL, apolog. Versuch, 124).—Concerning E. himself, our chief source of information is the book bearing his name. Of sacerdotal descent, he was closely related to the high-priest Joshua. He was highly esteemed by Artaxerxes Longim. (7:12–26). Having conducted the return of the Jews to Jerusalem, in the exercise of his official functions, he banished the foreign wives (7:6, 14, 25; Neh. 8:9; Ezra 9, 10). Foremost in studying the law he made it a point to reduce it also to practice (7:10). When in exile, the Jews felt the necessity of a thorough acquaintance with the law as never before, and Ezra, as their representative, became the model of a priest mighty in Scripture. Gathering round him such of the priests and Levites as sympathized with him (Neh. 8:7–9; 10:29), they explained the sacred Word to the people. Now for the first time do we find a pulpit (Neh. 8:4). Great was the anxiety of the Jews to hear these instructions (9:3). E. may be called the *Reformer of Israel*.—Tradition speaks of him as the president of the *Synagoga magna* and collector of the canon, a work loudly demanded by the necessities of this period. He gathered the 24 books of the O. T., but, as we cannot tell whether he died before or after the last prophet, and he could not be certain whether God would not send another *ἀνὴρ θεόπνευστος*, it cannot be said that he finished the canon. (Touching his labors, in this department, which tradition exaggerates, see the Church Fathers in FABRIC. *Cod. Pseudepigr.* V. T., p. 1158; cf. EUSEB., *H. E.*, V., 8; IREN., *adv. hæc.*, III., 25 (21, 2 ed. Stieren); TERTULL., *de habit. mul.*, I. C., 3; BASIL. *ep. ad Philonem.*, *Clem.*, *Strom.*, I., c. 22, § 149, ed. Klotz; HIERON., *adv. Helois*; ISIDOR., *libr.* III., *Etymol.*).—He is also said to have introduced the square letter (*Talm. Sanhedr.* C. 2; HIERON. in *prol. galeat.*), the points and the Masora. To him are ascribed 10 legal precepts (comp. WOLFF, *bibl. hebr.*, p. 943;

Orho, *lex rabb. phil.*, p. 174). Two apocryphal writings bear his name: the so-called third book of Ezra (in Cod. Alex. *δ' ἐσπεύς*, in *Vet. Lat. Syrus*), and LXX. Ezra I. (in ISIDOR., *Orig.*, 6, 2, Ezra II.). Comp. FABRIC., *bibl. græca* L. III., p. 746; EICHHORN, *Einl. in apokr. Schrift.* d. A. T., Lpzg., 1795, p. 335.—On the prophetic-apocalyptic fourth book of Ezra, see FABR., *Cod. apocr.* N. T., p. 936. LÜCKE, *Einl. in die Offenb. Joh.*, p. 80. *Ersch and Gruber*, Art. Ezra by Rödiger. —On an autograph of Ezra's, viz., the Codex of the Pentateuch, written by his own hand, see FABR., *l. c.*, p. 1147.—Concerning his death we have only fables. According to Jos. (*Ant.* XI., 5, 5) he died and was buried in Jerusalem; according to others, on a journey to Persia in the 120th year of his age. His grave is pointed out on the Tigris (according to *Benjamin v. Tudela*, I., p. 73, ed. Ascher).

The book of Neh. may be divided into three parts: I. chapt. 1–7; II. c. 8–10; III. c. 11–13. Clearest and most connected of all are the first six chapters, which, it is admitted, were written by Nehemiah. The section, chapter 8–10—according to *Khinert* (*Dürpt. Beitr.*, I., p. 131), and *Hävernick* (*Einl.* II., p. 305)—was composed by Ezra, but transcribed *verbatim* by Nehemiah; according to *Keil* (*Einl.*, p. 522), by Neh. himself; whilst *De Wette* (*Einl.*, p. 291) regards it as an interpolation, and *Ewald*, as the production of the author of all three works. It must be believed, however, that it was written by some one who lived in the time of Neh.—whether by Ezra, or Neh., or some one else, is of small account. Of the following chapt., the authorship of 12:1–26, and 12:44–13:3, is denied to Neh. (See Jos. *Ant.* XI., 7, 8; DE WETTE, *Einl.*, p. 293; VITRINGA, *Observ. ss.*, VI., p. 337; RAMBACH, *Annot. in libr. Neh. in den uberr. Annot. in Hagiogr.*, Vol. III., ad b. 1; KEIL, *l. c.*, p. 86, and Art. *Darius*).—The son of Hachaliah (1:1), N. was the cup-bearer of Artaxerxes Longim., who highly esteemed him. In the year 445 B. C., clothed with royal authority he came to Jerusalem, and stood in a relation to the civil and political life of the Jews similar to that occupied by Ezra in regard to their religion. It is worthy of remark that Neh. bore a double title: Pacha, or Pascha, and Thirsatha. The former seems to have been his proper official title (see 3:7; 5:14, 18; comp. v. 15, and 3:11; 7:11); the latter was merely honorary (8:9; 10:2; 7:65, 70; Ezra 2:63). In 433 B. C., he went back to the court, but got permission to return (Neh. 13:6). Concerning the duration of his absence, see *Prideaux's Connexions*. Of his death, nothing is known. Jos. *Ant.*, XI., 5, 8, says that he died an *εὖ γῆρας ἀφαιρόμενος*. See the beautiful sketch of his life by *Ewald*, *Gesch. d. V. Isr.* III., 2, p. 166.—(Comp. V. STRIGEL, *Schol. in libr. Esræ*: Lps., 1571. The same, *Schol. in Nehem.*: ib., 1575. J. H. MICHAELI's *Annot. in libr. Esr. (in uberr. Annot. in Hagiogr.*, Vol. III.). J. J. RAMBACH, *Annot. in libr. Nehem. (also in uberr. Annot. in Hagiogr.*, Vol. III.). BERTHEAU has announced a Comm. on Ezra, Neh., and Esther).

NÄGELSBACH — *Ermentrout*.

F.

Faber, John Augustanus, born at Freiburg, Switzerland. He joined the Dominicans at Augsburg, and became their prior. In 1516 he taught (probably theology) at Bologna, and was afterwards appointed court-preacher and confessor of Maxim. I., whose funeral sermon he preached Jan. 16, 1519. Some other honors and offices were also conferred upon him. (ERASM., ep. XVI., 16 ed. Basil). Charles V. made F. his court-preacher, 1520-21, at the recommendation of Erasmus, who describes him as a learned, eloquent, and affable man. At the same time F. projected measures of conciliation in regard to the Lutherans, counselling, quite in the spirit of Erasmus, the appointment of a tribunal, conjointly by the Pope, the Emperor, the Christian Kings, and the German Electors, by which existing dissensions might be settled. He communicated this plan orally (at Cologne, Nov. 2, 1520) to the Elector of Mayence, and afterwards in writing. Subsequently he and Erasmus differed more and more in their views of Luther.—F. died about 1531. It is not known that he left any unpublished writings. He is often confounded with John F., of Vienna, or with F. of Heilbronn.—(See SECKENDORF, *hist. Luth.*, 1521. ECHARD ET QUÉTIF, *Scr. O. Præd.*, II., 80).

WAGENMANN.*

Faber, John (Fabri), Bishop of Vienna, born in Leutkirch, Suabia, in 1478, early joined the Dominicans, studied theology at Freiburg, Breisgau, where he was made *Mag. art.*, then *Dr. jur. canon. or theol.* Talented and studious he was soon chosen vicar of Lindau and Leutkirch, and then episcopal official in Basel, and canon of the principal church there. In 1518 Hugo, B. of Landenberg, appointed F. his Vicar-general in Constance, and Leo X. conferred on him the title of papal prothonotary.—At first F. sustained friendly relations with members of the Reformed party (as Erasmus, Zwingli, Oecolamp., Melanch., Vadian, &c.), and kept up intimate correspondence with Zwingli, especially. But in 1521 he underwent a total change, apparently occasioned by a visit to Rome, and the liberality of the Pope. Thenceforth he opposed the new movement most virulently and indefatigably, with his pen, and from the pulpit, seeking every opportunity of showing his zeal. His devotion to the Papacy, and his arduous labors were richly rewarded. Successive offices of emolument, and posts of honor, were bestowed upon him, until, in 1530-31, he was raised to the See of Vienna. He died May 21, 1541. He bequeathed his library to the theol. institution he had founded in Vienna, and several valuable legacies, for benevolent objects, to Leutkirch.—His controversial works were numerous, but of no permanent value.—(See ECHARD ET QUÉTIF, *scr. O. Præd.*, II., 111, &c. KLEIN,

Gesch. d. Christenth. in Oestr., IV. KETNER, *diss. de J. Fabri vita et scr.*: Lps., 1735, 4to.).

WAGENMANN.*

Faber, (Favre) Peter Francis, a Swiss priest, attended *F. de la Baume*, B. of Halicarnassus, as secretary and confessor, on his tour of visitation to Cochinchina, 1740, an animated account of which he afterwards published: "*Lettres édiifiantes et curieuses sur la visite apostol.*" &c. In this work F. exposed the misdeeds of the Jesuits in China in a manner which greatly incensed them. They bought up all the copies of his work they could find, and destroyed them. He died in his 80th year. SIMLER gives full abstracts from F.'s letters in his "*Samml. alter u. neuer Urkunden zur Beleuchtung d. K. gesch.*," I., 159-256.

PRESSL.*

Fabian, the supposed name of the 19th B. of Rome, 236-50; but both his name and the time of his episcopate are in dispute. The Greeks call him *Fabius*; the Alexandrian Chron. (p. 630) *Flavian*. Eusebius (*H. E.*, I., 6, c. 29) says that, though a layman, he was chosen in consequence of a dove having perched upon his head during the meeting of the people and clergy for the election of a new bishop. Cyprian highly commends him (*Epp.* 4, 31). The *Pontificale* of Bucherius (p. 271) says he appointed 7 deacons over the 14 eccl. districts into which Rome was then divided. Later *Pontificalia* ascribe to him the appointment of 7 sub-deacons, as aids to the 7 persons who wrote the acts and sayings of the martyrs by order of Pope Clement. Baronius and Bollandus claim for F. the conversion of the Emperor Philip and his son; but this, apart from their conversion reflecting no great credit on the instrument of it, is doubtful. F.'s work against the heretic Privatus is lost. Other works have been falsely ascribed to him.—(See *Acta Sanct.*, II., Jan., p. 252. TILLEMONT, *Mémoir.* III., 362. Bower's *Hist. of the Popes*).

PRESSL.*

Fabricius, John, the successor of Calixtus, not only in office, but in irenical theology, in which, however, he went to extremes. For four generations his ancestors had served the Church of Nuremberg, in the spirit of moderate Melancthonianism. The founder of the family, John F., successor of Osiander at St. Lorenz, Nuremberg, was a personal friend of Melancthon; his son, John Baptist, born 1532, † 1578, studied under M. in Wittenberg, and was pastor in Nuremb. and Fürth; John Baptist's son John, born 1560, † 1637, pastor of St. Sebald, was renowned as *pacis et concordiae studiosus*; and his son John, born 1618, † 1676, who was educated by G. Calixtus and Horneius, in Helmstädt, became Prof. of Theol. at Altorf, and then, for 25 years, pastor of St. Mary's in Nuremb., was the father of the subject of this sketch, who was born at Altorf, Feb. 11, 1644. After an admi-

rable course of study, he travelled, 1670–77, through Germany and Italy. During this period he was chosen pastor of a congregation of evangelical merchants in Venice. From 1677–97 he was Professor of Theology at Altorf. In 1697 he was called as Professor to Helmstädt. He had a high reputation for acute and varied scholarship, and was especially familiar with points involved in the Romish controversy. He died Jan. 29, 1729.—(See his *Amoenitates theol. varii et selecti argumenti*: Helmst., 1699, 4to.; and his *Historia Biblioth. Fabricianæ*: Wolfenbüttel, 1717–24, 6 vols. 4to. Also CHRYSANDER's *Diptycha professorum theol.*, &c. WILL's nürnb. Gelehrtenlex., I., 376, &c.; V., 308, &c. W. HÖCK, Anton Ulrich u. Elis. Christine v. Braunschweig: Wolfenb., 1845, p. 80–136).

HENKE.*

Faculties, ecclesiastical, are powers to exercise certain prerogatives granted by the proper official to another person. Such powers can be delegated only by superiors having regular jurisdiction, and their limit is regulated by the deed of investiture. The most important are papal and episcopal faculties, and especially those referring to dispensations. Popes early granted to missionaries, and the heads of monastic orders, general faculties for dispensations, *ex causa longissimæ absentiæ a Romana Curia*. (See MEYER's d. Propaganda, I., 38, &c.: Göttingen, 1852). Subsequently papal nuncios granted them, particularly to carry out the decrees of Trent (see GIESLER, Eccl. Hist.); for as special officers their authority was superior, in some things, to that of the regular Bishops (see *Dispensations*). In consequence of difficulties growing out of this collision, the system of quinquennial faculties arose.—The faculties granted by Bishops relate partly to prerogatives properly belonging to them, partly to matters of privilege. Hence they may empower *auctoritate ordinaria (propria)* or *apostolica*, vicar-generals, officials, deans, priests, to perform acts which they could not otherwise perform.

H. F. JACOBSON.*

Facundus, B. of Hermiane, in the African province of Byzacena, a native of Africa, of the 6th cent., dwelt chiefly in Constantinople, as a representative of the African Church. He was prominent in the controversy concerning the Three Chapters (see Art.). After a thorough examination of the subject he wrote (547) his *pro defensione trium capitulorum*, in 12 books (publ. by J. Sirmond: Paris, 1629, and in Sirmond's Works, II., 297–586, ed. Venet.), in which he sought to persuade Justinian to revoke his edict. He denounces in general the common tendency of the age to theological controversies. In other arts and occupations, only the skilful had a voice, but every one felt at liberty to dabble in theological disputes. He also reproaches the pliancy of the Bishops towards the Emperor, and recommends the example of Ambrose. He defends Ibas of Edessa, and Theodore of Mopsueste against the accusations of their opponents, showing that their views coincide with the faith of the Church. Concerning councils he says: *Neque enim est alia conciliorum faciendæ utilitas, quam ut quod intellectu non capimus, ex auctoritate credamus.*

—He was also the author of *Liber c. Mucianum Schol.* (SIRMOND, 587–98), a defence of the African Bishops who had broken fellowship with Vigilius of Rome; and *Epist. fidei cathol.*, in favor of the Three Chapters. It is said he died in exile, c. 570.—(See BARON., ad ann., 546. CAVE, *Scriptor. eccl.*, I., 520. OELRICHS, *Script. eccl. lat.*, p. 361. NEANDER, Ch. Hist.).

HAGENBACH.*

Fagius (*Büchlein*) Paul, born 1504, at Rhein-zabern, in the Palatinate, studied at Heidelberg (from 1515) under J. Brenz, &c., from 1522 taught in Strassburg, where he learned Hebrew with W. Capito, and became acquainted with Bucer, Hedio, Zell, &c. In 1527 he went to Isny as rector of a school, and was subsequently sent by the Council of Isny to study theology at Strassburg. After that he was minister at Isny from 1537–43. Here he diligently prosecuted the study of Hebrew under the Jew, Elias Levita, and was aided by Councillor Peter Buffer in establishing there a Hebrew press. After Capito's death, F. was chosen his successor at Strassburg. Before taking that post (1544), he spent two years at Constance in regulating Evangelical Church matters there. In 1546 Frederick III. called him to aid in organizing the Reformation in the city and University of Heidelberg. His views, based on Melancthon's advice, were opposed by the majority of the Professors, who still adhered to the mediæval method. His labors at Strassburg were also brought to an end by the Interim, the introduction of which had been resisted by F. and Bucer (see Art.). In 1549 F., with Bucer, went to England at Cranmer's invitation. They reached England Apr. 25. F. became Professor of Hebrew at Cambridge; where he died the same year, Nov. 25. The bloody Mary had his bones exhumed, 1556, and burned with those of Bucer. On July 30, 1560, however, Elizabeth honorably restored the memory of both.—Martin Crusius describes F. as tall of stature, with an earnest but kind expression of countenance, an able preacher, and superior Hebrew scholar. His writings consist of expositions of the O. T., and works on Hebrew philology. In doctrine he held the mediating views of Bucer and the Strassburg theologians.—(See CRUSIUS, schwäb. Chron. for 1549, &c. MELCH. ADAM, *Vita theol.*, p. 204. HÄUSSER, Gesch. d. Pfalz., I., 612).

WAGENMANN.*

Faith, πίστις.—In order to ascertain the absolute religious significance of faith, we must first settle the import of the term as applied to common subjects.—*Faith is the basis of all social intercourse.* Men regard each other only as they believe in their mutual natural or moral excellence. We love those, only, in whose real affinity with ourselves, whether of blood or of spirit, we believe. Faith binds different persons together, by convincing them of their objective and subjective worth. This law holds absolutely in the case of *man's relation to God*. There are two degrees of the soul's communion with God: that of holy fear, and that of spontaneous love. Both presuppose faith as the receptive faculty. The former springs from a believing recognition of the majesty of the infinite power and holiness in which God reveals him-

self to the soul. The latter is kindled by a believing contemplation of the love and goodness of God, as the source of those blessings by which every necessity of our being is satisfied, and responsive gratitude and confidence are called forth. Hence it is by faith that we are enabled to apprehend the revelation of God's love, and to enter into that full communion with him which is the highest end of our development. Man is made for faith, and in every stage of his life faith is the subjective principle of his spiritual development. Even when faith becomes sight, its form only will be changed; essentially it will still be the bond uniting humanity to God.

Considered as to its *form*, faith is not a mere intellectual belief based upon an objective reality, as distinguished from a recognition of the subjective character of the grounds of such belief (James 2 : 14-26). The former is called *fides historica* as distinct from *fides salvifica*. Faith is a matter of the *heart* (Rom. 10 : 9, 10), of our inmost personality; a grasping of the sacred object with the deepest powers of the soul. And as all man's faculties are germinally included in the central power of the soul, they all become simultaneously involved in the exercise of faith. The believer not only thinks and supposes; he *knows* in whom he believes (2 Tim. 1 : 12); knowledge is essentially immanent in faith (Eph. 3 : 18). The soul is, likewise, filled with a feeling of holy joy, which soon changes into a cordial approval of the object of delight; and as, by a decided act of the *will*, it appropriates the blessings of faith, the soul attains to a certainty and confidence which become a firm foundation of desire and hope (Heb. 11 : 1; 1 Pet. 1 : 7). Thus, according to evangelical theology, faith comprehends: *Notitia*, *assensus*, and *fiducia*; neither of these must be wanting, though the measure of each may vary (Mark 9 : 24; Rom. 8 : 38, 39). *Fides est non tantum notitia in intellectu, sed etiam fiducia in voluntate, hoc est, est velle et accipere hoc, quod in promissione offertur, videlicet, reconciliationem et remissionem peccatorum* (ap. conf. III., 183).

The *object* of faith cannot be seen either by the natural eye, or the carnal reason; it belongs to the sphere of invisible things; especially of what is spiritual and divine. It is not absolutely incognizable, however, but manifests itself to the inner man. The proper object of faith is the revelation of God to man, comprehensively called, in the Bible, "the name of God." This revelation, however, issues from his being, and merely discloses that God is a spirit, and the life of a spirit is love, the operation of which presupposes, as to the nature of God, his absolute power, and as to his person, infinite holiness. The love of God is the inmost fountain and substance of the divine revelation, and remains such even towards the sinner, only that in his case it develops itself in the antithesis of anger and grace. The height of this grace was reached in the incarnation of the Son of God, to which the O. T. revelations constantly pointed. All these, in which the love of God is exhibited in degrees and forms suited to man's capacity, are objects of faith (Luke 24 : 25, 26); but pre-eminently Jesus Christ, in whom all were

consummated (John 3 : 16; 17 : 21; 20 : 31; Gal. 2 : 16; 1 John 3 : 23). And whereas faith embraces him, the personal fountain of our salvation, in the spirit, and does this with the mind (that is with the central faculty of man's life), faith, in its highest sense, is a personal, spiritual, union with Christ—a *receptive act of the soul, by which it fully appropriates the grace of Christ, and rises into a life of love with him*.—This life, however, cannot be produced by man's effort (John 6 : 29; 1 Cor. 2 : 5), but must be wrought by the Holy Ghost, who uses the means of grace to this end (Rom. 10 : 17; 1 Cor. 1 : 21; cfr. *Form. Conc.*, III., 11. Especially the Heidelb. Cat. q., 21). At the same time the soul must be duly prepared for it (John 5 : 44) by previous *repentance*, in which reliance upon self and the world is abandoned (Mark 1 : 15). This, also, is the work of the prevenient grace of God (John 6 : 44). When man yields to the influences of this grace, which also constrains him to a corresponding confession of Christ (2 Cor. 4 : 13), there will be a free surrender of himself to the Spirit of Christ, in and to whom he will thenceforth live. The necessary fruit of such faith is *love* (1 Tim. 1 : 5; 1 John 4 : 19).

Translated thus out of the dominion of a false selfishness into the grace and fellowship of Christ, who thenceforth lives and reigns in his heart (Eph. 3 : 17), and in whom he has become a new creature, (regenerated), the believer is no longer spiritually poor and empty, but filled with the fulness of Christ, and becomes participant in all the blessings of grace of which the person of Christ is the fountain—the pardon of sin (Acts 26 : 18), justification (Rom. 3 : 26; 5 : 1) without the works of the law (Acts 13 : 29; Rom. 3 : 28, &c.). For as we become incorporated with Christ by faith, we stand before God in him, as his members, and thus become just (*δίκαιοι*) before God in the righteousness of Christ (Rom. 1 : 17, &c.). Our faith is thus reckoned for righteousness, and we live by faith (Rom. 4 : 5; Hab. 2 : 4). He that believeth on the Son is not condemned (John 3 : 18), but is saved through faith, adopted, and assured of the resurrection unto life (Rom. 1 : 16; Gal. 3 : 26; John 5 : 24; 11 : 25, 26). Especially does faith, as the bond of union with Christ, qualify us to receive every spiritual gift, and form the conditional basis for the working of miracles, and effectual prayer (Matt. 9 : 22; 17 : 20; 21 : 22; and James 5 : 15). What St. James says upon the relation of faith and works is only in seeming contradiction to the above statements. In his epistle *δικαιοσύνη* does not mean "to be justified," but *to show and prove ourselves to be righteous*. Moreover the faith of which he speaks is merely intellectual faith (James 1 : 6, 18). Consequently, in order to prove one's self really righteous, we must exhibit those fruits of piety (not merely outward conformity to the moral law) which prove that we are really in Christ.—The Romish C. takes the opposite view, and contends that faith is limited to the sphere of knowledge, but, as certain knowledge, operates upon the feeling, and thus upon the will—also that faith is but the starting-point of justification, with which last

he identifies regeneration. (*Conc. Trid., s. VI.,* 6, 8).

But in addition to the gifts of grace, man also becomes participant, through faith, in the *personal life of Jesus Christ*. For Christ does not let himself be divided; whoever receives him by faith, receives him entire, by the Spirit (Gal. 3: 14; Eph. 1: 13; John 7: 38). The first work of the Spirit (who is the Spirit of Christ), is to illumine the heart by faith, so that we learn to know the mysteries of God in Christ (John 1: 69; Eph. 3: 8-21). There is indeed a knowledge of divine things which precedes faith. This consists, primarily, in the innate consciousness of God, implanted in the very ground of our personal being, and which no one can ignore; this forms the inner basis of all faith. It consists, also, in the knowledge of the particular object of faith; for before we can believe we must know what we are required to believe. Nevertheless, the proper insight into the true nature of the divine revelation is conditioned, objectively, by the Holy Ghost who has given it, and, subjectively, by faith, by which we inwardly embrace it, and experience its power; for without such experience there can be no real knowledge of divine things. But faith constrains us to such experimental knowledge, inasmuch as the love which animates faith, impels the spirit to seek more intimate knowledge of the object of faith; and thus the Holy Spirit, who searches all the depths of the Godhead, leads us into all truth, as hidden in Christ (1 Cor. 2: 7-16). Hence faith is the subjective principle of *illumination*.—But it is no less the principle of *sanctification*. Whoever believes in Christ is born of God, and overcomes the world (1 John 5: 1, 4). Faith is not only our mightiest weapon and strongest shield against the powers of darkness (Eph. 6: 16; 1 Tim. 6: 12; 1 Pet. 5: 9), but our victory over the world (1 John 5: 4). Faith, also, as a new life, produces *love*, which proves that we are partakers of the nature of God, which is love. And *love*, in connection with other spiritual affections, is the fruit of the Spirit (Gal. 5: 22), and exhibits its power by works of righteousness (Gal. 5: 6; 1 Pet. 1: 5-7).—The importance of this doctrine of faith is obvious. It humbles man by showing him that he is and has nothing, in himself, to render him worthy to stand before God, directs him to God as the only source of salvation, and builds his salvation upon a firm objective basis; it sets him inwardly free from himself, places him in living fellowship with God in Christ, and finally furnishes a specific spiritual principle of Christian morality, to which it prompts men by the purest motive—leads, in a word, to spiritual perfection.—The term faith is also used in an objective sense (see *Articles of Faith*: cfr. *Justification*; the various systems of theology—especially: CHR. F. SCHMID, *bibl. theol. d. N. Test.* SARTORIUS, *Lehre v. d. heil. Liebe.* SCHÖBERLEIN, *Grundlehre d. Heils*).

SCHÖBERLEIN.*

Family.—This term was used by the ancient Romans to designate: 1) domestics, or servants held as property; 2) a race, lineage, or progeny; 3) a sect, as *f. Stoicorum*. In the sphere of Christianity, however, the family is a commu-

nion based upon religious and moral relations, the intimacy and manifold bearings of which place it far above all other human relationships and associations (see *Christianity*). It is the image of the highest and most perfect of all unions: that of Christ with the Church. For Christianity—the ideal family in which Christ exerts his creative power in begetting, through the Spirit and the word, many children of faith unto God, children who mutually serve each other with their individual gifts—reflects itself in the natural family. It is true, the natural family is but a carnal reflection of the union of the Church, since even the life of a Christian family still holds in the flesh (Gal. 2: 20); but it is also a real reflection, because its bond of union is spiritual, it is held together by the Spirit of Christ.—The formal basis of the Christian family is *marriage* (see Art.), monogamy, the deepest ground and true consecration of which are found in the consciousness of mutual fellowship in Christ. In marriage, as in Christian friendship, there is the bond of reciprocal affection, but with this difference, that the former involves the exclusive fellowship of two persons of different sexes, whose union completes their personality, and hence is a life-union. Those thus united lay the groundwork of the Christian family, indeed are the family in an undeveloped, incomplete form, and contemplate the birth of children, as the proper and desirable fruit of their union. The natural desires for such issue, however, and their gratification, are ever cherished and indulged in subordination to the divinely ordered end of this sacred union, and to the will of God, and a sense of dependence on his blessing. And in order that this higher end of the family may be duly attained, and merely carnal passions be kept subdued, it will be necessary that the husband and wife endeavor, in all their social intercourse, to prove complementary helps to each others' moral and spiritual perfection; also, that if blessed with children, they faithfully co-operate in the proper training of these, under the influence of their harmoniously combined individual dispositions, the sternness of the father being softened by the gentleness of the mother, and the tenderness of the mother sustained by the firmness and authority of the father. Especially must the early consecration of the children to God in Holy Baptism, and their religious training engage earnest parental attention, so that through their earthly, temporal life, as a medium, they may be made meet for the family of the first-born in heaven. In this respect nature, as divinely arranged, gives to the mother a priority of opportunity, and therefore of duty, by placing the children bodily so near to her, in their early dependence upon her for maternal nourishment and care. And yet even during this early period of their life, the father may lend efficient help by his encouragement and counsel. Subsequently both parents will find opportunity to take equal part in managing the moral and spiritual interests of the household, yet with this difference that the influence of the father will be more directly exerted upon the sons, that of the mother upon the daughters of the family.

To maintain a healthy life in a Christian family, the education of the children must inculcate unconditional subjection to parental authority, as of divine origin; and this in order to form proper independence of character in them. They must be so taught the Word of God, habitual communion with the Lord, submission to the inner discipline of the Holy Spirit, that the doctrines and duties of the Gospel shall become an essential part of their spiritual life, and render them gradually more independent of parental admonition and support. This true Christian independence, rooted in the fear and love of God, and consequently in pious reverence also for earthly authority under God, will not be prejudicial to proper regard for parents, but elevate the nature of this regard, by making it a part of true piety. Hence even when apparent collisions occur, between the divine and parental authority, the higher regard paid to the former will be combined with due deference to the latter.—In this development of personal character the sons and daughters of a family will gradually enter into a relation of *friendship* to their parents; a higher mutual confidence between them will spring up, without injury to feelings of pious regard. This is a really advanced stage in the life of a Christian family, in which the older brothers and sisters quietly participate in the management and training of the younger members of the household, and thus become practically prepared for their own future destiny.—Should the marriage-relation be without natural issue, the lack of children may properly be supplied by the adoption of such as may be destitute, towards whom parental Christian duties may be piously and successfully performed.

The Christian family, ordinarily, also includes *servants*, or persons employed to labor. Whether these sustain a life relation, as personal property, or are but temporarily employed, they should be treated, as it is their duty to act, in a manner consistent with the spirit of the Gospel. Those who employ them should not merely be intent on obtaining a certain amount of service, but rather aim at making the relation subservient to the promotion of their higher spiritual interests. Care should, indeed, be taken not to encourage in such a temper of self-exaltation and perverseness. But the best means, usually, of preventing this will be to treat domestics in a Christian way, to have them participate in the religious services of the household, and show them tender sympathy in case of sickness, and treat them with the kindness due to members of the household—in a word, to aim at securing their true welfare for time and eternity.—To such, also, as may visit, or tarry in the household as *friends*, will the influence of a Christian family extend, so that these may likewise share in the benefits of the piety maintained in its midst.—The entire life of the Christian family will be continual acts of worship, in the higher sense, in which respect it must exhibit constant improvement, as well in its ordinary toils, as in its seasons of rest and social enjoyment: all must be done in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ, and to the glory of God. All this, however, will centre in, and be

confirmed by, *family worship* in the stricter sense, in which the presence and influence of the Word and Spirit of Christ, will be confessed and cherished, as the living moral force of the household, and the public worship of the congregation be daily perpetuated. This service will be conducted by the husband or father, as the priest of his house, and be participated in by all the other members of the family. It will properly include singing, the reading together of the Scriptures, and prayer. Around this common altar the whole family will stately gather, morning, and evening, and obtain there ever new life and grace, by which their whole being may become more and more inflamed with holy love to God and each other, better fitted for the toils and trials of life, and made more meet for eternal reunion in heaven.—A family animated with such a spirit, and conducted upon such principles, will extend its happy influence into the wider spheres of society, the school, the Church, the State, and even to the world at large. It belongs to the highest and holiest developments of Christian humanity.—(See ROTHE, Ethik, III., 2, p. 605, &c. Also the works on Ethics, by Reinhard, Flatt, Daub, Marheinecke, Harless, Schleiermacher, and THIERSCHE, Christl. Familienleben).

KLING *

Familists, a sect started by Henry Nicholas, or Nicolai, a native of Münster, who spent some time in Holland, then went to England, about the close of the reign of Edward VI., and there gathered a society called *familia charitatis*. His tenets were said to agree with those of David Joris, with whom he was familiar, and with those of the Anabaptists in general. His society, however, published (1575) a confession of faith, and an apology, in which they sought to prove their agreement with the three general Christian creeds. The fundamental characteristic of the sect was their tendency to a mystical self-absorption in God, or deification of themselves, which they held to be attainable through love. Nicholas was charged with saying, that Moses preached hope, Christ faith, but he, *love*; and in the title of a work styles himself "one deified with God, in the Spirit of his love." Hence the Familists were charged with denying the personality of Christ, and even with representing him as being only a communicating "condition" of divinity; and also with teaching that there was no other deity but that with which man might become fully identified. In their Apology, however, they avow belief in the doctrine of Christ's atonement, and simply demand an appropriation of the life manifested in him. They were said to be perfectionists, but in their apology they merely affirm the possibility of keeping the law of God with all the heart. They recognised infant baptism, and further differed from Anabaptists in not assailing the predominant Churches.—Nicholas was an illiterate man, but at first attracted some theologians and persons of rank. In 1580 Elizabeth issued a proclamation against them, ordering an investigation of their tenets. They were accused of horrid crimes. But the proclamation does not allude to such. After that they are lost in other sects. James I., in his Βασιλικὸν δῶρον, calls them an "*infamem anabaptistarum*

sectam, quæ familia amoris vocatur." Among the last of the sect was one Etherington, 1627. — (See *Böhmen's* acht Bücher v. d. Ref. d. Kirchen in England, 1734, pp. 541–73. *Walch*, Religionstreit. ausserh. d. Luth. K., IV., 840–53. *Arnold*, Kirchen- u. Ketzergesch. Th., II., B. 16, K. 20, § 36). KÖSTLIN.*

Fanaticism, from *fanaticus*, *fanum*, a temple, or place where the deity reveals himself. The derivation may refer: 1) to heathen oracles, as that at Delphi, where the will of the divinity was supposed to be communicated through dreams, or the fanatic ecstasy of the priestesses, so that a fanatic would be a person who imagined himself divinely possessed or inspired (hence Plato derives *μανία* from *μανία*); or 2) fanaticism designates an extreme prominence given to some particular facts of pretended or real revelation. In both cases the term points to a divine revelation; the former, and more likely case, lays chief stress upon the manner, the other upon the matter of the revelation. According to the former, fanaticism is the limitation of religion to the operations of fancy, and is the most dangerous of all the perversions of faith, whether it consumes itself, or madly turns against others of different belief, and persecutes them. According to the latter, fanaticism is the overestimating of some particular fact or facts of revelation. It disregards or renounces not only the understanding, but the most sacred reason of men, and substitutes fancy for knowledge, and passion for true feeling. The conception of exclusiveness, as a feature of fanaticism, involved in these definitions, may readily be traced to the fact that *fanum* was a *strictly defined locality*, distinguished by the manifestations of some particular god. So that f. is blind, one-sided, and exclusive. The fanatic, therefore, 1) shuts his eyes against the light of reason, and loves to be the toy of wild fancies, and of dark and confused feelings, and 2) is apt to cherish some fixed idea, which usually wears a sensual hue, or outward dress, which may possibly be clearly apprehended by the fanatic, but is not seen in its proper relation to other ideas and facts. He may, therefore, hold some truth, but is incapable of recognizing any other truth held by others. His mind is contracted for lack of culture, his heart narrow for want of love. He cannot conceive that the one bright ray of truth may be refracted into various colors, in passing through the spiritual eye of mankind, and that all these colors must be taken together, in order to obtain the unity of truth. Hence he is also 3) exclusive, inimical, persecuting, towards all who differ from him, and especially towards dissenting brethren, according to the psychological fact that family feuds are the fiercest. Thus fanaticism often becomes a blind self-consuming mania, rather than yield one iota of its assumptions. — Such fanaticism finds a place in every sphere of life, but prevails most in politics and religion, and becomes most dangerous when both these are combinedly under its influence. And here it may animate diametrically opposite tendencies. There are fanatics of political quietness at any price, and of revolution at any sacrifice; fanatics of progress and of retrogression; of liberty

and of despotism; of cosmopolitanism, and nationalism; of utopian schemes of philanthropy and of obscurantism; of rationalistic illumination, which denounces every learned opponent as a blockhead or knave, and of orthodoxy, who would be popes, but for lack of authority and power, and whose appropriate means of furthering their creed would be the inquisition, the rack, and the stake. The mournful illustrations of these varieties, furnished especially by the past history of religion, need not be all cited; illustrations found, not only along the Ganges, or among Musselmén, but even within the pale of the Christian Church. (Cf. Luke 9:54; John 16:2). It was fanaticism which excited the persecution of the Jews in the middle ages, and again in modern times; which established the Inquisition, and reared the stake, pleading Luke 14:23, and Tit. 3:10 as its apology; which preached the sanguinary crusade against the Albigenses; which prompted regicides, and instigated Gregory XIII. to order a *Te Deum* to be sung for the St. Bartholomew's massacre. But it was no less fanaticism which incited the iconoclasts, and the anabaptists of Münster, the crypto-Calvinistic controversies, the wrath of the Wittenbergers and Königsbergers against Calixtus, the hostility of the orthodox party of Calov against the pietists of Halle, and the Puritans to behead Charles I.—Nor have more recent times been wanting in exhibitions of the same unholy spirit. There are, even now, tendencies showing themselves within some portions of the Protestant Church, which betray its influence, in the angry opposition with which Christian toleration, and an evangelical union among Christians upon the broad basis of Gospel principles, are resisted, and in the bigoted claim sometimes urged: *extra (hanc visibilem) ecclesiam nulla salus*. Indifference, in religious matters, may be a blighting winter frost, whilst toleration is like the reviving breath of spring; but fanaticism is a consuming simoom. Indifference is like the pale cold light of the moon; fanaticism like a devouring conflagration; but genuine Christian toleration like a genial sun, whose rays at once give light and warmth, and life. CARL BECK.*

Farel, William, one of the most distinguished Reformers of France and Roman Switzerland; born 1489, at Gap, of noble descent. At first he zealously adhered to the faith of his fathers (his parents firmly believed in the miraculous virtue of a cross near Gap); he gradually attained to purer views of truth by reading the Scriptures. He studied at Paris, and then became Professor at the College of Cardinal le Moine. Briçonnet, B. of Meaux, a friend of the Gospel, called F. into his service. It is unknown how much he did there to spread the Reform. Persecution soon compelled him, with others, to leave France. He went to Basel, and found a friend in *Æcolampadius*. There, encouraged by *Æc.*, he issued his 13 theses declaring that the rules of life given by Christ are, alone, binding, denouncing justification by works, and rejecting the mass (see *Herzog's Leben Oekol.*, I., 251). The University tried to prevent a disputation, but the Council ordered one to be held. It occurred on Feb. 15, 1524.

The result was propitious. But Farel had to quit Basel. Starting for Wittenberg, he reached Strassburg and met Bucer and Capito. It is doubtful whether he got to Wittenberg. In compliance with an invitation he went to Montbeliard, where Ulrich of Wurtemberg had taken refuge, to preach, though not yet ordained. His success there exasperated the enemies of Reform. His zeal was not always moderate. In the spring of 1525 he returned to Strassburg. Late in 1526 he became preacher at Aigle, under the assumed name of Ursinus. There, also, the clergy and monks violently opposed him. After the triumphant issue of the Berne disputation, the government directed Farel to preach the Word throughout the entire canton. He prosecuted the mission with energy. In the fall of 1530 the Reformation was established in Neufchatel. Thence it spread into all the adjacent districts. Farel was often in danger of violence. Shortly before his death Zwingli advised him to greater prudence and moderation. — In company with Anton Saunier, Farel visited the Waldenses in 1531, and during that and later visits, had great influence in their Church affairs. On their return they came to Geneva, then distracted with political and Church strifes (see *Calvin*). At first he held private meetings in his own house. But he was soon discovered. The Council summoned him; he showed his Berne credentials. Then he and his comrades were cited to appear before the episcopal vicar, Amadé des Gingsins, Abbot of Bonmont, where the other clergy of the Bishop were assembled. They were received with vituperations. Farel nobly defended himself. When he left the place a rifle was fired at him. Farel turning around coolly replied: "Your shots do not alarm me." He was sentenced to quit the city within three hours. The canons called him a servant of the devil; two of them struck him in the face and kicked him. He and his companions barely escaped assassination. F. fled to Orbe, whence he sent Antoine Froment to Geneva to further the Reformation. Late in 1533 F. returned to Geneva. The opponents had called a Dominican, Furbity, a Sorbonne doctor, to vindicate the old system. A conference was held before a deputation from the Council of Berne, on Jan. 29, 1534, which led to new collisions, but proved favorable to the Reformation. Its friends increased. Farel, wonderfully protected by Providence against the plots of foes, preached in many of the churches, declaring that the Reform, as God's work, must prevail. In spite of the authorities, the people opened St. Peter's to F. The Council of 200 convened. F. defended himself with great effect. The majority decided in favor of F. and the Reformation; his enemies yielded the field. The Bishop transferred his See to Gex. The religious edict of Aug. 27, 1535, concluded the first period of the Genevan Reformation, in which F. was, doubtless, the chief actor. It devolved upon him, also, to remodel the rules and order of worship for the church there. The first Easter communion was largely attended, and made a deep impression. A strict discipline was introduced, extending even to matters of dress. Meanwhile F. stood almost alone,

until *Calvin* appeared. Humanly speaking, it was F.'s energetic and solemn appeal which led Calvin to lay hold of the work. Blind *Corault*, an Augustine, now joined them. Thenceforth F.'s labors in Geneva were intimately interwoven with Calvin's (see Art.) history. F. prepared the Genevan Confession. — Difficulties arising F. went to Neufchatel, where, also, he had severe contentions. The severe moral discipline of the Reformed Church was very unpopular; and many hoped that their former pleasures would be allowed them, if only the Censor could be expelled. An occasion of expulsion soon occurred. A lady of some distinction had caused scandal by abandoning her husband. Other means of remedying the evil having failed, Farel referred to the matter from his pulpit. The populace soon after assembled and decided against F.; although the better portion defended him. The avoyer v. Watteville claimed the right of dismissing him. But F. held his post in fidelity to Christ who had called him to it. Even during a plague which broke forth, he remained with his flock. After various mediations peace was restored. In Sept. 1541, Calvin was honorably recalled to Geneva, and F. also soon returned thither. In 1542 F. went to Metz, to aid the Reformation begun there. He preached his first sermon on the Dominican cemetery. The monks rang the bells to drown his voice; but the voice of the preacher rose above the noise of the bells. The next day 3000 persons flocked to hear him. Both his sermon, and his simple baptismal service caused great excitement. He was summoned before the Council, which forbade attendance on his preaching. Still he ministered to those smitten with the plague. He also preached in Gorze. Once he publicly contradicted a Franciscan who was declaiming upon the perpetual virginity of Mary. The women present fell upon him with hands and nails, and he barely escaped with his beard. Against numerous slanders F. defended himself in a letter to the Duke. At the instigation of the Cardinal of Lorraine an armed band fell upon the evangelicals whilst celebrating the Easter communion. Many were killed, the rest fled, and some were drowned. Count William and F. (wounded) took refuge in the Castle, whence F. was sent to Strassburg. Meanwhile Dr. Caroli, who followed F. like an evil shadow, tried to sow tares among the wheat at Metz; he also assailed F. in writing. Farel maintained correspondence with his friends in Metz, and his old congregation in Montbeliard. He visited Geneva, also, several times, sharing with Calvin and Viret the joys and sorrows of their office. In the various conflicts of the Swiss Church, and the interests of the Protestant movement at large he actively participated. In the sacramental controversy he was an unionist. He considered election among the most difficult theological questions, which only the Spirit could solve. He sided with Calvin against Servetus, and it fell to his lot to attend S. at his execution. The Libertines he boldly opposed. He rejoiced in the progress of the good cause in Geneva, and often said he would rather be the last in G. than the first elsewhere. Nothing but fidelity

to the flock in Neufchatel kept him there. From all sides his counsel was sought, and he was ever prompt in aiding his brethren. — In his 69th year he married a believing widow who had fled from Rouen. Even his friends disapproved of this step. A son by this marriage did not long survive him. After visiting the Valdians again, he accepted an invitation to visit Gap, in Nov., 1561, and preached there to a vast crowd. He did the same in Grenoble. Returning to Neufchatel he had to endure many trials. Calvin's death especially dejected him. In 1565 he once more visited Metz, and was cordially received by the elders of the congregation. On the day following his arrival he preached with the ardor of youth. On returning home he was taken ill. He died Sept. 13, 1565.—Farel's true greatness did not consist in scientific attainments, but in his practical talent, and honest zeal. Among his few works we may mention: *Sommaire, c'est une brève declaration d'aucuns lieux fort nécessaires à un chacun chrétien pour mettre sa confiance en Dieu et à ayder son prochain.* (The 1st ed. is extinct). — *Traité du purgatoire*, 1543, 12mo. *La très sainte oraison, que N. seigneur J. C. a baillé à ses Apôtres, les enseignant comme ils et tous vrais chrétiens doivent être, &c.*: Gen., 1543, 12mo. probably a revision of his tract *de oratione* Rom., 1524. — *La Glaive de la parole véritable, tirée contre le Bouclier de defense: du quel un ordelier Libertin s'est voulu servir pour approuver ses fausses et damnables opinions*: Gen. 1550 (important as an exposure of the Libertines). — *Traité de la Cène*, publ. by du Moulin, 1555. — *Du vrai usage de la croix de Jésus Christ, et de l'abus et idolatrie commise autour d'icelle: et de l'autorité de la parole de Dieu et des traditions humaine* (with an app. by Viret), 1540. — (The first biogr. of F. was anonymous probably by Ol. Perrot, see Haller, *Biblioth. d. schweizergesch.*, III., No. 781). Cfr. ANCILLON, *Vie de Guill. F.*: Amst., 1691. BAYLE, *Dict. GÉNÉRIER, hist. litt. de Gen.*: Gen., 1786. D'AUGER, *Hist. of the Ref.* HENRY's *Life of Calvin*. M. KIRCHHOFFER's *Leben F. aus d. Quellen*, &c., 2 Bde.: Zürich, 1831–33. CH. SCHMIDT, *Études sur Farel*: Strassb., 1834).

HAGENBACH.*

Fasting among the Jews.—The O. T. represents fasting as an act of humiliation, like weeping, rending the garments, &c. (Joel 2 : 12, 13; Zach. 7 : 3). And although one of the words, *צום*, used to designate the act, signifies abstinence, the other expression (Levit. 16 : 29, 31, &c., or more fully, Ps. 35 : 13) refers to deep self-abasement. Hence the LXX. renders it *ἀσχεῖν τῆς ψυχῆς*. — In this sense it was enjoined on the great day of atonement (Levit. 16 : 27, 32, &c.). It was, also, sometimes, voluntarily observed in seasons of special distress, or in commemoration of such seasons (Judges 20 : 26, &c.; 1 Sam. 31 : 13, &c.).—As a Mosaic ordinance, however, we find it nowhere prescribed but for the day of Atonement, and imply alluded to in connection with vows (Numb. 30 : 11–16). Even the fast enjoined was to continue only from one evening to another (Levit. 23 : 32), and did not explicitly require total abstinence from nourishment. The

mildness of the precept of fasting is the more remarkable, as it was given during the 40 days in which he received the law on Mt. Sinai, and during which the Rabbins (but not the Bible) say he ate nothing. This peculiarity finds a counterpart in the fact that whilst our Lord also fasted 40 days, he does not make his example binding upon his disciples. With all this the conduct and declarations of the prophets fully agree (comp. Joel 2 : 12, 13; Zach. 7 : 5; 8 : 19, and especially Is. 58 : 4). — This view of fasting, however, underwent a considerable change, immediately after the cessation of prophecy. Not only were fasts multiplied, but considered meritorious (comp. Zach. 7 : 5, &c., with Wisdom 34 : 28, 31; Tobit 12 : 9). This tendency was most fully developed in the Pharisees, between whom and their extreme opposites the Sadducees, stood the Essenes, who fasted often (never ate meat or wine, but lived on bread, vegetables, and water), but merely thereby to gain the mastery over the flesh. The Pharisees, in the hope of gaining moral merit, kept Monday and Thursday as fasts (Luke 18 : 12) because tradition said that Moses ascended Mt. Sinai on Thursday, and came down with the two tables of the law on Monday, and also that the first temple was destroyed upon one of these days. A controversy between the parties of Hillel and Shamai, was settled by appointing an additional fast. In the Talmud the Pharisaic fasts are systematized (see 9th sect. of the 2d part of the Mishnah). The system included mainly 4 points: 1) the fast of the Atonement day, the manner, &c., of observing which is most minutely prescribed (as the age at which Jewish children must begin to keep it, viz., girls when 12 years and 1 day old, boys when 13 years and 1 day;—obstacles to its observance, as pregnancy, sickness, &c.). 2) The national fasts of the 4th month (see Zach. 7 and 8, and Jer. 52 : 6, 7), of the 5th month in commemoration of 2 Kings 25 : 8, &c.; Jer. 52 : 12, of the 7th month referring to 2 Kings 25 : 25, &c.; Jer. 41 : 1, &c., and of the 10th month referring to 2 Kings 25 : 1, &c.; Zach. 8 : 19—besides the fast at the feast of Purim in commemoration of the peril and deliverance of the nation under Ahasuerus. 3) Fasts to avert certain evils, particularly drought, specially ordered by the Rabbins. 4) The fasts of the so-called 24 stations (see 1 Chron 25 : 26) requiring the priests and Levites of each station to fast 4 days during their service-week, viz., on Monday for people at sea, on Tuesday for those travelling through deserts, on Wednesday for children, that they may escape the croup, on Thursday for pregnant women and sucking children. — Most of the public fasts have been dropped, excepting that on the day of Atonement, on the Purim feast, and in the month Ab. Of private fasts we name only that of the first-born on Passover eve, and that kept on the anniversary of the death of friends. — At the fast observed on the day of Atonement they wore (and still wear) their white shrouds, and caps—hence this is called the *white* fast, the others, the *black* fasts.

PRESSER.*

Fasting in the Christian Church, consists, in general, in abstaining from food during a speci-

fied period, more particularly in a *jejunium*, an entire denial of food *a vespera ad vesperam*, or in *abstinentiam* (*semijejuniam*) abstinence from flesh. The ancient Church held strictly to the idea of a *jejunium*, hence the later declaration: "*qui nullatenus jejunare credendi sunt; si ante manducaverint, quam vespertinum celebretur officium*" (c. 50 *dist. I., de consecr. Theodulphus Aurel. a. 797*). Whilst some kept up the fast beyond the day (see DU FRESNE, *s. v. superpositio*; BINGHAM, *origin. eccl., l. XXI., c. I., § 25*), others curtailed it, or kept it but partially (SOCR., *hist. eccl., V., 22, &c.*). The Romish C. subsequently approved of the custom of the 13th cent., terminating the fast at 3 P. M., or, since the 14th cent., at 12 M., allowing a dinner, and a light evening meal (FERRARIS, *bibl. canon. s. v. jejunium, Art. I., nro. 16 sqq.*). — The fasts observed in the Christian Church were partly transferred from the Synagogue. Fasting was an expression of sorrow connected with other acts of repentance (2 Sam. 12: 16; Daniel 10: 3; Ezra 9: 3; 10: 6; Matt. 6: 16, &c.), and was used as a means of spiritual elevation, and preparation for important religious duties (Matt. 4: 2), and soon, according to Apostolic precedents (Acts 13: 2; 14: 23; 27: 9, &c.), was strictly enjoined. Abuses condemned in the O. T. (Is. 58: 4, &c.; Jer. 14: 11, &c. &c.), were revived. The practice, however, was specially promoted by the Montanists, and through monasticism (see TERTULL., *de jejun. adv. psychicos, &c.*), and the idea advocated that it was an effectual means of obtaining the pardon of sin. Numerous fasts were instituted, differing in the various churches. We shall notice only such as are still generally observed.

The chief of these, are the *Quadragesimal* fasts, referring, by Apostolic tradition, to the fasts of Moses (Ex. 34: 28), and to the 40 hours during which our Lord lay in the grave. The original 40 hours fast before Easter, were gradually extended, and acquired canonical sanction (c. 5, *Conc. Nic. a. 325 in c. 3, dist. XVIII., c. 50, Conc. Laodic. [after 347] in c. 8, dist. III., de consecr., &c. Comp. can. 65, 68, Apostolorum*). In the 4th cent. the fasts before Easter lasted for three weeks; in Illyria, Achaia, Alexandria, &c., seven weeks (EUSEB., *H. E., V., 24. SOCR., V., 21. SOZOM., VII., 19*). Subsequently seven weeks were kept in Rome also (cfr. JEROME, *ep. 27 [al. 54] ad Marcellam*, and LEO I., *sermo 43 de quadrig. 6*). But as they did not fast on Sunday (c. 7, *dist. 30, Concil. Gangrense [c. 365] c. 15, dist. 3, de consecr. Conc. Cæsaraugust, a. 380, &c.*), there were but 36 actual fast-days; hence the fast was made to begin on the Wednesday of the preceding week (Ash-Wednesday) as a *caput jejunii* (c. 16, *dist. 5, de consecr. cit.*). This became the rule, although some commenced the fast with Septuagesima week (DU FRESNE, *s. h. v.* RANKE, *d. kirchl. Perikopensystem.: Berlin, 1847, p. 293*). In imitation of the *Quadrig.* before Easter, a similar fast was for a time observed before Christmas (*Quadrig. Martini*), and before St. John the Baptist's day (DU FRESNE, *l. c.* See especially BURCHARD, of Worms († 1025) *Decr. lib. 19, c. 5*).

The custom of fasting on certain days of the week is very ancient (Luke 18: 12; see preced-

ing Art.), especially on Wednesday and Friday, the days of our Lord's betrayal and crucifixion (see TERTULL., *de jejun. c. 2*). These were called *dies stationum*, by comparing the life of a Christian with that of a soldier watching at his post (TERTULL., *de orat., c. 14*). We find later allusions, also, to these days (as in c. 16, *dist. 3, de consecr.*, from RUFIN., † 410. PHILOSTROCH., *hist. l., 10, c. 12*). But fasting on Sabbath, in case of a *superpositio*, was customary in the 4th cent., and formally allowed in Spain (c. 26, *Concil. Eliberit., a. 305, ed. Bruns II., 5*). It was practised even in Rome under Innocent I., 416 (c. 13, *dist. 3, de consecr.*). Wednesday was now dropped as a fast day. The Greek C. always disapproved of it. The usage of the West was confirmed by Greg. VII., 1078 (c. 31 *dist. 5, de consecr.*), and his successors (see *Bened. XVI., de Synod. dioces. l., 11, c. 5*). — In further imitation of the Jews (see preced. Art.) four special annual fasts were instituted (tradition says first by the Roman B. Callistus, † 223, at least for the 4th, 7th, and 10th months). In the time of Leo I. (after 440) these were assigned to the 1st, 4th, 7th, and 10th months. Thus originated the *ember days*, fixed upon the Wednesdays following Ash-Wednesday, Whitsuntide, the feast of the Holy Cross, and St. Lucia's day (see HARTZHEIM, *Conc. Germ., I., 74, and Capit. I., a. 769, c. 11*). — The *vigilia* (see Art.) were also fast days.

There were also *extraordinary fasts*, appointed for special occasions, and voluntary fasts *jejunia votiva*. They might also be public or private. (Cfr. c. 4, 5, *Cod. Theod. de quæst. [IX. 25]*, and c. 6, *Cod. Just. de feriis [III. 12]*). — *Abstinence* consisted in not eating meat, or any strong food (c. 6, § 2, *dist. 4, Greg. I.*). The mode of its observance rests upon special custom (FERRARIS, *l. c.*), upon dispensations, or upon the annual orders of Bishops. (See KOPP, *d. kathol. Kirche im 19ten. Jahrh.: Mainz., 1830*). Abstinence becomes obligatory after the 7th year, fasting after the 21st (FERRARIS, *l. c., Art. II.*), unless special vows have been made. Aged and feeble persons, and such as would be disqualified for their duties, are not bound to strict fasting. Other good works may be substituted for fasting (FERRAR., *l. c.*, and c. 24, *dist. 5, de consecr. Regula monach. ex Hieron. exc.*). It is allowed to casuistry to accommodate the rules to peculiar circumstances. And yet the Council of Trent urged the strict enforcement of all rules for the mortification of the flesh (§ 25, in the *decr. de delectu ciborum, &c.*).

The Romish C. exercises leniency in enforcing fasts upon its Oriental members, but rejects the regulations of the Greek C., as this does those of Rome. The Greek C. and its various divisions have rules for fasting differing from each other; but all are strictly obeyed. The ancient *dies stationum* are retained, excepting between Christmas and the Epiphany, during the third week after the Epiphany (in opposition to the Armenians), and in the weeks following Easter and Whitsuntide. But its principal fasts are: 1) ἡ τεσσαρακοστή, before Easter, based on Matt. 4: 2; — 2) a like term before Christmas (from Nov. 15 to Dec. 24), based on Ex. 34: 28; — 3) the fast of Mary (ἡ νηστεία τῆς

δεοράου from Aug. 1 to 15; — 4) the Apostles' fast, from the day after Whitsuntide to June 29, old style. Besides these there are *vigilia* and some extraordinary fasts (see FERRARIS, *l. c.*; v. MURALT, *Briefe über d. Gottesdienst d. morgenl. Kirche*. Lpz. 1838).

The Reformers were by no means averse to fasts, but simply restored the original conception of them, and rejected the notion of their being meritorious (see LUTHER's Comm. on Matt. 6: 16. CALVIN's Instit. l. 4, c. 12, § 14, &c. *Augsb. Conf.*, art. 26, and *Apol.* art. 8; *Schmalcald.* art. 3, 15; *Conf. Helv.*, II., art. 24; *Bohem.* art. 18; *Galic.* art. 24, &c.). The history of the Reformation, especially that of the "Churches under the Cross," furnishes evidence that prayer and fasting are among the best means to strengthen Christians for seasons of tribulation. In the 16th cent. general fasts were regularly ordered by the evangelical Synods of the Lower Rhine, Holland, and France (see ARMON, *tous les synodes nationaux: à la Haye*, 1710, 4to. T. I., p. 6). Subsequently they occurred more rarely, and were commonly combined with days of humiliation and prayer. In some churches the pulpit and altar were draped in black during the Quadragesima, and no marriages allowed, except by special privilege.—(See J. H. BOEHMER, *de jure circa jejunantes, abstinentes et jejunos*: Ulmæ, 1722, 4to., and his *jus eccl. Protest.* l. 3, tit. 46. AUGUSTI, *Denkwürdigk.*, &c., X., 311–420. BINTERIM, *Denkwürdigk.*, &c., II., 2, 589–632; V., 2, 3–168. HELFERT, *Darstellung d. Rechte welche in Anschauung d. heil. Handlungen stattfinden.*, § 87–95. ALT, *d. christ. Cultus*, p. 518, &c.). H. F. JACOBSON.*

Fastidius, Priscus, a native of Britain, according to Gennadius, a British Bishop, some even say a Metropolitan of London, lived at the beginning of the 5th cent. His work, *ad Fatalium de vita Christiana et viduitate colenda*, occupies a prominent rank among the few literary remains of the ancient British Church. It may be found, anonymously, among Augustin's works, Vol. 9, p. 888, and was published with F.'s name, by L. Holstenius, Rome, 1653, by Gennadius in 2 Books, by Baleus in 4: (1) *de vita chr.*; 2) *de doctrina spiritus*; 3) *de viduitate servanda*; 4) *admonitiones piarum*). The Benedictines, and Tillemont (*Mém.* XV., 16), blamed it for the tendency in Britain to Pelagianism. Tillem. says that though somewhat defective in style and language, the work was rather well written. F. did not write the *Chron. Sclorum*.—(See CAVE, *hist. lit.*, I., 401). PRESSER.*

Fatalism, from *Fatum*, what is irrevocably decreed, is the belief in the Omnipotence of blindly-ruling destiny. In Latin it has the passive form, what is allotted; expressed in Greek by *ἑμαρμένη*. The word *Μοῖρα*, though like *ἄἴσα* denoting originally a passive sense, has also an active meaning. Thus considered *Moira* is the last monotheistic expression of the Pagan-Greek view of the world, and indicates the unity that binds together the various members of the Greek Olympus. With Homer, however, the word has a double signification, as being sometimes superior to Zeus (according to the partial view of Harless, Müller, Bernhardt, Ulrici), and sometimes inferior (according to

the equally partial view of Lange, Nitzsch, Göttling, Schmalfeld). This two-foldness of meaning is rightfully explained by Nägelsbach, who says that, whilst Homer did not place the monarchical will of Zeus in direct opposition to that of the other gods, there was at work in heathenism a tendency which sought to subject its heavenly hierarchy to the influence of a single power, and that, in order to make this of practical avail, Homer identified it with the highest god. As the Greeks progressed in philosophy they denoted by *Μοῖρα* the single supreme power in the government of the world, as in Herod. I, 91, *τὴν πεπωμένην μοῖραν ἀδυνατῆσαι ἀποφυγεῖν καὶ θεῶν*, and in Schiller's Ring of Polykr. the *το δεῖον φθονερὸν*. As heathenism was not able to sunder the connection that obtains between human life and higher powers, whether good or bad, it was led to spiritualize the idea of fate, as may be seen in Anaxagoras, who regards the *Νοῦς* as the ruler of the world, the divine energy of Plato, particularly in *Philebus* (31, 4, *ἐν τῇ τε Διὶ φύσει βασιλικὴν μὲν ψυχὴν, βασιλικὸν δὲ νῦν ἐγγίγνεσθαι*), and in Timæus, and in the contemporaneous tragedians of whom Sophocles is worthy of special mention, in whose *Oedipus rex*, though fore-ordination is ascribed to fate, human responsibility is not destroyed nor human guilt effaced. From the time of Soph. when the Greek view of the world had attained its zenith, the two conceptions embodied in *Μοῖρα* were sundered, and developed in extremes. On the one hand, from Euripides to the Epicureans, there existed a tendency which, subjecting the idea of fate to the caprices and whims of mortals, put in its stead a blind chance, whilst, on the other, the philosophy of the stoics reduced everything divine to the boldest, most frigid naturalism which taught that wisdom consisted in resignation to the inevitable course of nature.—Two thoughts lie at the basis of every system of fatalism: 1) Destiny is a dead, blind force; 2) Human freedom is an absolute nullity. Mohammedanism combines them both, and they have found more or less favor among the advocates of Christianity. Leaving out of view the doctrine of *extreme predestination* which, with its *absolutum decretum* (Luther in his *de servo arbitrio*, also Calvin, comp. Verf. Abhandl. über Prädest. in Ullmann's u. Umbrechts Studien, 1847, 1, 2), approximates the Pagan notion of *Fatum*, we may say that fatalism, in its common sense, has its basis 1) in the *Pantheistic* view of the world which, destroying the freedom of man, makes his thinking and acting the thinking and acting of God through him, and so passes over 2) to the Determinism of Deism which admits nothing higher, in the world's government, than the laws of nature, and to that materialism which regards thought as a secretion of the brain. In direct opposition to all such Fatalism, Christianity (see Art.) teaches 1) that God is not blind chance, or dead fate, or a dark power of nature, but a Spirit, a living Being, the Father of love, and that he has, therefore, invested man, made in his image, with freedom in the exercise of which he is to aid in the realization of the Divine councils and the re-establishment of God's kingdom on earth.

Nägelsbach, homerische Theol., 1840. *Preller*, Art. Fatum in Pauly's Encyclop., Gruppe, Ariadne, 1834, C. L. Roth, Rede am Geburtsfest des Königs., 1852, im Correspondenzbl. für die gel. Schulen Württembergs.

CARL BECK. — *Ermentrout*.

Faustinus, Presbyter and Luciferian at Rome in the 4th cent. From *Migne's Patrologia*, T. XIII., p. 38–108, who published his entire works, we learn that, after the decease of Pope Liberius (352–366), having espoused the cause of Ursinus he met with the tragical fate that overtook his adherents. Gennadius (*de cir. illustr.*, c. 11) informs us that he wrote seven books against the Arians and the Macedonians. Tillemont first vindicated in favor of T. the authorship of the work attributed to Gregorius Bäticus. His *Fides*, dedicated to the Emp. Theodosius, was composed, according to Mabillon, between 379 and 381. His *libellus precum*, in which he attacks the Romish bishops, Hilarius and Damasus, was written in defence of his party between 383 and 384; dedicated to Emp. Valentinian and Arcadius. In his first treatise, *de trinitate sive de fide contra Arianos*, whilst pointing out the deviation of the Arians from the orthodox faith, he combats their assertion that the Son was created out of nothing, ascribes to the Son omnipotence and unchangeableness, and affirms, in conclusion, that the Holy Ghost is no creature. In his *Fides* he thus details the creed of his party: "We believe in one Father, who is not the Son, but has begotten—not created—the Son from eternity; in one Son who is not the Father, but from whom he is begotten, not created; in one Holy Ghost, who is in fact the Spirit of God. We confess at the same time to one substance of the Divine Trinity." He was equally opposed to the Apollinarians. In answer to the request in his *libellus precum*, that persecution might cease, Theodosius issued a rescript granting toleration to the Luciferian Bishops, Gregorius and Heraclidus, and affirming: *Sciant cuncti id sedere animis nostris, ut cultores omnipotentis dei non aliud nisi catholicos esse credamus*.

PRESSEL. — *Ermentrout*.

Faustus, the Manichean, born at Mileve, in Numidia, Bishop of the African Manicheans, and contemporary of Augustine, was a man of great natural talent, address, and eloquence, and, though pluming himself on his wisdom, was possessed of some natural candor and benevolence. One of the chiefs of his party, and regarded by the sect generally as an oracle, he was sought out by Augustine himself, who, entertaining a high opinion of his merits, desired from him a solution of the doubts that troubled his spirit. A nearer acquaintance soon convinced him that his knowledge was neither extensive nor profound, and that his facility of speech did but serve to conceal the superficiality of his acquirements. In reply to F., who wrote a treatise in defence of Manicheism, and against the dogmas and institutions of the Church, particularly the Bible, Augustine undertook its refutation in his 33 books, *contra Faustum* (written 400) which are specially important, as they contain complete sections of F.'s work. See *August.*, Conf. V., 3, 5, 6, 7, de Civ., D. XV.,

Retract., II., 7, c. *Faust. l. XXXIII.*, ed. Paris, Tom. VIII., and Schröckh, K.-Gesch., XI., p. 289; *Neander*, Ch. Hist.; *Gieseler*, Ch. Hist. and Art. Manicheism.

WAGENMANN. — *Ermentrout*.

Faustus of Rhegium (Reji, Rhiez, Regiensis, Rejensis), one of the chief defenders of Semipelagianism, was born in Britain (early in the 5th cent.), studied philosophy and rhetoric. He was a monk at Lerinum, and Abbot in 434, Bishop of Reji, or Rhegium, in Provence, 454 or 455, banished 481, by the West. Gothic King, Eurich, returned in 484, and died at an advanced age (about 493).—In the troubled period of the migration of nations, and a dominant Arianism, he labored not only for the spread of Christianity and ascetic piety, but composed treatises against the Monophysites, the Arians, and Macedonians, and on various practical and dogmatic questions, such as repentance on a death-bed, the condition of the soul after death, the nature of the soul, also homilies, or *sermones ad monachos*.—The presbyter Lucidus having, in 474, publ. an extreme representation of the Augustinian doctrine of grace, freedom, and fore-ordination, Faustus called upon him to retract. L. having fully done this at (or after) the Synod of Arles, 476 (see *Mansi*, T. VII., p. 1007; *Rössler*, Bibl. d. K. V., X., p. 326), F. further developed in his *de gratia Dei et humanæ mentis libero arbitrio*, libr. II., the ideas he had presented in his *epistola ad Lucidum*.—Desirous of avoiding extreme views, both in anthropology and christology, he combatted alike the doctrine of Pelagius and the so-called Predestinarians. Whilst entering a decided protest against absolute predestination which he regarded as Pagan fatalism, he distinguished (according to Scripture) in *de vocatione gentium* between the *gratia generalis*, i. e., the religious nature given originally to man and not destroyed by sin, and the *gratia specialis*, i. e., the effect of Christianity. Though grace in general precedes human merit, its operation is conditioned by the action of the human will and the use of the Divine means, and, indeed, the human will, "*Deo ita ordinante gratias speciales præcedit*," so that it may often begin the work of salvation.—Though this treatise obtained considerable favor in Southern France, its views (Semipelagian) were condemned by the Synods of Orange and Valence and the Romish bishops.—(No complete edit. of F.'s works: to be found—text rather incorrect—in the Greek, *Patrist. Coll. e. g. Biblioth. Patr. Magna T.*, V. P. III., p. 500, sqq. *Bibl. Lugdun.*, VIII., 525, sqq.; Extracts in *Rössler*, Bibl. d. K. V., X., p. 280. Comp. *CELIER*, *hist. générale des auteurs sacr. et eccl.*, T. XV., p. 157, sqq.; *Hist. liter. de la France par de relig. Bened.*, T. II., p. 585; *NEANDER*, Ch. Hist.; *WIGGERS*, *Augusti and Pelag.*, II., p. 224, 238. Comp. Art. *Semipelagianism*).

WAGENMANN. — *Ermentrout*.

Fear of God.—The fact that no mention is made of this religious affection until immediately after the fall (Gen. 3: 10), is decisive of its true import. From this fact it seems to be intimately associated with conscience (see Appendix to Vol. II.), and the O. T. economy is the scene of its chief activity. The first relation of

man to God is that of fear, based upon a sense of dependence (see Art.) connected with a consciousness of sin. Man knows that the God upon whom he is wholly dependent, whose power is unlimited, whose eye seeth in secret, who trieth the heart and the reins, hates sin, and will punish it, as a jealous God, unto the third and fourth generation. This fear, therefore, is urged as a proper motive to piety (Ex. 1 : 17 ; Deut. 6 : 2 ; Prov. 3 : 7 ; 14 : 2), and piety is its synonym. (Prov. 1 : 7 ; Job 28 : 28 ; Ps. 19 : 9), whilst the simple term "fear" is used to designate the entire feeling of "fear of God" (Job 15 : 4). Hence the common belief that if any one should see the thrice Holy God he would die (Ex. 33 : 20, &c.). And yet the piety of the O. T. involved a filial confidence in God, delight in God, in his law and worship, as many Psalms prove. In the O. T., also, we find the law of love (Deut. 6 : 5). The fear of God was also balanced by the hope of a future redemption (Jer. 31 : 31-34). Thus the original stand-point of O. T. piety was wholly transcended. Fear was combined with filial confidence, supreme love, and inspiring hope, until the relation of sonship was attained (Deut. 32 : 6 ; Hos. 11 : 1 ; Is. 1 : 3 ; 63 : 16 ; 64 : 8). But as this relation was based not in a consciousness of the atonement, but upon the covenant relationship of God to his people, and inasmuch as this filial relation was chiefly employed to exhibit the sin of the people in its fearfulness, the sense of it did not carry the people beyond the spirit of fear; and this becomes more evident as the law of love is seen to have remained a mere injunction. — First under the N. T. economy of the atonement is fear found to yield to affectionate confidence. There are passages which seem to use the term in the O. T. sense. Thus in Acts 9 : 31. But even there the writer adds the explanatory words: καὶ τῇ παρακλήσει τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος ἐκλήθοντο. So far as sin may still appear in the life of the redeemed, and danger of forfeiting grace exists, fear maintains its place (2 Cor. 5 : 11 ; 7 : 1, &c. ; Heb. 12 : 28, 29 ; cfr. Matt. 10 : 28). But the more the spirit of bondage yields in the heart to the consciousness of adoption — the more love to God who first loved us predominates — the more will fear give way to filial reverence (Rom. 8 : 15 ; 2 Tim. 1 : 7 ; 1 John 4 : 18). That which wrought naturally in primeval man, before the fall, operates in a moral religious manner in the sphere of redemption. On the other hand, some Christians who were only outwardly converted, fell back into the O. T., and even pagan sphere of religion. The natural man, although nominally Christianized, could not reach the high ground of Gospel grace. This is seen most clearly in the saint-worship of the Romish C. (see *Eck*). Hence that Church has lowered the Eucharist, emphatically a feast of love — to a *mysterium tremendum*. FROMMÜLLER.*

Feeling. — It is the design of this article to furnish a historical sketch of the import and conception of *feeling within the sphere of religion*. We define feeling to be *the immediate consciousness of the soul of itself and its activities*. When this consciousness pertains to the mere state or condition of the soul the feeling is

subjective; when it pertains to its spiritual activities the feeling is *objective*. — In the ancient Greek classics αἰσθησις designates every kind of perception, sensuous and spiritual, mediate and immediate, as well as what we call feeling. The recognition of an objective feeling is involved especially in the Platonic doctrine of the philosophical Ἔρως; *what* he desires is a clear perception, which, however, he must already dimly possess, in order to understand it. Plato also knew of a sensuous spiritual feeling, though he does not thus designate it, for he makes the νοῦς participate in ἐπιθυμητικόν, and the seat of this participation is the liver, whence proceed μαρτεία and ἐνδοκασμός. With this is connected the Platonic doctrine that virtue cannot be taught (*ep.* 7, p. 460, *ed. Becker*). — The broad use of the Latin *sensus* likewise comprehends natural moral feeling, *sensus communis, sensus hominum*.

The LXX. often uses αἰσθησις in the sense of "insight" (Prov. 1 : 4, and 7, where Symmachus has γνῶσις, Wisdom 20 : 17). It occurs but once in the N. T., Phil. 1 : 9, and there with ἐπίγνωσις. — In the *patristic* age the *usus loq.* was not psychologically fixed, but commonly αἰσθησις and *sensus* were employed where we speak of knowledge obtained through feeling (Orig., *c. Cels.* 1, 48 ; 7, 34. CLEM., *Strom.* IV., p. 333, *ed. Potter*. EUSEB., *præp. ev.*, p. 788, D.). The feeling accompanying *will* was also expressed by κρίσις (THEOD., *H. E.*, 1, 8. GREG. NYSS., *c. Eunom.*, I., p. 6. JUSTIN., *Apol.*, I., 36. EUSEB., *H. E.*, 5, 13). — The Latin Fathers were anticipated by the prevailing *us. loq.* of the term *sensus*. Thus Tertullian speaks of the *publicus sensus, quo duce anima Deum datorem suum novit*, by which the soul, naturally, has knowledge of eternal truth (*de anima*, c. 2). Augustine, using a term which had become predominant in the mystical system, speaks of an *INTERIOR sensus* (*de civ. Dei*, XI., 27). The mysticism of the West was developed on the basis of Augustine's. It includes subjective and objective feeling under the terms, *sensus, sentimentum, affectus, gustus*. Bernhard says *affectus* is *spontanea quædam ac dulcis ipsius animi ad Deum inclinatio*. *Gustus*, which is identified with *sensus*, also mediately involves an impulse, but yet properly designates only feeling as related to itself and its contents, which is, therefore, also called a *modus cognoscendi*, as is likewise the case with *amor*. (GERSON, *de monte contempl.*, c. 10: *Este sapor seu GUSTUS vel AFFECTUS aut spirituale illud SENTIMENTUM potest dici fore unus modus cognoscendi, quia amor ipse cognitio est*). The complete directness of this *sensus* far transcends rational insight (Hugo St. V., f. 378, c. 1, 2 *ed.*: *Par.*, 1526). And because mystical theology rests in *feeling* it differs from all other sciences (GERSON, *de myst. Theol. præl.*, cons. 8). Not only mystical theology, but theology and faith in general, rest, according to THOMAS (but not Scotus) in a *pia affectio*, since a *motus voluntatis ad primam veritatem et summum bonum*, which begets *assensus*, is essential to faith (*Summ. theol.*, II., 2, 9, 4, 5).

The German mediæval mysticism, in its practical way, speaks of *feeling* as a subjective consciousness, and demands its renunciation. (Thus

ECKARD in *Tauler's Predigten*, 1826, I., p. 100). As Abraham was required to forsake his kindred, so must the spiritual man tear loose from all emotions, from joy, sorrow, &c. (*Tauler*, l. c., 93). This done he can penetrate the depths of the Godhead, and "enjoy fully the presence of God, and thoughts of eternity" (III., 71). Hence the *objective* feeling of the nearness of the God, who is above all creatures, is the last result of the renunciation of the subjective feeling of creature existence. — The *Reformers*, who were familiar with the mystics, could not have been unacquainted with the significance of the sphere of feeling for religion. LUTHER sometimes uses "fühlen" of spiritual feeling (as of sin, *Is.* 59: 12). He often uses the term synonymously with "Empfindung" (as on 1 Cor. 15). He makes the witness of the Spirit to flow through personal *experience*, and this to consist in *feeling* (*Walch*, XII., 1046). MELANCHTHON, on Rom. 8: 10, explains the *obsignatio spiritus* as, *fiducia et lætitia in corde prælucente voce evangelii* (see also QUENSTEDT, *theol. dogm.*, III., 572). Very clearly does MELCHIORIS (a Reformed theologian of the 17th cent.), express himself upon this point: *Judicium pendet a conscientia a spir. s. excitata, directa, veritatisque amore imbuta, cui se revelata veritas ipsa probat rationibus, quas illa ad se ipsum attendens certas habere potest, atque indubitatas* (*Opp. de demonstratione*, II., 554). — *Pietism*, like *Mysticism*, laid special stress upon feeling, because its *unutterableness* was thought a proof of its purity. Thus SPENER on Rom. 8: 16: "dies Zeugniß ist nun das Fundament des höchsten Tröstes, aber hievon kann wenig geredet werden, denn Niemand verstehet es, als wer es fühlt." This made the orthodox party more suspicious of feeling in religion, and it seems, according to WERNSDORF (*disput.* II., 253), to have been wholly rejected.

Since the pietistic period many find the surest evidence of regeneration in a sweet experience of the grace of God, which Spener denies in his "letzten Bedenken" (I., 231, 192). But the religious significance of feeling was recognized even outside of pietistic circles, at the beginning of the 18th cent. Thus M. PFAFF, in an appendix to his *institut. theol. et moral.*, treats of the *sensus* or *gustus spiritualis*, and does not hesitate to call it, with the Quakers, a *lumen spirituale* (§ 3). — About 1750, however, Moralism and Utilitarianism acquired influence. In proportion as confidence in the truth of religious *thinking* vanished, that in the *objective contents of feeling* also disappeared (see MOSHEIM, *Sittenlehre*, V., 556). Utilitarianism regarded the discovery of a recipe to keep moths out of carpets, as more valuable than the metaphysics of Leibnitz. The only remaining category for feeling was that of *obscure fancies*. MENDELSON upon Sensation (*Verm. Schr.*, I., 9) says: "Wir fühlen nicht mehr, sobald wir denken; der Affect verschwindet, sobald die Begriffe aufgeklärt werden" (comp. PLATTNER, *Neue Anthropol.*, § 608. EBERHARD, *allg. Theorie d. Denkens*, &c. SPALDING's *Gedanken über d. Werth d. Gefühle*, 1761).

Philosophy opened the way for a better appreciation of the subject. Until Wolf philosophy recognized only two powers of the soul:

the *reason* and *will* or *desire*. TERRENS added feeling as "the inner sense for the agreeable and disagreeable." Thus also KANT, in his *Kritik d. Urtheilskraft*, s. XXII., says: "Alle Seelenvermögen können auf die dreie zurückgeführt werden, welche sich nicht ferner aus einem gemeinschaftlichen Grund ableiten lassen, das Erkenntnisvermögen, das Gefühl der Lust u. Unlust, und das Begehrungsvermögen." But Kant also directed attention to the fact that in the sphere of aesthetics we discover a relation of feeling to the ideal, hence an *objective feeling*. FRIES laid hold of this point and affirmed that the aesthetic religious contemplation of creation is based upon feeling, and says: "Von Erkenntnis wissen wir, an das wahre Wesen der Dinge glauben wir, Ahnung lässt uns die Ewigkeit in der Erscheinung erkennen." — *Rationalism* was constructed under the influence of this doctrine of feeling. It is an error to consider it merely as a system of ratiocination. Some of Wolf's disciples indeed adhered to demonstrative knowledge. But the most prominent representatives of Rationalism — apart from decided adherents of Kant — occupy the stand-point of Fries and Jacobi. It is true they inconsistently affirm that reason must accompany faith, but deny to reason the power to demonstrate supersensuous things. One of the most acute older Rationalists, GÄBLER, defined Religion to be "the feeling of dependence upon the eternal." WEGSCHEIDER also (*institut.* § 2) contends for a *fides religiosa* as a *sensus quidam necessitatis*, and calls this *fides* the basis of religion; though he likewise pleads for a *recta ratio* along with the *fides*. — It was *de Wette* who introduced Fries' and Jacobi's philosophy of feeling into theology, and he adhered to it through his entire, fertile, literary course. He also cleared up the relation of *feeling* and *will* to religion, but made the latter to consist in the aesthetic contemplation of creation, thus confounding religion with *art*. — Such diverse factors as the spirit of the Moravians, Spinoza, and Jacobi of whom Schleiermacher confesses he learned much, combined to produce S.'s *doctrine of feeling*, the influence of which still operates in otherwise opposite systems of theology. What S. meant by feeling was often misrepresented by theologians (see WEISSENBORN, *Vorlesungen über S.'s Dogmatik*, &c., 1847). S. did not make feeling consist merely in the antithesis of pleasure and dislike, in a mere subjective affection, since this involves only a *sensuous antithetical self-consciousness*. S. indeed expressly denies that immediate self-consciousness is objective, but in doing this merely disputes that any thing may become an object of self-consciousness by an act of reflection. He affirms, rather, that "in jedem Selbstbewusstseyn sind zwei Elemente, ein *Seyn* und ein *Irgendwiegewordenseyn*; das letzte also setzt für jedes Selbstbewusstseyn ausser dem Ich noch etwas Andres voraus, woher die Bestimmtheit desselben ist, und ohne welches das Selbstbewusstseyn nicht gerade dieses seyn würde." Now in our self-consciousness we find a feeling of direct dependence, and that to which our reflection traces this dependence we call God. Thus through feeling we acquire our first realization of God (*Glan-*

benslehre, I., § 4), "Vermittelst des religiösen Gefühls ist der Urgrund ebenso in uns gesetzt, wie in der Wahrnehmung die Dinge in uns gesetzt sind" (Dialektik, p. 430).—This theory was vindicated and further developed by Twisten, and especially NITZSCH. Nitzsch shows (System d. chr. Lehre, § 10) that notwithstanding Hegel's violent assault upon the theory of S., there are points of contact between the two systems.

THELUCK.*

Felicissimus.—Some of the clergy having been dissatisfied with the selection of Cyprian as Bishop of Carthage, there soon sprang up a contentious rivalry between the presbyter-system represented by them and the episcopal authority exercised by Cyprian. The presbyter Novatus having, without any understanding with the Bishop, nominated Felicissimus Deacon in his church, C. regarded such conduct as an invasion of his rights, but acquiesced in it. During the Decian persecution, and whilst the Bishop was away from Carthage, some of the presbyters received into Church-communion the *lapsos* on the strength of the *libellos pacis* of the martyrs. Having sent a commission to Carth. which had to do with the conduct of the *lapsi* and the obtaining of some church-money, Fel. regarding the administration of the treasury as one of the functions of the diaconate, protested against C.'s action, and refused communion to any who might appear before the commission. Five Presbyters and a large portion of the confessors espoused his views. On C.'s return, 251, Fel., with his clerical adherents, was excommunicated. The controversy, however, did not end. F.'s party elected Fortunatus Bishop, and dispatched him to Rome to secure the support of Bishop Cornelius. In no long time, however, the strife ceased, and the Episcopal element came off conqueror.—Comp. die ausführlichen Untersuch. bei Walch, Ketzerhist., II., 288–310. Neander, Ch. Hist. Rettberg, Cyprian, 89–138. KLAIBER.—Ermentrout.

Felix, the *Manichean*, an Elder of his sect, was a contemporary of Augustine, and a shrewd, though illiterate man. He came to Hippo to spread his errors there. Augustine disputed with him in the church for the space of two days before the congregation. The proceedings, taken down by notaries, are given in detail in two books (*August. Opp.*: Par., 1688; Benedict. ed., Tom. VIII., lib. 2; comp. *Retract.*, 2, 8). The day before, F. had publicly declared that he was willing to be burned along with his books, if anything wrong could be found in them, but during the disputation showed himself timid, weak, vacillating, and ready for flight. He could look, indeed, for no favorable issue, when his books were taken from him and placed under the public seal. Augustine addresses him calmly and without passion, but caused him to feel his dialectic skill and superiority. The contest centered in the famous Epistle of Mani, in which he styles himself an apostle of Jesus Christ. The proof which F. brought to support the claim, that M. was the religious reformer promised by Christ, is singular: "M. has come and shown us, by his preaching, the beginning, the middle, and the end. He has taught us concerning the formation of the

world, why it was created, of what, and by whom; he has taught us the cause of day and night; instructed us concerning the course of the sun and the moon. Because we have nothing of this in Paul, and the writings of the other Apostles, we believe that Mani is the Paraclete." Augustine replied thus: "We read nowhere in the Gospel, that the Lord has said, 'I send you the Paraclete to instruct you concerning the course of the sun and moon.' He would have us Christians, not mathematicians. It is enough, if men know as much about these things, as they learn in the schools. Christ has promised that the Paraclete will come to lead us into all truth, but he says nothing about beginning, middle, and end—nothing about the course of the sun and the moon. Or, if you indeed believe, that this doctrine belongs to the truth, which Christ has promised through the Holy Ghost, then I ask you: How many stars are there in heaven? If you have received that Spirit, which is said to teach such things, you must answer to the point."—In like manner he met other objections, and so pressed upon his antagonist, that overpowered by the learning and episcopal dignity of the celebrated Church-doctor, and influenced perhaps also by a fear of the civil law, F. at length gave way and cried out: "Say what you wish, and I will do it." Augustine demanded the anathema, and at the request of F. first pronounced it over Mani, whereupon the vanquished heretic declared in presence of the people: "I, who have hitherto believed in Mani, curse him and the deluding spirit, which was in him, and said, that God had mingled a part of his substance with the kingdom of darkness. All this and the other blasphemies of M. I curse." The protocol was immediately signed by both parties. *Possidius* in his life of Augustine says, that after the third meeting F. perceived the error of his sect and was converted to the faith of the Church. Consult C. W. F. Walch, Entw. einer vollständigen Hist. d. Ketzereien, I., 802. Neander, Ch. Hist. Gfrörer, allg. K.-G., I., 481. FRONMÜLLER.—Porter.

Felix, the *Martyr*, and his companion in suffering, Regula, were honored at Zurich as the first proclaimers of Christianity there, and hence as the patron-saints of the city and the two ministers. Their history is highly colored in the legends. It is said they were put to death by order of Decius, the viceroy of the tyrant Maximian. After undergoing horrible tortures, so the story runs, they were beheaded, but immediately rose up and taking their heads into their hands, ascended the hill to the Minster Church; whence they are so represented in the seal of the two minsters and the city of Zurich. In the 13th cent. a third patron was added in the person of Exsuperantius. They have also been associated with the Theban legion, but the connection is doubtful. Consult Rettberg, K.-Gesch. Deutschlands, 1, p. 110, also Proceedings of the Antiquarian Society of Zurich, 1841, v. 1 and 2. DR. PRESSEL.—Porter.

Felix I., a Roman by birth, appears to have occupied the episcopal chair at Rome from about 269–274, although accounts vary. He is said to have ordered annual masses to be celebrated on the graves of the martyrs, a custom, how-

ever, which had grown up by degrees of itself. Still, during the persecutions under the cruel Aurelian, he supported with burning zeal the confessors of Christ; according to the legends he buried, in his own person, 342 martyrs. If his name is rightly chronicled in the martyrology of the Roman Church (his day is May 30), he died also in the midst of the same persecution. The law concerning the consecration of churches is more justly referred to Felix III. A fragment of his letter to Bishop Maximus, of Alexandria, contained in the *Apologeticus* of Cyril, in which he expresses himself against the doctrine of Paul of Samosata, concerning the incarnation of the Logos, is also called in question. The letters ascribed to him in the pseudo-Isidorian collection are certainly not genuine. Life of Anastasius, Platina; *Acta Sanct.* (Bolland.), April, Pt. 1. Dr. G. Voigt.—Porter.

Felix II. (?).—When, under the Emperor Constantius, the Roman Bishop, Liberius, was driven into exile, because he refused to sign the sentence of condemnation against Athanasius, F., hitherto a deacon in the congregation at Rome, was appointed in his stead, through the influence of the Arian party in the court, but without the consent of the clergy and the people. Nevertheless, he found considerable support among the clergy, even after the return of Liberius, for the latter, weary of banishment, conformed to the will of the Emperor, and coming back Aug. 2, 358, induced his rival to retire after a pontificate of three years. The supposition that both, at the desire of the Emperor, shared for a time the episcopal chair, is untenable. The further fortunes of F. are very variously told; according to Jerome, he made use of the dissatisfaction of his party with the wretched subserviency of Liberius, to regain his seat by force; according to Sozomen, he was formally banished by the Emperor; according to others, he lived till Nov. 22, 365, in retirement at Porto. The *Acta Martyrum*, which assign to him a saint's day (July 29) cannot be reconciled with the better Church-historians. Hence the annalists and canonists have been compelled to invent for him the strangest subterfuges. The confirmation of his saintly character by Gregory XIII., 1582, is remarkable, because Baronius had spoken very decidedly against his claims. Indeed it is doubtful, whether he should be counted in the line of Roman Bishops, or regarded only as an antipope. *Baronius, l. c.*; *Fleury, Historia ecclesiast. liv. XIII.*; *Bower's History of the Popes.*

Dr. G. Voigt.—Porter.

Felix III. was elected Pope through the influence of Odoacer, in March, 483. He boldly seized the opportunity of acting as umpire in the controversies of the Oriental Church. The Constantinopolitan Emperor had, by the advice of his patriarch, Acacius, attempted to reconcile and win over the Monophysites by an act of union (henoticon). The Roman Bishop headed the zealous opposers of this measure. In a convocation of 67 bishops he solemnly deposed and excommunicated Acacius, and rejected also the offers of compromise from the successors of that patriarch, as long as his name stood on the books of the Church. This was the occasion of

the first schism, of 34 years, between the Latin and Greek churches. F. died Feb. 25, 492.—*Acta Sanct.*, Febr. T. III. (Feb. 25); *Bower, III.*, 85.

Dr. G. Voigt.—Porter.

Felix IV., consecrated July 12, 526, died Sept., 530. Little is known of him. His elevation to the apostolic chair occurred after a vacancy of almost 2 months, and at a time when party-epirit threatened to overthrow St. Peter's chair. The Arian, Theodoric the Great, regarding it as an extraordinary circumstance, restored the right of choice to the clergy and people, reserving only to the civil power the authority to ratify.—*Baron.*, *Annal. eccl.*; *Pagi, Crit. in Annal. Baronii.*

Dr. G. Voigt.—Porter.

Felix V., *Amadeus* (of Savoy), as Pope. After the fruitless attempts of the Councils of Pisa and Constance to carry out a thorough reformation of the Church, a new one was called at Basel under Eugenius IV., which, because it took a very decided stand against him, was summoned to Ferrara in 1438. The members, believing themselves absolved from their allegiance by this act, deposed the Pope because he had put them under the ban for contumacy, and elected, in 1439, Amadeus VIII., Duke of Savoy, under the name of Felix V. A son of Count Amadeus VII., born Sept. 4, 1383, and carefully educated by his grandmother, who was regent, he had married, in his 18th year, Maria of Burgundy, and, in a tumultuous and bloody age, soon acquired the reputation of a wise, just, and mild prince. Emperor Sigismund raised his earldom (Grafschaft) into a duchy. By envoy he took part in the Council of Constance, and shared (1422) in the crusade against the Hussites. He became no less celebrated by what he did in favor of trade and the administration of justice, than by his preference for a life of religious contemplation. Strengthened in this tendency by various misfortunes, especially the death of his wife, he built, in 1430, a hermitage at Ripaille, on Lake Lemán, and divided his time between the business of State and solitary devotion. In Nov., 1434, he placed the reins of government in the hands of his son Louis, and assumed the garb of an anchorite. In Nov., 1439, the Council of Basel, although he had repeatedly protested against the deposition of Eugenius IV., elected him Pope, trusting that so just and wise a prince would put an end to the confusion. Only the wish to restore peace to the Church overcame his scruples and induced him to accept the dignity. He adopted the title of Felix V., and entered Basel on the 24th of June, 1440, with great splendor. For the space of three years, from Lausanne and Geneva, he conducted, by his cardinals, the Council of Basel, and was acknowledged as Pope by many countries and princes, as France, Spain, Switzerland, Austria, Hungary, Bohemia, Savoy, and Piedmont, whilst the Emperor Frederic, the electoral princes and others remained neutral, and only in 1447 sided with Eugenius, won over by the grant of certain privileges. The successor of Eugenius, Nicolas V., was just as little inclined to yield. At length Felix consented to withdraw, on condition that the bulls issued by Eugenius and Nicolas against his followers should be revoked, and the measures pursued by him confirmed. Nicolas ac-

cepted these terms. Having thus ended the schism, and restored peace to the Church by resigning the papal dignity, he retired to his beloved hermitage at Ripaille, with the rank of Cardinal-legate and permanent Vicar-general of the Papal See in Savoy, Basel, Strassburg, and some other places. He died at Geneva, Jan. 7, 1451, justly styled by his contemporaries, the peacemaker, the Solomon of his age. — *Guichenon*, *histoire geneal. de la roy. maison de Savoye*, 1660. *Ferrerii, reg. Sabaudæ domus arbor.* 1702. *Aen. Sylvii, commentar. de gestis Concil.* : Basil, 1577. HARTMANN. — Porter.

Felix (in *TACIT. Hist.*, V., 9, *Antonius Felix*, in *SUIDAS*, *Claudius F.*, in *JOSEPH.* and *TACIT. Ann.* XII., 54, simply *Felix*), was the freedman of Emperor Claudius (*Suet.*, *Claud.*, 28), who appointed him about 52 or 53 A. D., procurator of Judea, Samaria, Galilee, and Perea. His predecessor was Vent. Cumanus, whom Claudius banished (*Jos. B. J.*, II., 12, 6, 7). Tacitus, whose minute accounts seem reliable, says (*Ann.*, *l. c.*) he was previously associated with Cumanus as governor of Samaria. This will explain the "many years" in *Acts* 24 : 10. Felix was the brother of Pallas, a man of great influence at the court of Claudius, and for a time under Nero (*Jos. B. J.*, II., 12, 8; XX., 7, 1; *Tac.*, *Ann.* XIV., 65). Probably Pallas secured F.'s continuance in office under Nero. F. was a reckless and cruel ruler (*Ann.* XII., 54; *Hist.* V., 9), although Tertullus flattered him (*Acts* 24 : 3). His energy was chiefly directed against the robbers and seditious Jews (*Jos. B. J.*, II., 13, 3, 6; *Ant.* XX., 8, 5). By "robbers" *Jos.* means also the seditious Jewish patriots of that period, of whom he crucified hundreds. The seditious prophets of that day also gave F. trouble, especially one from Egypt, who had many followers, and even threatened to take Jerusalem. F. put four hundred of his adherents to death. But even F.'s severity failed to quell rebellion (*Tac.*, *Ann.* XII., 54; *Jos. B. J.*, II., 13, 6).—Paul was brought before Felix (*Acts* 23 : 24, 25; see *Drusilla*), and unjustly imprisoned by him for two years. When Porcius Festus was appointed F.'s successor, the Jews accused Felix before Nero, who, however, allowed him to escape for his brother's sake. — The Magician Simon, a Jew of Cyprus, is called by *Jos. Ant.*, XX., 7, 2, a friend of Felix.—(See *Comm. de Fel. Judææ procur., quam præc.*, C. G. F. *Walchio disquisitioni subjecit resp. J. D. Claudius*: Jena, 1747, 4to.). H. PARET.*

Felix of Nola, Confessor, lived and labored in N. (noted as the city where Augustus died, and where church bells were invented), where he was born, and served the Church as a presbyter about the time of the Decian persecution. After being deprived of his possessions, he supported himself by husbandry. During the persecution he hid himself in an opening of an old wall, over which a spider wove a web, and so concealed him from his pursuers. As early as the 5th cent. pilgrims visited his shrine, at which wonders were said to be wrought. Even Augustine sent ecclesiastics to it, from Africa, to make their vow of purity. REUCHLIN.*

Fénélon.—Francis de Salignac de La Motte Fénélon, a younger son of the Marquis de Féné-

lon, was born Aug. 6, 1651, at the castle Fénélon in Perigord (the present dep. Dordogne). He received a plain Christian education, and was trained to act conscientiously and upon principle. His parents were pious and upright, and reared him accordingly, so that his natural talents and noble heart were early improved by the practice of self-denial and humility. In his quiet rural home he was taught the ancient classics. Early destined for the Church, he was sent, in his twelfth year, to the neighboring University of Cahors, where he pursued his studies with great success. At eighteen he finished his academic course, and returned home. His uncle Anthony, Marquis de Fénélon, an able statesman, invited him to Paris, where the young Abbé, only nineteen years old, preached several times with extraordinary acceptance. His prudent uncle, perceiving the temptation to which the youth was thus exposed, induced him to enter St. Sulpice, a seminary for educating priests, where he earnestly and devoutly performed the duties assigned him by the superior, the Abbé Tronson, for five years. In his 24th year he was consecrated priest. Thenceforth he labored with humble zeal in the parish of St. Sulpice. From this post the Archbishop of Paris called him to the office of superior of the "*Nouvelles Catholiques*," a society of young women of rank who devoted themselves to the instruction of the daughters of Protestants in Rom. Cath. doctrines. He was admirably adapted for this service, and made many proselytes. The results of his experience here, he published in his treatise: *De l'éducation des filles*, in which he ably develops the principles, &c., of a Christian education. — During this period F. sought to improve his scientific attainments by making *Bossuet's* acquaintance. Though much younger than B., they became warm friends. F.'s activity as superior attracted notice, his catechetical lectures were largely attended, and his eloquence filled his hearers with admiration. Louis XIV. resolved to use F.'s talents for the accomplishment of his scheme of uniting France in one faith. He offered F. the mission of converting the Reformed of Poitou, with the aid of a military corps. Fénélon accepted the mission, but only on condition that he should go without the soldiers; he desired no other arms but the apostolic weapons, the sword of the Spirit, and the power of grace. This point was yielded; F., with four attendants, among whom was Fleury, went to Poitou, labored indefatigably, though with mildness, and won the sincere respect of the Reformed, if he did not succeed in inducing many to renounce their faith. On returning from this mission he resumed his superiorship, but immediately fell under the suspicion of Protestant tendencies. He quietly pursued his duties, merely publishing his polemical treatise: *Sur le ministère des pasteurs*, in which he denies the divine authority of the Protestant ministry, because the right of appointment to the office does not belong to the people, and because Protestant clergy are not in the line of episcopal succession. The argument is skilfully managed, but upon entirely Romish principles.

In 1689 Louis XIV. appointed F. tutor of his

grandsons, of Louis, Duke of Burgundy (born Aug. 6, 1682), the Duke of Anjou (afterwards King of Spain), and the Duke de Berry, whilst his friend, Duke de Beauvilliers, was appointed governor of the princes, and other distinguished men (including Fleury) were employed as teachers. F. was the soul of this college. He realized the responsibility of his trust, carefully studied the character of his pupils, sought to win their confidence, especially that of the heir-presumptive, and properly to mould his moral character. Nor did he labor in vain.—Although surrounded by the pride and gaieties of the royal court, he shunned its vices and lived in the strict observance of his devotional duties. As a proof of his humility and disinterestedness we find that whilst public opinion assigned to him each eccl. dignity that became vacant, he was passed by, and almost forgotten by the King, until the Abbey of St. Valerius, and then (1694) the Archb. of Cambrai were conferred upon him. On receiving the latter dignity, he resigned the Abbey, to Louis' surprise.—But with this elevation came a series of conflicts and humiliations. He became acquainted with Madame Guyon (see Art.) in 1687, and gradually a sincere, pure friendship was formed between them. When Madame G.'s writings were subjected to a theological censorship, F. was put on the committee of examination, and at the close urged by Bossuet to sign his *Instruction sur les états d'oraison*, directed against her views. F. conscientiously refused, and this so displeased Bossuet that he not only broke friendship with F., but bitterly persecuted him. F. had never fully approved of Madame Guyon's views, but merely vindicated her motives. In 1697 he published his *Maximes des Saintes*, in which he showed: 1) that love to God is to love him for his own sake, apart from any happiness found in him; 2) that in the life of the most advanced Christian, love excels, animates, and controls all other virtues. The doctrine of *quietism* was, however, found lurking in the book. Two parties arose regarding it in Paris, Bossuet, as the leader of a powerful party, violently assailed it. F. exercised forbearance and meekness upon the Scriptural rule: "in quietness shall be your strength." Still he was firm. Louis was swayed by Bossuet, and F. was asked to retire from the court to his See. About the same time his palace at Cambrai was burned down, and many valuable papers, with his library, destroyed. "I would rather," said he, "see my palace consumed than the hovel of one of my poor parishioners."—What most grieved F. was that his best friends had to suffer for him, and that suspicions were excited against his moral character. But he endured the trial with patience and resignation. The entire nation sympathized with him; only at Versailles, and in Paris, there were some who rejoiced over his humiliation. At Cambrai he was received with joy. He began to devote himself earnestly to his episcopal duties, seeking in every way to promote the spiritual interests of his diocese. He removed the seminary for priests from near Valenciennes to Cambrai, that he might have personal supervision over it. His sermons were not the product of hard study, but of meditation

and prayer, and flowed with evangelical simplicity from a full heart. His life corresponded with his preaching. He was severe towards himself, mild towards others. He appropriated nearly all his income to beneficent purposes. And notwithstanding his manifold official labors, he lived a life of faith, hid with Christ in God.—The only interruptions to his peaceful life sprang from the controversy which drove him from the court, and which was kept up between Bossuet and himself. Much was written by both, and with ever growing severity. F. referred the matter to the Pope. Bossuet, with the Archb. of Paris, Cardinal Noailles, and the B. of Chartres, laid a declaration concerning the "Maximes," &c., before the Papal Nuncio, in which F. was heavily accused. Deductions were drawn from the *Maximes* of which F. had not thought. But he answered every objection.—Whilst the *Maximes* were under examination at Rome, an unexpected blow was inflicted on F. in Paris. The Sorbonne issued a censure of twelve theses derived from the *Maximes*.—In 1698 Bossuet wrote a full history of the controversy: *Relation du quietisme*. F. published a successful *Réponse*. In 1699 F. was stricken from the list of the household of his princely pupil. But the more indignities were heaped upon him, the higher he rose in public estimation.

At length, in 1699, Rome decided against him, but not until powerful influences had been brought to bear upon the case, from Versailles. A papal breve was issued condemning the *Maximes* on account of 35 errors (not heresies) found in the book. Fénelon keenly felt the humiliation, but submitted at once to the decision. He publicly executed the condemnation of his own book, after having (to preserve the Gallican prerogative) obtained the King's permission. He ordered all copies of the book to be brought to his palace that he might set fire to them with his own hand. Although this course cannot be approved of on evangelical principles, one cannot but admire the complete self-control which it exhibits; and submission to what F. regarded as the supreme authority. Even Bossuet seemed to be assuaged, whilst F. avowed his regard for the spirit and merits of Bossuet. Thus ended the controversy, and history of the *Maximes des Saints*.

The leisure which he could seize from his official duties, F. devoted to correspondence with his pupil, reminding him of the principles of rectitude and piety. For the same purpose he now collected the fragments of *Telemachus*, which had been his text-book, arranged and revised the whole, and sent a carefully written copy to the Duke of Burgundy. The copyist fraudulently wrote a duplicate, which found its way to Paris, and was secretly printed, but at once suppressed by the King, appeared however in Holland in June, 1699. The book was soon multiplied by innumerable editions in all European languages, and was read with avidity by all classes. It established his continental reputation, but debarred him forever from the royal court. The work was supposed to contain allusions to Louis XIV., and reproaches upon his reign. That some of F.'s thoughts and

delineations were modified by surrounding circumstances is very likely, but it was unjust to charge him with having *designed* a covered attack upon the King.¹—These literary labors were never allowed to interfere with his official duties, which he ever promptly and faithfully discharged. He showed his spirit, especially in his conduct towards Protestants. For whilst he openly and zealously opposed whatever he thought an error, he was free from all bigotry and bitterness.—In the Jansenist controversies he took an active part, not simply by authoritative interference, but by instruction and argument. He translated and commented upon Augustine's *de gratia*, and wrote much upon the subject in other forms. By his persuasive earnestness and kindness, he acquired almost equal influence with both parties. When the *Unigenitus* of 1713 was issued, Louis XIV. asked his opinion as to the best manner of treating the bull; and his publication of it was considered a master-piece, so that even Clement XI. communicated to F. his great satisfaction with it.—F.'s conception of episcopal duties may be gathered, also, from his letter to the Archb. of Rouen, who contemplated the erection of magnificent edifices in Rouen. F. warns him against indulging a spirit of display at variance with the poverty and lowliness of Jesus Christ.—The excellence of F.'s character was most strikingly displayed during the Spanish war of the succession (1701–13) of which his diocese was frequently the scene. He faithfully counselled the Duke of Burgundy to exert himself for the amelioration of the horrors of war. The episcopal palace was thrown open to the people driven from their homes, to the sick and wounded, and in 1709 he supplied the army with food. His pious beneficence and services excited general admiration. And yet all this cost him no severe effort, for the love of God prompted him.—Meanwhile he was afflicted with successive bereavements. First his true and faithful friend, the Abbé de Langeron, died in his arms, in 1710. Shortly afterwards the father of the Duke of Burgundy died, then his wife. Finally the Duke himself was called off. "My bonds are all broken," cried F., "now nothing holds me longer to the earth." After this blow his health failed. He desired to be released from his official responsibilities, and appointed a successor. Suddenly he was seized with a violent sickness, and after suffering six days he fell asleep, whilst some around him were repeating the Lord's prayer in Gethsemane, on Jan. 7, 1715.

There is no complete edition of F.'s works. Some years before the first French revolution an edition was begun, and 9 vols. 4to. (1787–92, Paris) published, but many of F.'s writings were left out. The ed. of 1810, Paris, 10 vols. 8vo.,

¹ The principal of F.'s works are: *Dialogues des morts*, 1712, and *Directions pour la conscience d'un Roi* (publ. Holland, 1734; France, 1774), both designed for his pupil. *Démonstr. de l'existence de Dieu, tirée de la connaissance de la nature*, 1713. *Dialogues sur l'éloquence*, and *Lettre à l'Académie française*, both on rhetoric, and valuable, publ. 1718. He says, among other things, that every properly constructed discourse must: 1) prove, 2) delineate, 3) persuade.

is a reprint of that. The Toulouse ed., 1809–11, 19 vols. 12mo., is more complete. The ed. of Lefèvre, 1835, does not contain all F.'s correspondence.—The first biography of F. was written by one of his converts from Protestantism, Ramsay, an Englishman, who spent several years with F.: *Vie de Fénelon*, 1725, 12mo., 2d ed. 1729. The 1787 ed. of F.'s works is prefaced with a biography by the editor, Abbé QUERBEUF, of which an abstract is found in the ed. of 1810. In 1808, Bausset, former B. of Alais, publ. a *Histoire de Fénelon*, 3 vols. 8vo.; 2d ed. 1809.—(Comp. TABARAUD, *Suppl. aux hist. de Bossuet et de Fénelon*: Paris, 1822, 8vo.).

LECHLER.*

Ferarra-Florence, Synod of.—Amurath II. having already subjugated almost all the provinces of the Greek empire, also threatened the capital. The Emperor, John Palæologos, having exhausted all his own means, turned to the West, hoping that, as in former centuries, a pious zeal would reanimate, and a second Peter summon the Western Christians to a new crusade. Pope Eugene, artful and ambitious, and still powerful, was the only proper person for this purpose. To him John applied, and he in turn promised to raise up all Europe against the Turks, *provided* the Greeks, after an impartial and mutual examination of doctrines, would unite with the Roman Catholic Church. The Emperor consulted the Patriarch, and, Amurath still approaching, all scruples suggested by the deep-rooted aversion of the Greeks against the Latins, vanished. It was resolved to hold an eighth general council in Italy, in which all Christian princes of Europe should unite and constitute one only Christian Church. The Greek Emperor and Patriarch, and 700 men and clergy of Greece, learned and wise, attended. The Grand Duke of Russia permitted his metropolitan, Isidore, to attend, declaring, however, that neither their fathers nor he wished the union of both churches; that Isidore might attend the Council, but he with his bishops would adopt no change, either in the dogmas or in the liturgy, which the Council might propose. He also charged Isidore to maintain the purity of their faith. On the 18th of September, 1437, the Pope transferred the Council from Basel to Ferarra, where he opened it in person, on the 8th of January, 1438. The Council of Basel in turn suspended Eugene on the 24th of January, 1438, and deposed him on the 25th of June, 1439, as a Simonist, heretic and disturber, and, four months later, elected Felix V. The Council was attended by all the Basel Fathers who were not schismatically inclined, and by many other Western prelates. In February of the same year, the Greeks, with their Emperor and Patriarchs, arrived. On the 18th of August Isidore followed, who, as head of the Russian Church, a man of profound learning and the friend of Eugene, was received with great honors, the Greeks also including him among the defenders of their own against the Romish Church. Neither the Western princes, nor the remaining Basel Fathers appearing in Ferarra, and the four months appointed for waiting on them having uselessly passed away, Eugene declared: "Where I am with the Em-

peror and the Patriarch, all Christendom is assembled, especially as all the Patriarchs and Cardinals are here." The first public session was held on the 8th of October, 1438. The Greek Cardinal, Bessarion, opened it with a discourse, demonstrating the desirableness of a union for both parties. At the second session Andrew, of Rhodes, spoke in the same conciliatory spirit; and the dialectical method of discussion was determined on. The Greeks, allowed to choose the position of opponents, or of defenders, chose the former. A certain Nicholas, a Greek by birth, was appointed the mutual interpreter. Marcus, Bishop of Ephesus, demanded that the definitions and forms of the old Councils should first be read, it having also been done at the seventh Council, and being indispensable to the nature of an œcumenical Synod. Accordingly, the Nicene Creed, various decrees and definitions of the third, fourth, fifth, sixth, and seventh general councils, citations from the epistles of Pope Cœlestin to John of Antioch, Vigilius to Eutychius, of Agatho to the Emperors, and from the Acclamation of the Patriarch John of Constantinople to the fifth Council, were read. The first subject of discussion, dogmatically the most important point of dispute between the two churches, was: The relation of the Holy Ghost to the other persons of the Trinity. The discussion was, at first, only formal, involving the right of the Latins to add the word "*filiouque*" to the symbol. The Greeks maintained that the addition, "*filiouque*," was made, not *ab intrinsecus*, but *ab extrinsecus*. The Latins replied, that "*filiouque*" was not an addition (*προθήκη*, proposition), but much more a *declaratio* (*ἀναρτυξίς*, explanation), and therefore allowable, as in the second symbol some things were already added to the first for explanation, that the decision of Ephesus only forbid the addition of *contraria*, but not *declaratoria*, as the creeds of Charisius and others, though containing more than the symbol, had also been approved by the same Council. Bessarion answered: If even the addition were true, it were unauthorized, much else, in itself true, not having been added; and that from the position of the Latins, additions to the Holy Scriptures, such as *ὁμοούσιον* = same essence, etc., must have been allowed, since, according to the Fathers, the symbol had equal authority.

With these purely *formal* transactions, the Synod of Ferrara drew to a close. Consistency was evidently with the Latins, for, the Son and the Father once admitted to be equal in essence, and only distinguished by the peculiar predicates of the Father and the Son, the participation of the Son in the sending of the Spirit must also be acknowledged. Hence, a *material* examination of the dogma of the Latins being at last determined on, an agreement did not seem difficult. Still, a public discussion of this point was at first prudently avoided, and each party chose twelve Fathers for a private discussion. Before this arrangement was consummated, the Emperor communicated a message from the Pope, removing the Synod from Ferrara to Florence, the plague having appeared in the former place. The Greeks disliked the transfer, and at first demanded that the proposed private dis-

cussion should still take place in Ferrara. The Pope, however, declaring, that in Ferrara he could not furnish funds for their subsistence, they were compelled to remove to Florence, insisting, nevertheless, that the Synod should not continue beyond four months longer. To appease their consciences, it was said to be incumbent upon the Pope to remove or dissolve the Synod, before its close, on account of the plague! On the 13th of February the Patriarch and suite entered Florence, and three days later the Emperor was received in the most solemn manner. The Patriarch again taking sick, the first session in Florence could not be held before the 26th of February. At the 18th session, on the 2d of March, two great theologians, the provincial of the Dominicans, John (of Schwarzenberg), an exceedingly skilful dialectician, and Marcus of Ephesus, stood arrayed against each other on the dogmatical arena. The Greeks gave striking evidence of having already lost all true conception of the doctrine of the Trinity, seeming to see in the doctrine of the Western Church, of the procession of the Holy Ghost from the Father and the Son, a plurality of divine causes (*πολυαρχία*). John gained the day, therefore, proving successively from the Church Fathers and the Scriptures, the truth of the addition, "*filiouque*." Among the former, he appealed to a manuscript of St. Basil against Eunomius, dating prior to the commencement of the Greek schism, which Nicholas of Cusa had brought from Constantinople, and in which Basil distinctly taught, that the Holy Ghost proceeded not from the Father alone, but also from the Son. The Greeks declared the passage a later addition, and the Latins in turn reproached them with having unauthoritatively erased it. Marcus, the Greek, admits at last, that the Holy Ghost had indeed received from the Father *existence*, and from the Son *manifestation* to men, but these being essentially different, the addition, "*filiouque*," was wrong. On the other hand, John, appealing to the Scriptures and to the Church Fathers, established the Romish dogma, saying, that the Father was the one *cause* of the Son and Spirit, and that all who taught two principles, or primeval causes in the consubstantial Trinity, were to be condemned; that the Holy Ghost proceeded from the Father and from the Son, by eternal procession — not from two principles, or spirations, but from one. This explanation having removed all suspicion of a *πολυαρχία* in the Romish dogma, a union seemed now possible. Bessarion, whom Eugene afterwards raised to the dignity of a Cardinal, chiefly assumed its consummation. In an exceedingly elegant address to his countrymen, he spoke, first, of the causes of the schism, as in its time indeed entirely justifiable in the Greeks, but that now, after an œcumenical Synod, they could no longer stand separated from the Latins, unless these were unfaithful to the truth. That this was not so, he endeavored, further, to demonstrate in his discourse, as between the two churches there was, in general, no contradiction, the Orientals saying: *spiritum procedere ex patri per filium*, and the Occidentals, *ex patri et filio*. This, he said, was no antithesis, the prepositions *per*, *ἐκ*, as

well as *ex* or *is*, equally indicated the mediating cause. Hence, in conclusion, he exhorted most impressively to a union. Thus the Emperor and Bessarion; but the stricter party of the Greeks, led by the metropolitan Marcus, declared that the Latins were schismatics and heretics, and therefore they would rather die than *Latinizare* (Latinize). Still a majority of the Greeks were influenced, more by their well known interests than by all the arguments of the Latins. With the 25th session the public discussion closed. Committees conferred in regard to a form of union, and in the committees of the Greeks a regard to political embarrassments prevailed over dogmatical scruples. It was agreed, 1) That the procession of the Holy Ghost is a dogma; 2) That the addition of the Latins is its proper explanation; 3) That the Greeks even believing the procession of the Spirit from the Son, should not be required to incorporate "*filioque*" into their symbol. It was added, apologetically, that the Greeks never intended to exclude the Son, but rejected the additions, believing that the Latins holding it deduced the Spirit from two principles and inspirations. This form of union adopted, the Orient and Occident exchanged, on the 8th of June, 1439, the kiss of peace. On the following day tidings of the death of the Patriarch John, of Constantinople, were received; death was said to have arrested him whilst preparing a document in which he declared himself willing to subscribe to, and sanction all things which the Catholic and Apostolical Church of Christ in Rome teaches and dogmatically establishes.

The other differences between the two churches were more easily arranged. Respecting the sacraments, not only the ritual differences between the Greeks and Latins in the use of leavened and unleavened bread were left free, but even was for the first time ecclesiastically acknowledged as the number of the sacraments. Respecting departed souls it was established as the doctrine of the Church, that the souls of those who, though dying in grace, have not yet offered the equivalent of repentance over their sins, will after death be purified by the punishments of purgatory. The intercessions of the faithful, masses, prayers and alms, and other pious works, will alleviate these punishments. The souls of those not sinning again after baptism, or cleansing themselves again from sin, will be immediately taken up into heaven and behold the Triune God more or less clearly, according to their peculiar merits. Finally, the souls of those dying in any mortal sin go at once to hell, there to suffer various punishments. Concerning the Primacy of the Roman Pontiff, it was at last established, that he rules over the whole earth, is the successor of St. Peter, the true vicegerent of Christ, the father and teacher of all Christians, Christ himself having imparted to him plenary authority to feed, guide, and govern the whole Church as its head. After him the Patriarch of Constantinople shall be second; of Alexandria, third; of Antioch, fourth; and of Jerusalem, fifth in rank. Upon these grounds the decree of union was established on the 6th of July, 1439, according to which all in the Greek Church remained unaltered and only

the oneness was to be acknowledged. The Emperor and the Greeks subscribed the *decretum unionis*; only Marcus of Ephesus steadfastly refused his assent. Five original copies of this document were prepared and subscribed; later, ten were shown at various places, nine of which are, however, certainly only copies (comp. *Mémoire sur les exemplaires originaux de décret d'union* in the *Mémoires de l'Académie des inscriptions*, T. 43, p. 287, sqq.).

Bishops and princes left the Council with high hopes, but John found in his empire a universal tumult among the ecclesiastics, opposing the union and boisterously accusing the bishops in attendance upon the Council with unfaithfulness and bribery. This party, led by Marcus, of Ephesus, prevailed, and the hatred of the Greeks against the Romans burned with increased violence. The universal indignation induced many bishops to withdraw their signatures. The great number of Greeks already living under Turkish rule determinately opposed all Latinizers. The unhappy Emperor to stay his tottering throne, sustained the union, which, however, hastened more than retarded the coming destruction. The Emperor promoted the election of Theophanes as Patriarch of Constantinople, who, a devotee to Rome, acted imprudently toward the refractory bishops and ecclesiastics. He endeavoring to force Latinizing bishops into Asia Minor, the three Patriarchs of Alexandria, Antioch, and Jerusalem, issued, A. D. 1443, a synodical letter, very strongly declaring themselves against the *συνάροπσις ἐν Φλωρεντίᾳ* *μιαρὰν συνόδον* (the impious Synod of Florence), deposing all Latinizing ecclesiastics, threatening excommunication against the refractory, and charging the metropolitan of Cæsarea, Cappadocia, as *ἐπαρχὸν πασης ἀνατολῆς* (*exarch of all the East*), to execute this decision in his diocese. Simultaneously they addressed an energetic letter to the Emperor, threatening him with all the censures of the Church and the wrath of God, should he not separate from the Latins. The Russian Grand Duke learning the true nature of the union, as that of the Greeks with the Latins and not the reverse, and as the work of political influences, commanded Isidore to be removed from the metropolitan residence into the cloister to do penance. Isidore, true to his principles, passed nearly two years in the cloister, escaping at last to Rome, where the Pope gave him the title of Patriarch of Constantinople, and of Dean of the College of Cardinals, and the bishoprics of Sabina, Corfu, and Nicasia. The metropolitan See of South Russia was now completely separated from that of the North, the See of Kiew submitting to Rome and accepting the union, but henceforth continually renewing its attempts at union with various Russian Eparchies. The attempted union was an entire failure, and remained such notwithstanding the Emperor's appointment of new religious disputations in Constantinople. Speedily ripening for destruction, the Byzantine empire was subdued by Mohammed, not by Rome.

The Greeks having left Florence, the Synod continued full six years longer, during which five sessions were held in Florence, and two

after its transfer to Rome. At the first session (Sept. 4, 1439) the schismatics of Basel and their opposition Pope were excommunicated. On the heels of the union with the Greeks, was to follow with easily foreseen inefficiency the vain spectacle of re-union with the Armenians. These, at length, ostensibly renounced their Eutychian errors, and promised, adopting the same days as the Latins, to sing the symbol of the first Constantinopolitan Council on all Sundays and prominent festivals, and to acknowledge the Synod of Chalcedon, held against the Nestorians and Eutyches, and all the subsequent Synods. The same was done with the Jacobites represented by Andrew, Abbot of St. Anthony. The Council being finally, in 1442, transferred to the Lateran, delegates successively appeared from all the Oriental churches, seeking union through papal decrees with Rome. This semblance of an universal union under papal rule was evidently designed to regain for the Pope the affections of the West, and to intimidate into submission the adherents of the Council of Basel. The Jacobitish Ethiopians, the Syrians, differing on the dogma of the procession, the Nestorianized Chaldeans and the monothelitic Maronites, were all furnished with special decrees of union.

Of the proceedings of the Council, two reports, one in Greek, the other in Latin, are extant, the latter by Horatius Justinianus, in the collection of Reports of Councils, in that of Labbeus et Cossart, T. XIII., in that of Harduin, T. VIII. In behalf of the Greeks has been written: "*Vera historia unionis non veræ inter Græcos et Latinos, sive Concilii Florentini exactissima narratio græce scripta per Sylvestrum Sguropulum* (should be *Syropulum*), *magnum Ecclesiarcham, qui Concilio interfuit, transtulit in sermonem latinum*, ROB. CREYGHTON: Hagæ Com., 1660, fol. Comp. also LEONIS ALLATII, *de eccl. occid. atque orient. perpetua consensione, libri tres*.

DR. PRESSEL. — J. H. Derr.

Ferdinand III., St., King of Leon and Castile, son of Alphonso IX., of Leon, was born 1198, and in 1204 recognised by the Cortes as successor of his father, although the Pope had declared the marriage of his parents void on account of their consanguinity. In 1217 his mother, Berengaria, transferred to him the crown of Castile. On Nov. 30, 1219, he married Beatrice, daughter of the Hohenstauffen Philip. After his father's death, 1230, he ascended the throne, but was resisted by the friends of his step-sisters by his father's first marriage, who had the right of succession by Alphonso's will. Through his mother's prudent mediation, however, war was prevented, and the contest peacefully adjusted. — In 1224 F. opened the campaign against the Moors, and by 1250 succeeded in making the Moorish Kings of Valencia, Baeza, Murcia, and Granada, vassals. His siege of Sevilla was considered one of the greatest martial achievements of the middle ages. The city surrendered Nov. 23, 1248. The 300,000 Mohammedans were allowed to leave the city. F. then entered it with great solemnities, went to the chief mosque, and after complete purifications, celebrated a mass. — He died May 30, 1252. Four hundred years afterwards he

was canonized by Clem. X. In every relation he proved himself a man of noble Christian principles, and excellent character, according to the best standard of his age. His chief merit consists in his conquest of the Moors. Throughout he was a most obedient son of the Church. His son, Alphonso X., succeeded him. PRESSEL.*

Fermentarii (also *Fermentarii*, *Prozymites*), a term of reproach applied to Greek Christians by the Latins, because they used leavened bread in the Lord's Supper; the Greeks in turn calling the Latins *Azymites* (see Art. and *Cæcilius*). — In earlier times the Latin Church also called the Lord's Supper *fermentum*, a proof that it likewise used unleavened bread. — (See J. G. HERRMANN, *Hist. Concertationum de pane azymo et fermentato in cæna Domini*: Lipsæ, 1737, 8vo. AUGUSTI, *Archæol.*, VIII., 257, &c. MARHEINEKE, *das Brod im heil. Abendmahl*: Berlin, 1817).

HAGENBACH.*

Festivals, of the ancient Hebrews. — The hallowing of the course of time is accomplished in general, according to the order of the Old Test., by the morning and evening sacrifice, by which every day is consecrated to God (Num. 28: 3–8; Ex. 29: 38, sq.). Notwithstanding this, however, special times were set apart and were made specially holy. The Pentateuch determines the following as such holy times: 1) the seventh day of the week or the *Sabbath*; 2) the new moons, as the first-born among the days of the month, but otherwise of subordinate significance with the exception of the seventh new-moon, which is called יוֹם תְּרוּעָה, *day of the trumpets' sound*; 3) the three pilgrimage-festivals, on which the whole congregation was to assemble itself at the holy place, namely, a) the *Passover*; b) the *feast of weeks* (Whitsuntide); c) the *feast of tabernacles*; 4) the *day of Atonement*. Besides, 5) every seventh year was hallowed as a *Sabbath-year*, and every fiftieth year as a *year of Jubilee*. — The legal regulations concerning the holy times in general are given in Ex. 23: 10–17; Lev. 23, 25; Num. 28, 29; Deut. 16. — The most general designation of the holy times would be according to the fundamental meaning of the word מוֹעֵד יְהוָה. But this expression, even in its widest sense, is used only of such holy days (including the Sabbath), on which holy assemblies מִקְרָא קֹדֶשׁ, and consequently a meeting of Jehovah with the congregation, took place (according to the meaning of the word in מוֹעֵד יְהוָה, Ex. 29: 42; Num. 17: 19), therefore Ezek. 46: 11 (see *Hitzig in loco*.) also of the new-moons, for these, according to the prophecy, Ezek. 46: 3 (comp. Isa. 66: 23), were to become days of holy assembly, what they are not in the Pentateuch. More frequently, however, the expression referred only to the assembly-days of the annual festivals, excluding the Sabbaths and new-moons. Lev. 23: 4; Ezek. 46: 9; 2 Chron. 8: 13; 31: 3. — Still narrower is the meaning of the word מִקְרָא, which is the common name of the three pilgrimage-festivals as the jubilees of the year. The word means *revolving*, and seems to be taken from the joyful dances which accom-

anied these festivals (Judges 21 : 19-21; Ex. 2 : 5, with 19).—The *number seven* constitutes the fundamental type for the order of the holy times. The succession of the holy days has a reference to the natural revolution of time, with the exception of the day of atonement. The weekly Sabbath is connected with the course of the moon, for the week of seven days is probably to be derived from the synodical month. But here is a distinct reference to the lunar phases in the setting apart of the new moons. Moreover, it is to be observed, that the Passover was celebrated at the vernal, and the feast of tabernacles at the autumnal equinox. But it is quite a mistake, to derive the significance of the times of worship of the O. T. from these cosmical relations. The Old Test. looks upon the signs of the heavens, which the God who rules over the stars has ordered, merely as chronometers for the theocratic institutions (see Gen. 1 : 14; Ps. 104 : 19; comp. *Bähr*, Symbolik des mos. Kultus, II., 546). Among the chronological festivals, as *George* (die älteren jüdischen Feste, 1835, p. 193, sq.) designates the first class of O. T. times of worship, belong at the most only the new moons; yet just these have subordinate significance throughout the Pentateuch; and throughout the whole O. T., there is no trace that the seventh new-moon was observed as the civil new-year's festival. The Sabbath, however, has its religious significance by virtue of a special divine *appointment*, as the sign of the covenant between God and his people (Ex. 31 : 13), as the practical evidence, that among the people whom God has consecrated to himself, human life should manifest itself in labor and rest according to the image of the divine life (vide the Art. Sabbath).—That which makes the festivals of the O. T. to be festivals, is by no means a human choice connecting itself with the life of nature, but the appointment of the God of the covenant, who by these festivals, on the one hand, preserved the great facts of the deliverance and guidance of his people in living remembrance (comp. Ex. 13 : 9; Lev. 23 : 42. sq. etc.), on the other, admonished the people to regard their earthly calling and mission as constantly dependent upon the giver of all blessings.

Concerning the observance of the festivals, not to anticipate the special articles, we will only observe the following:—1) Besides the sacrifices prescribed for every day, special public sacrifices were made, which, however, varied according to the character of the separate holy days (Num. 28 : 29).—2) As upon the weekly Sabbath, so also upon the seven festival-days (the first and seventh day of unleavened bread, the day of the feast of weeks, the new-moon Sabbath, the day of atonement, the first and the last day of the feast of tabernacles) rest from labor was commanded. At the same time, however, the difference existed, that whilst on the weekly Sabbath and the day of atonement all

labor (פְּלִמְלָאָה) was forbidden (Lev. 23 : 2, 31; comp. Num. 29 : 7) on the remaining days above-mentioned, according to Lev. 23 : 7, 8, 21, 25, 35, 36; comp. Num. 28 : 18, only מְלָאָה עֲבֹדָה (*vulg.* servile opus), was

forbidden, which, as appears from Ex. 12 : 16, did not exclude the preparation of food (vide *Gusset*, lex hebr., ed. II., p. 817, sq., 1583).—3) The positive side of the celebration of the Sabbath and the above-named festivals, is contained in the regularly recurring formula, Lev. 23; Num. 28, that upon them shall take place

קָדַשׁ מִקְדָּא. This expression is to be translated *holy assembly* (*Hengstenberg*, über den Tag des Herrn, p. 32, sq.), and means that, as in Ezek. 46 : 3, 9, the people shall come to the holy place to worship. Besides, there existed a formal obligation to appear at the holy place only on the three pilgrimage-festivals, and this only for the males (Ex. 23 : 14, 17; Deut. 16 : 16). 4) Those who come to the festivals *shall not appear empty* before the Lord (Ex. 23 : 15; comp. 34 : 20; Deut. 16 : 16); namely, as the latter passage adds, "every man shall give as he is able, according to the blessing of the Lord thy God which he hath given thee."—(Comp. *Riehm*, die Gesetzgebung Moses in Lande Moab, p. 52, sq. *Jos. Ant.*, III., 10, 6, fin.).—In the historical books of the O. T. there are but few notices of the festivals. Even in Joshua (5 : 10, sq.) mention is only made of the first passover celebrated in the land of Canaan. This being so with regard to this book, which is so closely connected with the Pentateuch, certainly nothing positive can be inferred against the non-existence of them from the silence of the following books. That the distraction of the theocratic life under the Judges exerted an important influence upon the observance of festivals, is to be presupposed. Yet mention is made, Judges 21 : 19; 1 Sam. 1 : 3, of a yearly festival, when the people went to the house of God. From the time of Solomon the feast of tabernacles is first mentioned. The passages, 1 Kings 8 : 2, 65; comp. 2 Chron. 5 : 3; 7 : 9, 10, are to be understood, that from the 8-14 of the seventh month the consecration of the temple took place, from the 15-21 the feast of tabernacles was celebrated, then, according to 1 Kings, on the eighth, according to 2 Chron., on the ninth day after, consequently on the 23d of the month, the people were dismissed. For further notice, vide 1 Kings 9 : 25; 2 Kings 23 : 22; Neh. 8 : 17; Isa. 29 : 1; 1 Kings 12 : 32; Amos 5 : 21; 8 : 10; Hosea 2 : 13; 5 : 7; 9 : 5. Comp. also, *Bertheau* on 2 Chron. 30 : 27; *Keil*, apologet. Versuch über Chron., p. 399. *Oehler*. — *Beck*.

Festivals, of the later Jews.—During the post-exile period several new festivals were added to those appointed in the Pentateuch. Here belong already the days of mourning celebrated with fasting mentioned in Zech. 7 : 3, 5; 8 : 19, namely, 1) on the ninth of the fourth month, because on this day (2 Kings 25 : 3; Jer. 52 : 6, 7) the Chaldeans forced an entrance into Jerusalem; 2) on the 10th of the fifth month, in remembrance of the destruction of the city and temple (Jer. 52 : 12); 3) in the 7th month in commemoration of the assassination of Gedaliah (2 Kings 25 : 25; Jer. 41 : 1); besides 4) a fast was observed on the 10th day of the tenth month, because on this day (2 Kings 25 : 1; Jer. 52 : 4) the siege of Jerusalem began.—Further, the conversion of the seventh new-

moon to the civil new-year's festival falls within the post-exile period. The origin of this festival cannot be certainly fixed. Comp. Jos. Ant., I., 3, 3; Hupfeld (*de primitiva et vera fest. ap. Hebr. ratione*, II., p. 14); Hitzig, Comm. on Isaiah, p. 335; Hävernicks on Ezek. 40:1; Herzfeld, *Geschichte des Volkes Israel*, p. 346. — Of the Jewish festivals which arose during the next succeeding centuries, the first place belongs to the *Purim* (פּוּרִים) — concerning the significance of this name, vide Esther 9:24–26; comp. 3:7 — ἡ Μαρδοχαίων ἡμέρα, 2 Macc. 15:36). The historical occasion of the festival is related in the book of *Esther*. It was not a temple-festival, but was celebrated in the synagogues by the reading of the book of *Esther* (the *Megilla*), in the houses by banquets and other amusements, the giving of alms, etc. The festival occurred on the 14th and 15th of Adar, just one month before the Passover. Concerning the celebration of the festival in leap-years, see Wieseler's chronolog. Synopse der Ev., p. 207, sq. — Another festival, from the time of the Maccabees, is the festival of the consecration of the temple Πῆλιν, τὰ ἑξαίτια, John 10:22,

fuller αἱ ἡμέραι ἑξαίτιας τῆς θυσιαστηρίου, 1 Macc. 4:59). It was appointed by Judas Maccabee, because he succeeded (A. C. 164) in capturing Jerusalem, purifying the temple, and restoring the worship of Jehovah. It extended through eight days, probably in imitation of the feast of tabernacles, comp. 2 Macc. 1:18; 10:6, sq. The festival was not at first confined to Jerusalem; it was celebrated by illuminating the synagogues and houses, whence without doubt the name *phœra* in Jos. Ant., XII., 7, 7; comp. Buxtorf, *synag. jud.* c. 28; Lightfoot on John 10:22; Schröder, *Satzungen und Gebräuche des talmudisch-rabb. Judenthums*, p. 161, sq.; Ewald, *Gesch. Isr.*, III., 2, p. 357; Lund, *Heilighümer*, p. 1069.

Finally, to this period belongs the festival of the *conquered citadel*, which, according to 1 Macc. 13:50–52, was appointed in commemoration of the recovery and purification of Acre on the 23d of the second month, A. C. 141.

From the period before the destruction of Jerusalem are yet to be mentioned: 1) *the Herod-festival*, in commemoration of the death of Herod, celebrated about the time of the Passover; 2) *the wood-festival* (ξύλοποιον ἑορτή, Jos. b. jud., II., 17, 6), vide Lund, *Heiligh.*, p. 1067, sq. — *The basket-festival*, mentioned by Philo in the treatise *de septen.*, is not a regular festival, but refers to the presentation of the first-fruits commanded in Deut. 26, which were brought to Jerusalem by festive processions. See the particulars in tract. *Mischna Biccurem*, c. 3.

The destruction of Jerusalem and of the temple by the Romans, gave a new significance to two of the above-named days of mourning. Titus took the city by storm, in the same month (the fourth, *Thammuz*), in which the Chaldeans captured it; and as this should have happened on the 17th, the fasting was transferred to this day. Besides, the Romans destroyed the temple in the same month (the fifth, *Ab*), in which the Chaldeans had destroyed it, according to

the Talmud on the 9th, which, on this account, is celebrated as the day of the burning of the temple. The Jewish days of mourning culminate in the commemoration day of the destruction of the temple. The Lamentations of Jeremiah are read in the synagogues.

The modifications of the older festivals, which have taken place during the later history of Judaism, will be more particularly noticed in the separate articles on these festivals, which may be consulted. In elucidation of the present Jewish order of festivals, we add yet the following. — 1) Connected with the eight-day feast of tabernacles, probably with reference to Chron. 7:10, was the festival of *the joy of the Law*, on the 23d of Tisri. The age of this festival cannot be definitely fixed (vide Zunz, *die gottesdienstl. Vorträge der Juden*, p. 37). — 2) Instead of the Sabbatic days of the Old Test. festival-seasons, there appear among the later Jews two holidays for each (except the day of atonement). Accordingly, Pentecost and New-Year are not only celebrated during two days, but at the Passover, the first and seventh holiday are doubled, so that the whole festival continues eight days, and labor is allowed only on four intermediate days, and this with limitations. Likewise the feast of tabernacles begins with a double holiday, which is followed by five half holidays (see *Tabernacles*). Concerning the origin of this double celebration of festivals consult *Mischna*, *rosch haschana*, 2, 5, sq.; 3, 1; 2, 2, sqq.; 1, 3; *Ideler*, *Handb. der Chronol.*, I., p. 512, sq.; Grätz, *Geschichte der Juden vom Untergang des jüdischen Staats*, 1853, pp. 82, 397. *Saalschütz*, *mos. Recht*, p. 409. *Schröder*, *l. c.*, p. 232. — 3) By the calendar of Hillel, the months alternately consisted of 30 and 29 days, if the year was regular (*Ideler*, *l. c.*, I., p. 340, sq.). By this arrangement a double new-moon festival was celebrated in the months of the first-class (30 days). Concerning the celebration of new-moons in the synagogues, vide Buxtorf, *l. c.*, p. 473; Schröder, p. 83. Concerning the festival calendar of the Jews generally, consult Schröder, p. 90, sq.; Johnson, *die Lehren der mosaischen Religion*, 3 Ausg., 1829, p. 189, sq.

OEHLER. — Beck.

Festivals, ecclesiastical. — A festival holiday (*festus dies*, *feria* or *feriæ*) is a day on which the ordinary worldly occupations are abstained from, and religious exercises substituted in their place. The necessity of such a change from work to festival days existing in the nature of man, receives, however, special stimulus and gratification in connection with other festivals relating to the development of the nation. All events, which have had an influence upon the founding, advancement or retardment of the nation, it recalls to remembrance from time to time, to express joy or sorrow; this celebration becomes regular and constitutes itself into a formal festival-cycle. The history of all nations demonstrates this origin of festivals; we find it also among the Israelites, whose entire development is based on a series of events, in which the government of divine grace is most prominent. But what was only shadow and type in Judaism became perfected truth by the appearance

of our Lord, and is designed to make itself known as reality to entire humanity. The rigid antithesis of the Old Test. between festival and non-festival days must cease in the new covenant. In the spirit of the Redeemer (Matt. 12 : 8; Mark 2 : 27) and of his Apostles (Gal. 4 : 9-11; Col. 2 : 16, 17; Rom. 12 : 1; 14 : 5, 6, etc.), the ancient fathers also declared against this antithesis. So *Clemens Alexandr.*, Strom. lib. VII., cap. 7; *Origenes*, contra Celsum lib. VIII., cap. 21-23; *Jerome* on Galatians, 4 cit., and others. Agreeing with these, *Augustine* (ep. 118, 130, etc.) says: "*Observatione Sabbati, quæ observatione unius diei figurabatur, ablata, perpetuum sabbatum observat, qui spe futuræ quietis sanctis est operibus intentus.*" This idea, that every day is a day devoted to God, either with or without the usual worldly occupations, was acknowledged much earlier; for the Jews not only called the last day of the week, but the entire week τὰ σαββάτα, and the single days, μία, δευτέρα τῶν σαββάτων, etc. (Levit. 23 : 15; Deut. 16 : 9; Matt. 28 : 1; Acts 20 : 7; 1 Cor. 16 : 2). Since the seven-days week was retained in the Church, the designation of *feria, prima, secunda*, etc., also passed over to the single days of the week. We find this certainly already in the second century (vide *Tertullian*, de jejuniis, c. II.; comp. Art. *Fasts*). Accordingly, by degrees, the entire year could be regarded as a connected series of festivals. The Church was concerned, also, to appropriate to each day its peculiar festival reference, and thereby yearly renew and repeat her holy history.

It is not the design of this article to consider in extenso all the festivals of the Church (for this belongs to the articles on the single festivals), but only to give a condensed view of them and of the more general canonical principles concerning holidays.

All the festivals of the Church divide into two sections, the one devoted to the commemoration of the author (*semestre Domini*), the other to the commemoration of the advancement of the Church (*semestre Ecclesiæ*). The filling up of the whole Church year did not take place until later; for originally only the Jewish festivals were celebrated, with a changed spirit and design however, and to these were added new ones. First of all, on the part of Jewish Christians, the *Sabbath* was observed as the last day of the week, to which, however, *Sunday* was added, as the day of the resurrection (ἡμέρα τοῦ κυρίου—κυριακή, *dies dominica*, Rev. 1 : 10). The latter soon became more general in the gentile-Christian congregations, and after the destruction of Jerusalem gradually took the place of the Sabbath (*Chr. Ludw. Franke, de diei dominici apud veteres Christianos celebratione*: Hales, 1826. *John Utr. Oschwald, die christl. Sonntagsfeier*: Leipzig, 1850; vide the Art. *Sunday*). Moreover, the *Passover* (Easter) was borrowed from the Jews, since, in the stead of the Jewish sacrificial lamb the sacrifice of our Lord was celebrated (1 Cor. 5 : 7, 8); likewise also the *feast of the weeks*, fifty days after Easter, πεντηκοστή, *Whitsuntide* (Acts 2 : 1), since in the stead of the first harvest and the commemoration of the promulgation of the law, the establishment of the Church by the outpouring of

the Holy Ghost was celebrated (vide the Arts. *Easter* and *Whitsuntide*). Only later, as it appears, in the third century, *Christmas* was added, the festival of the birth of our Lord (vide Art.). Connected with these chief festivals was a certain preparatory and subsequent celebration, and thus arose the three great festival circles, which constitute the *semestre Domini*. The Christmas-cycle comprises the four *Advent-Sundays* (see the Art.), Christmas itself, with which is connected *St. Stephen's day*, *St. John the Evangelist's day*, and the *Innocents' day*; likewise eight days after the celebration of the birth of our Lord follows the festival of the circumcision (*festum circumcisionis et nominis Jesu*), first made a universal festival in 1244 (c. 1, dist. III., de consecr.), and later everywhere acknowledged as the beginning of the civil year, and again six days after this the festival of the manifestation of our Lord (*Epiphany*), then follow the Epiphany Sundays to the commencement of the Easter-cycle. The number of Epiphany-Sundays varies from one to six, according to the time when Easter occurs, which is a changeable festival. (Concerning the Christmas-cycle see *Augusti, Denkwürdigkeiten aus der christlichen Archäologie*, Bd. I; *Ranke, das kirchliche Pericopensystem*: Berlin, 1847, p. 370, sq.).

The great fasts (see the Art.) served as preparation for the commemoration of the death of our Lord, and extended formerly to Sunday *Septuagesima, Sexagesima, and Quinquagesima*. The proper fast-Sunday (*carnis privium*) is the last, called also *Estomihi*, according to Ps. 31 : 2. The Sundays belonging to Lent are *Quadragesima prima* to *sexta*, or *Invocavit* (Ps. 91 : 15), *Reminiscere* (Ps. 25 : 6), *Oculi* (Ps. 25 : 15), *Lætare* (Isa. 54 : 1; 56 : 1, mid-lent, *dominica de panibus, refectionis*), *Judica* (Ps. 43 : 1, *dominica mediana, nigra*), *Palmarum* (Matt. 21, *dominica indulgentiæ*). Then follows the *hebdomas magna* (*sancta, muta*), passion-week, in which Maundy-Thursday (*dies viridum*, Ps. 23 : 2, *cæna domini*), Good-Friday (πάσχα στυγνόςμιον) and the *sabbatum sanctum*, the Lord's day of rest, are the most important. The festival of the resurrection (πάσχα ἀναστάσιμον), *Easter*, was early regarded by the Church as *corona et caput omnium festivitatum*, and she began with it a celebration which transferred the pre-eminences of Sunday to all the days until Whitsuntide (*quinquagesima lætitiæ*), until since the fourth century restrictions were imposed (*Conc. Eliberitan., a. 305, can. 43*), Ascension-day (ἐορτή ἀναλήψεως ἐπισωζωμένη) having been raised to a proper festival. Whitsuntide existed already independent of this, as a peculiar festival. The ten days from Ascension to the outpouring of the Holy Ghost, were regarded, later, as a preparatory celebration of Whitsuntide, and this festival was closed with the following Sunday, *Trinity-Sunday* (*Augusti, l. c., Bd. II.; Ranke, l. c., p. 286, sq., 360*). Easter-week was followed by the Whit-week, beginning with the *dominica in albis* (*Quasimodogeniti*, 1 Pet. 2 : 2), because those who were baptized on Easter appeared in their white baptismal garments. Then followed the Sundays *Misericordias Domini* (Ps. 89 : 1), *Jubilate* (Ps. 66 : 1), *Cantate* (Ps. 98 : 1) *Roga'*

jucunditatis, Isa. 48 : 20), *Exaudi* (Ps. 27 : 7). The festival of Trinity, which was received into the series of ecclesiastical holidays before the 14th century, closed generally the solemn festival-cycle; the Rom. Cath. Church, however, celebrates in addition, on the *feria V.*, *Corpus-Christi-day* (*festum corporis Christi*, Urban IV., 1264; *Transitus* (*Bullar. Magnum*, I., 121, 122), *c. un. Clem. de reliquiis*, III., 16, 1311). *Conc. Trid. sess.*, XIII., *de SS. Eucharistiæ sacram.*, cap. 5). The number of Trinity Sundays, being dependent on the earlier or later occurrence of Easter, varies from 22 to 27.

Within these festival-cycles occur also a large number of separate festival-days. The most important of these are the *Lady-days* (Conception, Dec. 8; Nativity, Sept. 8; Presentation, Nov. 21; Espousal, Jan. 23; Annunciation, March 25; Visitation, July 2; Purification, Feb. 2; Ascension, Aug. 25); *St. John's-days* (Conception, Sept. 24; Nativity, June 24; Beheading, Aug. 29); *Apostles'-days* (Matthias, Feb. 24 (in the East, Aug. 9); Philip and James, the son of Alphaeus, May 1; Peter and Paul, June 29; James, the son of Zebedee, July 25 (in the East, April 16); Bartholomew, Aug. 24 (in Rome on the 25th); Matthew, Sept. 21 (in the Greek C., Nov. 16); Simon and Judas, Oct. 28; Andrew, Nov. 30; Thomas, Dec. 21; John, Dec. 27; Barnabas, June 11); the *Evangelists' days* (Matthew, John (see above); Mark, April 25; Luke, Oct. 18); the *Cross-festivals* (finding of the Cross, May 3; Exaltation of the Cross, Sept. 14); the *Martyr-days* (the Maccabees, Aug. 1; Stephen, Dec. 26; the Innocents, Dec. 28); the festival of the archangel, *Michael*, Sept. 29; *All-Saints'*, Nov. 1, etc. In the single countries, dioceses, and even parishes, there were added yet special festivals, as for *Church-consecrations*, etc. The manifoldness of these festivals in the German bishoprics appears from the Synodal regulations and other decrees, a summary of which *Hartzheim* gives in his *Concilia Germaniæ*, Index, Tom. XI., fol. 217, *sub v. festa*. From them it appears also, that the immense number of holidays early occasioned complaints, and called forth a desire to have them lessened on account of the injury resulting from them to civil life. Since the middle of the 15th century this was discussed more earnestly, because Peter, of Alliac, demanded at Constance: *ut, præterquam diebus dominicis et in majoribus festis ab Ecclesia institutis, liceret operari post auditum officium: cum quia in festis sæpe magis multiplicantur peccata in tabernis, in choreis et aliis lasciviis, quas docet otiositas, tum quia dies operabiles vix sufficiunt pauperibus ad vitæ necessaria procuranda* (in *Gerson., opera ed. du Pin*, II., 911). These complaints, often afterwards reiterated, could remain the less unnoticed, inasmuch as the Reformation also exerted a great influence on this subject of discipline (*Kopp, die katholische Kirche im 19. Jahrhundert: Mainz, 1830, p. 321*). Many festivals which had been retained to this time were forthwith abolished. Luther, Zwingli, and Calvin desired only to retain Sunday (comp. *Luther's Werke von Walch*, X., 1630; *Zwingli, Erkl. der Art. XXV.*; *Calvin, institut. lib. II., cap. 8*). Later Luther declared, that in addition to Sun-

day other festivals might be observed (*Werke Walch*, X., 1647). In some dioceses of the Rom. Cath. Church the number was now lessened (vide the Synod of Treves, 1549, *c. 10, de moderandis feriis*, in *Hartzheim's Concilia Germaniæ*, Tom. VI., fol. 601), more general reductions, however, were made first by Urban VIII., Dec. 22, 1642, *Universa per orbem* (*Bullarium*, Tom. V., fol. 378), by Benedict XIV., 1742-45 (vide his treatise *de synodo diocesana*, lib. XIII., cap. XVIII., nro. X., sq.; *Kopp, l. c.*, p. 327-8), Clemens XIV., 1772, and others, but mostly with reference to particular countries. Inasmuch as this is an ecclesiastical matter, which, however, has, at the same time, special interest for the State, the papal chair has generally made the regulation of festivals according to the proposition of the State, as in Prussia by the decree of Benedict XIV., Jan. 28 1754; Clemens XIV., June 24, 1772; Pius VI., April 19, 1788; Pius VII., June 17, 1819; Leo XII., Dec. 2, 1828 (vide *Piper's Kirchenrechnung: Berlin, 1841, 4to., p. 65-6*). A similar diminution of festivals was made in Austria, Bavaria, etc., especially since Clemens XIV. In the Protestant Church on account of ancient customs, according to Luther's counsel, many of the festivals of the ancient Church were retained, until about the middle of the past century, when reductions were commenced. In Prussia this took place by the royal edict of March 12, 1754; Feb. 13, 1755; Jan. 28, 1773 (*Piper, l. c.*, p. 69, sq.). By this edict the third holidays of the high-festivals, three fast-days, Maundy-Thurs-day, and Ascension-day, were particularly abolished, the latter, however, was restored March 4, 1789. Similar legislation followed only later in other countries, as in Hanover, Jan. 25, 1822; Nov. 15, 1830; in Saxe-Weimar, Nov. 11, 1823; in the electorate of Hessa, Dec. 17, 1826; Saxony, Jan. 13, and 19, 1831, etc. On the other hand, however, other festival-days have been introduced, as a *Harvest-festival* (Prussia, 1773, 1836), a Church-festival in remembrance of those who have died during the year, on the last Sunday of the Church-year (in Prussia by government-order of April 24, 1816, and ordinance of Nov. 25, same year; in Russia by law for the evangelical Lutheran Church, of Dec. 28, 1832; in Saxony, by the ordinance of Oct. 28, 1840, etc.); the festival of the Reformation on Oct. 31, or the next following Sunday (*Piper, l. c.*, p. 82-4). To these must be added also festivals of a casual character, as *missionary-festivals*, etc. (*Piper, l. c.*, p. 85, sq.; *Ranke, l. c.*, p. 285). The authority to appoint, to remove, and to abolish festivals, belongs in the Romish Church to the bishop for each diocese (*Concil. Trid. sess. XXV., cap. 2, de regularibus*), to the Pope for the whole Church. In the Protestant Church this authority belongs to those invested with the government of the Church, therefore especially to the ruler of the country. It has also been acknowledged by the Church, that it belongs to the State generally to appoint, &c., thanksgiving festivals, on special occasions (vide the Bavarian Concordat and the edict of May 26, 1818, § 55; Prussian common-law, Th. II., Tit. XI., § 34, 35, etc.).

Ecclesiastical festivals are divided into ordi-

ary (*feriæ statutz*), which belong permanently to the Church year and regularly return, either on the same day of the month (*feriæ immobiles*), or on another day (*feriæ mobiles*), and extraordinary (*feriæ indictæ*), which are appointed for special occasions. The occurrence of the movable festivals always depends upon Easter, which may fall between the 22d of March and the 25th of April. The festivals are whole (*feriæ integræ*), if they are observed with the regular morning and afternoon service, half (*feriæ intercisæ*), if only the first takes place. From these are distinguished yet *dies liturgici*, week-day services with a morning sermon, prayer-meeting, etc. As regards the solemnities, the Romish Church distinguishes between *festæ simplicita* and *duplicita*. Double festivals are those which rest on two religious facts, or are dedicated to the commemoration of two persons, as James and Philip, May 1; Peter and Paul, June 29. This is also specially the case, when a festival-day is transferred to the following Sunday and observed together with it. But the Church also celebrates simple as well as double festivals, when she permits the responses, antiphonies, and verses, which are sung at high-mass, to be repeated by two choristers alternately. If this takes place only in part, the festival is called *semiduplex*. The Protestant Church distinguishes above all others the three *high-festivals* Christmas, Easter, Whitsuntide, besides these also Good-Friday, which properly is no festival-day in the Romish Church on account of the omission of mass. The festivals are *feriæ mere ecclesiasticæ* or *publicæ*, according as they are observed only by the Church, or at the same time are also acknowledged by the State, by the suspension of business and labor. Purely ecclesiastical festivals are celebrated only in the Church, *in choro*, whilst the others exert an influence also *in foro*. To the first class belong especially festivals which have been in part abolished, on which the priests are obliged to hold mass *pro populo*. (Decision of the *Congregatio pro interpretat. Conc. Trid.*, Sept. 28, 1852; vide *Heuser*, die Verpflichtung der Pfarrer für die Gemeinde zu appliciren: Düsseldorf, 1850; verb. mit der Tübinger theologischen Quartalschrift, 1853; Hft. II., p. 312, sq.). From an agreement between the State and the Church, the manner and mode, according to which the festivals are to be observed, have been determined. The older regulations are found in *Tit. de feriis, Cod. Theodos. lib. II., tit. 8*; *Digestor. lib. II., tit. 12*; *Cod. Justin. lib. II., tit. 12*. — *Decret. can. XV., qu. IV.; dist. III., de consecrat. — Tit. X., de feriis lib. II., tit. 1*. Later ones in *John Conr. Irmischer's Staats- und Kirchenrechnungen über die christliche Sonntagsfeier*: Erlangen, 1839-40. *Piper*, Kirchenrechnung, etc. Whilst in the Apostolic Church the strict legal observance of the Sabbath was abandoned, a spiritualistic apprehension of it (*Tertullian, et al.*), as also monkish asceticism, led back here and there to the Jewish principle, although it was modified by a legislation expressing the spirit of the Gospel. With right it was insisted, that ordinary worldly traffic, especially the administration of justice, should cease, that public labors be suspended,

etc. But, inasmuch as the observance of festivals was regarded as a special means of grace, the Protestant Church found it necessary to restore their proper significance (vide *Luther*, in den Werken von Walch, VI., 2257, verb. X., 56, X., 1947; comp. Augsburg Conf. Art. 26, 28; Apologie der Conf., Art. 4, 8; Concordienformel, Art. 10; Conf. Helvetica, II., Art. 24). From time to time, the State also found it necessary to renew the regulations concerning the ecclesiastical observance of the festivals, and to threaten the manifold violations and abuses with punishment. This has become specially urgent lately, inasmuch as the requirement to observe Sunday and other festivals was mistakenly regarded as intolerance, and the abolition of the same was presupposed in connection with the restoration of religious freedom.—*Literature*: AUGUSTI, Denkwürdigkeiten, Bd. I.-III. BINTERIM, Denkwürdigkeiten, &c., Bd. V., Hft. 1, p. 119-560. H. F. JACOBSON. — *Beck*.

Ferrer, *Vincentius*, born Jan. 23, 1357, in Valencia, of pious parents, was early destined for the Dominican order, which he entered Feb. 5, 1374. He practised the severest mortifications of the flesh. But he equally distinguished himself by his literary labors. He spent from 1380-84 in the Universities of *Barcelona* and *Lerida*. As a result of his studies he wrote: *Tract. de moderno Eccl. schismate compilatus ad christ. princ. D. Petrum, regem Aragonum*, in which he advocated the claims of Clem. VII. For this he obtained the D. D. from Lerida, in 1384. At the close of 1384 he returned to Valencia, and there lectured upon theology, and preached until 1391. Then Peter de Luna induced him to travel through France, and he spent some time at the royal court. Probably during this period he wrote his *Tract. valde utilis et consolatorius in tentationibus circa fidem*, and *Tract. de vita spirituali*, and possibly his treatise *de sacrificio Missæ atque ejus ceremoniis* (originally written in Spanish). Returning to Valencia King John I., of Aragon, appointed him one of his councillors, and confessor of the Queen. In 1395 Bened. XIII. (Peter de Luna) called him to Avignon as *Magister sacri palatii*. After serving in this capacity for two years, F. resolved to execute the long cherished purpose of going forth as a public preacher of repentance and conversion, among the people of that degenerate age. The extreme wickedness of the times was calculated to stir the heart of such a man as F., and loudly demanded some special checks. F. was not content with enduring mere private mortification. He desired to be an instrument in raising up his fellowmen from their moral and social degradation. He determined, accordingly, to go forth; Benedict XIII. sought to dissuade him; but failing, he finally appointed him Apostolic preacher, with the title of special legate, and invested him with large powers. In 1397 F. began his apostolic labors, and devoted to them the rest of his life. Soon a crowd of admirers followed him, who were formed into a congregation with prescribed rules and usages. Self-castigation was their first law. On their processions through towns and villages they sang hymns composed by F. Not only laymen, but clergy joined their ranks

F. often preached three times a day with great earnestness and effect. His sermons were less theological than moral, and full of allegorical interpretations of Scripture. In this way he visited *Spain, France, Italy, England, Scotland, and Ireland*. Even Bishops and noblemen thronged to hear him. The people regarded him as a saint, and almost worshipped him. On one of his tours he died suddenly at Vannes, Brittany, April 5, 1419. John V., Duke of Brittany, helped to carry his coffin; his wife, a daughter of Charles V. of France, had washed his corpse. — He was canonized June 29, 1455, by Calixtus III., though the bull of canonization was first published by Pius II., Oct. 1, 1458. — (See *Act. Sanct. Antw. April.*, T. I., 5; *Apr.*, p. 479, &c. A. BZOVII, *Ann. Eccl. Colon. Agripp.*, 1622, T. XV. O. RAYNALDI, *Ann. Ecc. Ed. c. nott.* J. D. MANSI, *Lucæ*, 1747–56, T. VIII. HELLER's *Leben F.*: Berlin, 1830. HELLER.*

Festus, M. Porcius, succeeded Felix, under Nero, as procurator of Palestine. When the case of Paul, whom Felix had left a prisoner, was brought before Festus, he would have discharged him but for Paul's appeal to the Emperor. Josephus reports (*Ant.* 20, 8, 9; *B. J.*, 2, 14, 1) that Festus, like Felix, was greatly occupied with quelling the robber-hordes (*Sicarii*) which then infested Palestine, but pursued a more equitable course with them. He appears to have served as procurator from c. 60–62 A. D. For Jos., l. c., says he assumed the office whilst Pallas was still in favor with Nero; but *Tacit. ann.*, 14, 65, says Pallas was poisoned in a. 62. The precise date of his term of office must be ascertained by determining those of his predecessors and successors. (See WINER's *Lex. Festus and Paul*; ANGER, *de temporum in actis apost. ratione*, 99, &c.; NEANDER's *Planting*, &c.; WIESELER, *Chronol. d. Apostelgesch.*, 89–99).

KLAIBER.*

Fetichism is the lowest form of religion, the rudest kind of idolatry. It is found only among the most degraded tribes of Africa, Northern Asia, N. America, and the cannibals of Oceania. It forms the first step of human beings whose life differs but little from that of brutes, towards specifically human religious consciousness. Mere self-consciousness (which, in one view, is only the highest form of that concentrated self-feeling found even among brutes) cannot rise, essentially, above animal life, until it acquires a presentiment of the existence of divine powers ruling over men and the world. In Fetichism we discover the obscure working of such a presentiment. The Fetichist is, as already stated, in a state of deep moral and intellectual debasement; he neither knows himself nor nature; his soul is simply crowded with confused sensuous impressions. His will is under the control of desires and passions. Surrounding objects are viewed not as they stand, but as they are useful or hurtful to him. In such a person the religious instinct, in its dreamy operations, will regard the object fixing its attention (God) merely in its practical relations to man, in spite of the efforts of that instinct to rise to higher conceptions; it cannot get beyond separate sensuous objects. It confounds, therefore, the highest ideas it can form with the

lowest embodiment of them; that which is most general, with the minutest outward forms. The feeling after God makes its first faint attempt to spread its wings, and soar aloft, but then the fearful bondage of the sensual world is fully revealed. Desiring to find God man grasps the nearest object which seems best to him, the image of which is prominent amid the chaos of his soul, and transfers to it his sense of dependence; he regards it as the source of his happiness, the power by which he is protected from all evil. — This serves to explain why such persons do not select objects of worship which might commend themselves aesthetically, by their beauty, their greatness, magnificence, &c. (as the sun, moon, stars, the sea, &c.), but some single thing which suddenly presents itself, as manifestly and immediately beneficial or injurious. The enormous absurdity of such a transfer of the idea of God to insignificant single objects of this sort, must become obvious to the worshipper, if he shall not wholly cease to be a man, and must gradually correct itself. This is done, partly, by multiplying these objects of worship, and assigning different times to the worship of each. If we further consider that people of this grade have only what is sensuously near to them, and outwardly in their profession, and that they, therefore, desire to have these representatives of deity, or parts of deity in immediate proximity to themselves; moreover, that they, according to the degraded condition of their will, regard these deifications only as means by which (in a magical incomprehensible manner) some good is secured, or some evil is prevented, — we have a complete conception of Fetichism. — Let us now look at these deified objects themselves, and then at the form of the relation religiously sustained to them.

The term *Fetich* was introduced by *de Brosses* through his treatise, *du culte des dieux Fétiches*, 1760. He obtained it from French merchants, who used it as a corruption of the Portuguese *Fetisso*, from *facere*, in the sense of pretending to do something, to *bewitch*; hence a *fetich* was something which could bewitch persons. Some fetiches are worshipped by an entire tribe, as the tiger in N. Guinea and Dahomey, the serpent by the Whydah negroes; and even their own shadow by those of Benin. But each village, also, each family, and individual, has a particular fetich. A piece of wood or a stone, against which a negro strikes his foot, a tree or an animal, perhaps something about which he dreamed the night before, becomes his private fetich (*Obi, Kisseey*, &c.). Some one may have a fetich which is supposed to possess extraordinary power to injure others. In such cases no pains or cost will be spared to get it from the owner. Large collections of fetiches are highly prized. A traveller on the coast of Guinea found 20,000 in one negro's house. — The fetiches are either natural (an animal, reptile, &c.) or artificial, as a tuft of hair, a skin, horn, claw, or a head of a beast fastened on a pole, as a representation of the beast itself and the power supposed to dwell in it. Sometimes the fetich is a fanciful unmeaning combination of objects in some frightful form. But even such monstrous combinations indicate the awakening conscious-

oss that the divine being is something above and beyond any sensible objects (see *CRUIKSHANK'S Gold Coast of Africa*: London, 1854). These fetiches were not, primarily, instruments of sorcery (though now used as such), but real idols. Offerings of water, milk, &c., are laid before them morning and evening, and they are always approached with religious fear. Their favor is propitiated by fasting and celibacy. They are besought for protection against lightning, wild beasts, poison, and murder, against sickness and all accidents. Before going to battle their aid is invoked, and after a victory sacrifices are offered to them. They guard property; a figure resembling a scarecrow in our cornfields, standing upon the field of a negro, would serve as a security against thefts. They are called upon to attest oaths; and in their dim presentiments of a future life, the negroes think they must give an account of themselves to their respective fetiches. But the really slight moral hold which these fetiches have upon their worshippers is apparent from their being cast away (or even broken up and burned) as soon as they seem no longer to serve the desires of their devotees. In such cases they seem to have been considered mere means of sorcery. The priests or fetich-men, especially, use them thus. Here we observe a resemblance between Fetichism and the Shahmanism of the Buddhists.—From the preceding sketch we see that Fetichism is pantheism in its rudest form. It lacks the first conditions of a mythical religion. And yet two facts must be kept in view: 1) that even among nations which worship fetiches, there are some movements towards a higher grade of religion, as among the Gallas. Some seem to have the idea of the unity of the supreme deity; others (the Congos) hold to a sort of dualism, of a supreme good and evil principle. 2) Conversely, also, some higher forms of religion appear in some respects to sink to the level of F.; as the animal-worship of the Egyptians; and the *ἑῶνα* of the early Greek tribes, were probably fetiches (*Schleiermacher*, *Glaubensl.*, I., § 8). Fetichism also reminds one of such punishments of the gods as that inflicted upon the Hellespont by Xerxes (*HERODOT.*, VII., 34, &c.), of the conduct of the ancient Romans when certain mischances befel them (*SUTTON.*, *Aug.* 16; *Calig.* 5), of the maltreatment of patron saints by modern Christian Romans, and even of the vulgar belief in witchcraft everywhere found.—(See *MERNERS' Allgem. krit. Gesch. d. Religionen*, 2 Bde.: Hanover, 1806. *RITTERS Erdk. I. Dr. WETZ.*, *Vorles. über die Religion*, &c.: Berlin, 1827, pp. 197–241).

H. PARET.*

Feuillants, a branch of the Cistercian order, so called from the abbey of Feuillans (about 18 miles from Toulouse) which was subject to Cîteaux. They owe their existence to *Jean de la Barrière*, who became abbot of Feuillans in 1574, and endeavored to reform the abuses which had crept in, and restore the earlier discipline of the order. He was violently opposed by the monks at Cîteaux, but was sustained by a decree of the Pope, 1586–87, who not only forbid the Cistercians to disturb the Feuillants, but allowed the latter to found other monasteries of monks, and of nuns, upon their reformed

plan, and desired a number of their monks to be sent to Rome, where two monasteries were assigned to them. Henry III., of France, also requested sixty to be sent to Paris, and furnished them with a new and handsome edifice in the *Rue St. Honoré*. The successor of Barrière obtained the title of vicar-general of the congregation, its release from amenability to Cîteaux, and in fact the elevation of the Feuillants to an independent order. They spread rapidly, both in Italy and France, and continued to flourish until the French revolution. Henry IV. and Pope Urban VIII. conferred some special privileges upon it. Among its distinguished members were *Charles de St. Paul*, an ecclesiastical writer, Cardinal *Bona*, and *Joseph Morotio* the historian of his own and other orders. (See *Ersch and Gruber*, *Encycl.* Bd. 43). S.*

Ficinus, Marsilius, an enthusiastic Platonist, was born at Florence, Oct. 19, 1433, the same year in which Cosmo de Medicis was driven from that city, and fled to Venice. The reading of Cicero early directed F.'s attention to Plato. After the return of Cosmo to Florence the father of F. introduced the youth to Cosmo, who encouraged him to translate Plato's works, and took him into his own house to afford him a better opportunity of pursuing his philosophical studies. The sons of Cosmo became F.'s pupils, and a warm friendship grew up between him and them. F. dedicated all his works to the family. He remained twelve years in the house of Cosmo. In five years he laid his 4 books *institutionum ad Platoniam disciplinam*, before Cosmo. Though highly approving of his production, he was advised to defer publication until he had mastered the Greek language, and studied Plato in the original. At the suggestion of Cosmo F. prepared a Latin version of all Plato's works. This was finished in 1468, about which time he seems first to have delivered public lectures. His new doctrines were eagerly listened to, and whoever heard him became his and Plato's friend. Reuchlin, it is said, caught the spirit of Orientalism from F. during his visit to Rome. Plato began to be regarded with veneration, as the founder of a new religion. F. was charged with keeping a light continually burning in his room, before an image of Plato, the only one he kept there. He saw in the life of Socrates many points corresponding with those which marked that of Jesus Christ. He called his associates "Brothers in Plato." In his *Theologia Platonica* and *de Religione Christiana* he endeavored to prove the agreement between both. In 1477 he was consecrated a priest and obtained the charge of two churches. In 1484 he obtained a canonry in the cathedral at Florence, and preached with great acceptance. Then he translated the *Enneads* of Plotinus, and a number of Neo-platonic writers. From 1492–99 he labored at new commentaries on Plato, and lectured upon Paul's epistles, which death (Oct. 1, 1499) prevented him from completing. He was small in person, and sickly, but very temperate, laborious, and patient, and a faithful friend. His complete works were publ.: Venice, 1516; Basel, 1561; Paris, 1641.—Besides the works named he wrote *An Exposition of Paul's Ep. to the Romans*;

six Discourses; a Treatise upon God; a Dialogue between Paul and the Soul, to show that we can come to God only through God; an Address of Christians to Sixtus IV.; a Treatise upon the Divine character of Christian Ethics; upon love, &c.—(RITTER, *Gesch. d. chr. Philos.*, V., 272–91. SIEVEKING, *Gesch. d. platon. Akademie zu Florenz*: Göttingen, 1812).

DR. PRESSEL.*

Finns, Conversion of the.—About the middle of the 12th century, Christianity first penetrated into Finland. No other European country is so divided by creeks, rivers, and marshes, and hence also no people was more difficult to train to uniformity of doctrine and worship. Their language even, it is said, lacks appropriate words for church, altar, and priest. Finn, in the middle ages, was synonymous with sorcerer, all surrounding nations so generally believing their black arts. Their old religion reveals a profounder view of nature than that of any other northern people. Their worship strikingly authenticates its affinity to the other religions of northern nations by constantly and prominently revealing a Trinity. An obstinate race, Christianity met with peculiar difficulties among them. Hence, also, long after their conversion, heathen and Christian worship, superstition and faith were most strangely blended among them. Although the northern apostle, Ansgar, had received authority from Gregory IV., over Finland, as over the whole North, no priest, unless Erick, who is said to have been slain, had ventured among the Finns. They continued in the blindest heathenism, had little or no conception of Christianity, and, like the heathen Esthen, followed the worthy profession of the old North—piracy, incessantly annoying the shores of Sweden. Furnished thus with a welcome pretext, Erich IX., the Holy, King of Sweden, uniting with himself a very zealous oppressor, Bishop Henry, of Upsala, of English nativity, and brought to Sweden by Cardinal Nicholas, waged war against the Finns. Sweden, since A. D. 1008, had Christian kings. King Inge, 1075, prohibited all idolatry, subdued the rebelling heathen and secured the full triumph of Christianity in Sweden. Bishop Henry had taken to heart the papal bull, encouraging all princes to convert the heathen with fire and sword. Punishments and violence, Rome's frequent resort in the Christianization of the North, were now also almost exclusively to convert the Finns. The Bishop himself, seizing the sword, followed the war. Before setting out, Erich sent an embassy, declaring war against the Finns, should they not freely submit and accept the Christian faith. They insolently refusing, the King, landing where Abo now lies, smote the Finns in a bloody engagement, compelling them thus to accept laws from their conquerors. Although believing to be doing God service, Erich was sorrowful, especially since so many souls had to be sacrificed before learning to know Christ. To compensate the living for this harm, he caused Bishop Henry to baptize the greater portion of the Finns in the fountain of Upsala, afterwards St. Henry's fountain. He built a church at Rendamecki, where he erected a bishopric, extending also over Esthland, and

which was removed, A. D. 1300, to Abo. Here Rolof, a visigoth, was the first Bishop. Folquin, Julius and the Englishman Thomas, succeeded him. The King returning to Sweden, Bishop Henry remained in Finland. Entering into a nobleman's house in his absence, he procured food for himself by force. Balli, the nobleman, whom he had disciplined, soon afterwards returning, followed him and slew him on the ice, on the Kiulo marsh, in the beginning of 1158. He cut off the Bishop's fingers and appropriated the rings to himself. The place of his death was said to have been distinguished by numerous miracles. The Pope canonized him, declaring him to be the patron saint of Sweden and Finland, and ordering a yearly fast in his honor, on the 19th of January. His image, in full bishop's attire, with a battle-axe at his side and the murderer at his feet, was erected in the Finnish churches for universal veneration; the cathedral of Abo was afterwards erected in honor of him. After its completion, in 1300, his remains were removed into it as its most precious treasure. The Russians settling, A. D. 1174, in Wätka, Christianity was thus introduced into this northern territory among the Finns (comp. *Stahl*, *Gesch. der russ. Kirche*, I., p. 172). All these pretended conversions were evidently only conquests, producing at most only a hypocritical worship, without effecting a real change of moral character. The Tavasts, especially, remained the sworn enemies of Christianity and its messengers. Hence Jarl Birger, in the spring of 1248, led a large army against them. He conquered, compelled the Finns to be baptized, and built the castle at Tavastehus, that its strong garrison might keep the people in subjection. To establish the Swedish dominion and, ostensibly, Christianity in Finland, a third and long contemplated invasion was accomplished in 1293, during the minority of King Birger, by his guardian, Torkel Knutson, regent of the kingdom. The Pope approved this, granting the participating knights and warriors the same indulgences as to the knights of the cross. The regent led the army in person, subdued the refractory Finns and caused his companion, Bishop Peter, of Westerås, everywhere to preach to and baptize them. As baptism and masses alone would not hold the Finns in subjection, he built the strong castle of Wiborg. In 1300 the Pope appointed a jubilee for all Christendom. Torkel Knutson celebrated this in Finland, the bishop's See being now also removed from Rendamecki to Abo. Zealous and moderate he introduced law and order among the peasantry. Christian morals and education gradually advanced under the subsequent rulers of Finland. Heathenism was continually repressed, finding adherents only in the remotest regions of Tavastland, Oesterbotten, and Sawolax. The Bishop of Abo and his chapter rose to great influence, and worship was there celebrated with great pomp. Churches increased, and towards the close of the 15th century, the wooden churches were more and more exchanged for stone ones. The cathedral school of Abo was very numerously attended. Six cloisters were gradually established, the oldest of which was the Domini-

can cloister of Abo. The ecclesiastics received their tithes and surplice fees mostly in ermine and other costly furs. In the upland regions, however, removed from the sea, heathenism still existed for a long time by the side of Christianity, and only later did the measurably excusable hatred of the Finns against those who endeavored to urge the gospel of peace upon them by open force, disappear. — (Comp. *Olof Dalin's Geschichte Schwedens*, Bd. II. *Fr. Rueh's Finland und seine Bewohner*: Leipzig, 1809).

DR. PRESSEL. — *Derr*.

Firmilianus, *B. of Caesarea*, in Cappadocia, c. 250, was one of the most respected Asiatic bishops, and a special friend of Origen (EUSEB., VI., 27), who spent some time with F. after his banishment from Alexandria. F. was somewhat prominent in the controversy of Cyprian with Stephan about *heretical baptism* (see Art.). Stephan had previously broken fellowship with the bishops of Asia Minor and their churches. At the beginning of the controversy Cyprian, accordingly wrote to F. upon the subject, and received in reply an assurance that he and his churches agreed with Cyprian, not only in regard to the nullity of heretical baptism, but the arrogance of the Romish Bishop. This letter, the only production of F. extant, is preserved in a literal Latin translation in Cyprian's letters (CYPR., *ep.*, 75), and is one of the most valuable documents in the controversy. On account of its opposition to the pretensions of the Roman See, Romanists endeavored to suppress it (hence it is not found in the ed. of Erasmus and Minutius), and then to prove it to be spurious. Its genuineness, however, has been fully vindicated. — (See RETTBERG, Cyprian, 189. WALCH, *Ketzerhist.*, II., 321, &c.). KLAIBER.*

First-born *the*, both of man and animals, were to be sacred to the Lord, according to the Mosaic law (Ex. 13 : 2, 15; 22 : 28; 34 : 19; Numb. 3 : 12, 13; 8 : 16; 18 : 15; Luke 2 : 23), and sacred as the first-born, to the exclusion of every other consideration (Levit. 27 : 26). The following difference in the mode of consecration was prescribed. *The first-born of men* were not to be slain, but devoted to the service of the temple. The tradition, therefore, in support of which *Onkelos* quotes Ex. 24 : 5 (*Mischn. Sebach.* 14, 4; *Targ. hieros.*, 49, 3), that primitively the offering of sacrifices devolved upon the first-born sons of the tribes of Israel, is quite probable (comp. Ex. 19 : 22). This rule was subsequently changed by the law of Sinai, which assigned public sanctuary services to the tribe of Levi (Numb. 3 : 12), so that thenceforth the first-born of the other tribes were merely to be presented in the temple a month after their birth (*i. e.*, after the 33 days of the mother's purification, Lev. 12 : 4), and to be redeemed at the estimation of the priest, the sum to be regulated according to the seeming vigor of the child, and to the wealth of the parent, but not to exceed five shekels (Ex. 13 : 13; Numb. 18 : 16; Luke 2 : 22, 27; *Mischn. Bechoroth*, 8, 8; PHILO, *opp.* II., 234). This rule is still retained. When his first-born son is 31 days old, the orthodox Jew invites ten friends, with the Rabbin, to his house, lays the infant with a fixed sum (from 2 to 8 florins) upon a table, and on being asked,

"Would you rather give up your first-born, the first child of his mother, to the Lord, or redeem it with five shekels, after the shekels of the sanctuary, which is twenty gerahs?" answers, that he will redeem him. The Rabbin takes the money, swings it around the head of the child in token of his vicarious authority, and closes the ceremony with benedictions. Should the father die before the child is 31 days old, the mother is not bound to attend to his redemption, but must fasten a tablet of metal or parchment around his neck, with this inscription: "This first-born son is not yet redeemed;" thus he is bound, at a proper age to redeem himself (BUXTORF, *Synag.*). At present it is customary, also, for all male first-born to fast on the pass-over-eve. The redemption of the first-born of animals seems to have wholly ceased. — As *the first-born of unclean animals* could not be offered in sacrifice, they were also redeemed, a sheep or some other unclean animal, with one-fifth of their value, being substituted for them (Ex. 34 : 19, 20; Numb. 18 : 15; Levit. 27 : 27). — But *the first-born of clean animals* (εὖν χερσαίων, ὅσα πρὸς ὑγιεινότητος καὶ χρησὶν ἀνθρώπων, Philo), if physically perfect, had to be sacrificed within a year after it was eight days old (Numb. 18 : 17, 18). If it had a blemish it was to be eaten within the owner's gate (Deut. 15 : 19–23). The assumption of MICHAELIS and others (Mos. Recht, § 193, IV., 85; JAHN, III., 415; ROSEN-MÜLLER, *Schol.*, II., 519), of a so-called "second-first-born" offering, cannot be proven, much less the substitution of the female for the male, which were against Deut. 15 : 19.

In this entire arrangement, and the consideration on which it was based, the Israelites stood alone. For although other nations offered first-fruits to their deities, in acknowledgment of the source of all mercies, none thus devoted the first-born of mankind or animals, excepting the Phoenicians, Carthaginians, and some cognate tribes, who sometimes offered their first-born sons, especially only sons, 1) on extraordinary occasions; 2) by an actual sacrificing of them; 3) as propitiatory sacrifices to the gods, or 4) as voluntary sacrifices (MOYERS, Phoen.). — In accordance with the custom and laws of most other nations, the Jews conferred special prerogatives upon first-born sons. The first-born son by his father's first marriage not only enjoyed the special respect of the household, but had right to a double portion of the estate (Deut. 21 : 17; see Talmud restrictions in *Bechoroth*, 8, 9), was recorded in the genealogical register as the first-born (Gen. 22 : 21, &c.; Numb. 3 : 2; 1 Sam. 8 : 2), represented his unmarried sisters, was called "the head," and, if his father was a prince, followed him as "chief in the kingdom," and even as high-priest (Gen. 49 : 3; 2 Chron. 21 : 3; cfr. HEROD., 6, 52; ROSEN., *Morgld.* III., 263). A father was expressly forbidden to transfer the rights of primogeniture to a younger son (Deut. 21 : 15–17), excepting in the way of punishment of the first-born (Gen. 49 : 3, &c.; 1 Kings 1 : 1, &c.). Whether a voluntary bartering of a birthright was allowed cannot be determined; the only case in the Bible is that of Esau (Gen. 25 : 29, &c.). First-born daughters enjoyed no other

advantage than that of being first given in marriage (Gen. 29 : 26).—Already in the O. T. we find the conception of the individual first-born applied to the entire people of Israel (Ex. 4 : 22 ; 19 : 6 ; Jer. 31 : 9, 20). In the N. T. both the duties and rights, the sacrificing and priesthood of the first-born are represented as being combined and perfected in Christ (Rom. 8 : 29 ; Heb. 1 : 6 ; 12 : 23 ; Col. 1 : 18 ; James 1 : 18 ; Apoc. 14 : 4).

DR. PRESSER.*

First-fruits.—The religious custom of offering the first and best fruits of the season to the deity, as an expression of a sense of his superior claims (cf. Jer. 2 : 3) existed among most ancient nations, and may be traced back to Gen. 4 : 3, &c. In the Hebrew branch of the Shemites it became an established law. The law distinguishes two kinds of first-fruit gifts (at least as far as the distinction was applicable): 1) the solemn offering of first-fruits which the whole nation presented, 2) those first-fruits which each one was to consecrate to the Lord. Of the former kind two were offered: 1) *the sheaf of first-fruits* (doubtless of the earliest barley) for the solemn opening of the harvest (see Art.) on the second day of the passover, the 16th of Nisan. This sheaf was waved before the Lord by a priest, and combined with a burnt-offering, a meat-offering, and a drink-offering (Levit. 23 : 10–13); 2) *the first-fruits of the two wave-loaves*, seven weeks later, on Pentecost, which was properly the feast of the harvest (Levit. 23 : 15, &c.).—Besides these two great official first-fruits-offerings, each Israelite was to present a basketful of every kind of produce of the earth, as each successively ripened (Ex. 23 : 19 ; Deut. 26 : 2, &c. ; Numb. 18 : 12, &c. ; Neh. 10 : 38 ; Prov. 3 : 9). Some of these (as the fruits of trees) were brought in their natural state; others, as oil, wine, &c., in a prepared form, but before any person had tasted thereof. The first gatherings of wool (Deut. 18 : 4) and honey, at least once (2 Chron. 31 : 5 ; comp. Deut. 8 : 8), were also offered to the Lord. Of young trees no fruits should be taken until the fourth year, when their products were offered unto the Lord. After that their fruits might be eaten (Levit. 19 : 23, &c. ; cf. Jos. Ant., 4, 8, 19). This sort of first-fruits were not placed upon the altar, but went to the support of the priests (Ezek. 44 : 30, &c. ; cf. 2 Kings 4 : 42 ; Philo, *opp.* II., 233, *sq.* M.). Hence store-rooms were subsequently provided in the temple for these offerings and the tithes, and placed under a special keeper (2 Chron. 31 : 11, &c. ; Neh. 12 : 44 ; 13 : 5 ; Mal. 3 : 10). But this sort of first-fruits were often combined with *meat-offerings* (Levit. 2 : 14, &c. ; Numb. 15 : 17, &c. ; Josh. 5 : 11, &c.) ; and although private individuals preferred to bring *their* free-will-offerings along with the official first-fruit-offerings at the Passover and at Pentecost, as far as this was possible, Ewald goes too far in entirely combining the two kinds of first-fruit-offerings (see *Passover*).

As the law left the amount of these gifts to the good-will of the individual (Deut. 16 : 10 ; comp. 26 : 2), opportunity was had to make special subsequent regulations. The talmudist tracts *Biccurim* and *Therumoth* contain many

such. The smallest amount allowed was $\frac{1}{4}$ of the prepared first-fruits. The particular products of which the first-fruits were to be offered, were specified. All had to grow in the holy land. Those mentioned in Deut. 8 : 8 were required, excepting *dates* instead of honey. Those living far away from the temple, might present their first-fruits dried; they were not to offer them before the Pentecost, nor after the feast of the Dedication. Prepared (as distinct from natural) first-fruits of Jewish districts beyond Palestine were also required, but they were mostly converted into money, and thus sent to the temple (Jos. Ant., 16, 6, 7 ; Philo, II., 568, 578, 592 ; cf. Tobit 1 : 7). There were also regulations for the use of these first-fruits by the priests, and penalties inflicted upon the people who partook of them (Levit. 22 : 6, &c. ; Numb. 18 : 11, &c.—See *Winer's Lexicon* ; SAALSCHÜTZ, *mos. Recht*, p. 343, &c. ; 416, &c. ; EWALD, *Alterth.*, p. 226 ; 316, &c.). RÜETSCHL.*

Fish IXΘΥΣ, an ancient Christian symbol, referring sometimes to Christ himself, sometimes to Christians; to Christ, as the letters of ΙΧΘΥΣ are the initials of the formula $\text{Ιησοῦς Χριστός Θεοῦ Υἱός Σωτήρ}$ (Jesus Christ, Son of God, Saviour); to Christians, because Jesus called the apostles fishers of men (Matt. 4 : 18). The

Talmudists also call the Messiah יֵשׁוּעַ , and associate him with the sign of the fish; and the miraculous fish in Tobit 6 : 1–8, is referred to the Redeemer (OPTAT. MILEV., *contra Parmenian*, III., 2).—As fish live in water, the water of baptism was considered the proper life-element of Christians, and hence baptisteries were called *piscinæ*. Heretics, on the contrary, are serpents and frogs, which live in marshes and filthy ponds. Often a fish with the monogram of Christ was engraved on signet-rings, on grave-lamps, or on tombstones. *Clem. of Alex.* calls Christ the fisher of mortals, who catches the clean, and rejects the others (so TERTULLIAN, *de baptismo*. See MÜNTER, *Sinnbilder*, &c., d. alten Chr.: Altona, 1825. AUGUSTI, *Archæol.* XII., 367, &c.). HAGENBACH.*

Fish and fishing among the ancient Hebrews.—The fish is a character in the Hebrew alphabet, though with the Syrian name *Nun*; as a numeral it denotes 50. As fish abounded in Egypt the Israelites became accustomed to their use (hence Numb. 11 : 5). Man was appointed to rule over them (Gen. 1 : 26 ; 9 : 2 ; Ps. 8 : 9). Moses allowed such as had fins and scales to be eaten, but not to be offered in sacrifice (Levit. 11 : 9–12). They are named as food in Matt. 7 : 10, &c., &c. Hence the dying of fish is considered a divine judgment (Is. 50 : 2 ; Hos. 4 : 3, &c.). They were caught in baskets or by striking them with a hatchet, or with harpoons, but chiefly in nets, during the night, or at early dawn. The fish-gate was on the west side of Jerusalem, and probably received its name from the fish-market there. Nehemiah (13 : 16) had to contend against the Tyrians selling fish on the Sabbath.—There are no fish in the Dead Sea, excepting at the mouth of the Jordan, although Ezek. 46 predicts the removal of this curse, a prophecy which is explained spiritually. The sea of Gennesareth abounds in fish (Jos.

2. J., III., 10, 7). Hasselquist found, in 1750, the *silurus*, *mugil*, and *sparus Galilæus* there. The distinguished comparative anatomist, v. Lapp, obtained a fish, through Dr. Barth, from the sea of Genn., which proved to be the *chromis niloticus* of Cuvier, or the *labrus nilot.* of Hasselquist (the ancient *coracinus*).—These fish are also found in the Nile, and in the waters near Alexandria; hence the opinion that there was some connection between the waters of Samaria and Galilee, and those of Egypt. REUCHLIN.*

Fisher, John, Bishop of Rochester, was born at Beverley, Yorkshire, A. D. 1453, 1455, or 1459. Already advantageously distinguished at Cambridge as an earnest student, he was, early in life, appointed Chancellor of the University. After entering the ministry he devoted himself with great zeal to the pastoral work, filling the office of Confessor to Margaret of Beauford, widowed Countess of Richmond, and mother of Henry VII. Influenced by him, the Countess established Christ and John's College, Cambridge, endowing and furnishing the first with approved teachers, and leaving means and instructions for the second in the hands of her executors, the Bishops of Rochester and Winchester. Henry VII. expressed unlimited confidence in Fisher by conferring upon him, 1504, the See of Rochester. Here Fisher manifested rare zeal and faithfulness, and, honored by the nation and King, and inseparably attached to a people almost adoring him, he reached a happy old age. The youthful Henry VIII., who ascended the throne in 1509, also declared, that in all his journeys he knew no man who, for learning and worth of character, could be compared to the Bishop of Rochester. Against Luther, Fisher faithfully assisted his King, and, to say the least, decidedly exercised the greatest influence upon the king's book, *de septem sacramentis*. The folio collection of Fisher's writings, shows him to have been one of the most zealous, though not shrewdest, defenders of the Catholic Church. (*Volumen, quo Lutheri errores refutavit; aliud, in quo sacri sacerdotii auctoritatem defendit; homiliæ ad plebem adversus 41 Lutheri articulos*: Würzburg, 1594, written at first in English, but afterwards translated by Paines into Latin; *de veritate corporis et sanguinis Christi in eucharistia lib. 5 adversus Ecolampadium; de septem sacramentis; meditationes in septem psalmos Davidicos penitentiales; contra captivitatem Babylonicam Lutheri; de matrimonio regis Angliæ; precationum liber; pro Lutheri damnatione liber; tract. de charitate*). His tragical end as a martyr to the freedom of the Church, gained him greater renown, than these literary labors. For this, the King's guilty passion for Anne Boleyn furnished the occasion. All the Bishops united in declaring Henry's first marriage invalid, Fisher alone refusing. Incensed at this, Henry gladly seized the opportunity to humble and punish the troublesome and refractory counsellor. In Addington, Kent, was a pretended and somewhat notorious prophetess, Elizabeth Barton. A certain Deering declaring, in a special book, her revelations to be silly stuff, she attracted no further notice at court, until the divorce question and separation from Rome agitated men's

minds. Being now brought forward and instructed by the opposing party, she enjoined the King to concede the rights of the Pope; exterminate the new faith; and retain his rightful spouse, likewise declaring that, should he marry Anne Boleyn, he would not retain his throne beyond a month, and die a disgraceful death. Among others, Bishop Fisher was weak enough to encourage her. Arrested and brought to trial, she acknowledged her deception, remarking truly, that her learned assistants were more censurable than she, an ignorant maid. She was found guilty of treason and executed. Fisher was accused of collusion with her. Cromwell intimated the possibility of pardon, by seeking the royal clemency. Fisher refused; and, confined by age and frailty, addressed a written defence and justification to the Lords, alleging "it could be no transgression of the law, to have held Miss Barton, upon the evidence of worthy and learned men, for a moral person, and, with this preconceived opinion, to have conversed with her and heard from her, that the King would not long survive the divorce; that he was no conspirator, and could affirm before the throne of Christ, his ignorance of any crime or maliciousness, which any one on earth might contemplate against the royal majesty." Still, Fisher was fined 300 pounds redemption money for his personal property. Fourteen days after the condemnation of Miss Barton, the Council required from the Bishop and More the oath of allegiance to the proposed succession. Both were willing, without reserve, excepting only that part of the form declaring the King's first marriage invalid. Both were cast into the Tower, and deprived of their revenues for life. Fisher was more than twelve months in prison, want compelling him to entreat the tyrant for clothing to cover his nakedness. About this time, Paul III. made Fisher a cardinal. The King was annoyed. Fisher already on the brink of eternity, said: "Were the red hat lying at my feet, I would not stoop to pick it up." The King in turn declared: "Paul may send him the hat, but he shall have no head for it." Hence (June 17) he was tried before the Chancellor, judges, and several peers, for denying the King's spiritual supremacy, and condemned to a traitor's death. The King of France vainly interceded for him. He was executed, June 22, 1535, aged 78 years. Carefully dressing himself the same morning, his servant reminded him, that after two hours he would forever lay aside these things. He replied: "What then? Remember you not that this is my wedding day?" Frail in body, he was borne to execution in a chair. Opening, at random, the New Testament in his hand, at John 17: 3-4, he read this, closed the book and said: "Here is wisdom enough for me to my life's end." Reaching the scaffold, he cast away his staff, calling out, "Courage feet; doubtless ye can yet travel the little way still before you." Ascending the scaffold unassisted, he briefly addressed the spectators, declaring that he came to die for the faith of the holy Catholic Church of Christ; after which praying, he laid his head patiently upon the block. With one stroke it was severed from his body. Thus died this reverend, up-

right, and pious prelate, a martyr to freedom of conscience. Soon after, More shared his fate. The King's wrath still insatiate, Fisher's head was put up on a spear near London Bridge, and his naked body exposed, during several hours, to public gaze, and afterwards buried without shroud or coffin. His numerous manuscripts found in prison were burned. All were deeply pained at the end of this worthy and great man, but not one in England dared denounce this horrid murder. Hence the martyr's image beams more resplendently in the judgment of posterity; and even the Protestant Church, whose violent opponent he was in life, crowns his head, felled by the tyrant's sword, with esteem and love. PRESSEL.—Derr.

Fistula (also *canna, cannula, calamus, arundo, pugillare, siphon, pipa*) was a hollow reed used in the Western Church from the 8th to the 13th centuries, in drinking the wine of the Lord's Supper, to prevent spilling any of it. The Greek C. use a spoon.—(See J. Voort, hist. fistula eucharist.: Bremæ, 1740. SPITTLER, Gesch. d. Kelche im Abendm.: Lemgo, 1780. AUGUSTI, Archæol., VIII., 485).

HAGENBACH.*

Flacius, Matthias (*Flacich*), sometimes surnamed Illyricus from his native country, was one of the most remarkable characters of the second period of the Reformation, distinguished for the persevering energy with which he contended for the pure Lutheran doctrine, and a mode of worship and form of organization agreeing therewith, and for the tragical issue of his sincere, albeit passionate, zeal in the cause he espoused.—F. was born in Albona, which then belonged to Venice, where, after his father's death, he obtained his further education. As a youth of 17 years he was fired with love for religion and the Bible, and a desire to serve both with his heart and pen. Accordingly he applied to a relative, Lupetinus, provincial of the Minorites, for admission into that order, in the hope of being sent to Padua or Bologna, and promised in compensation the half of his inheritance. But Lupetinus, a pious and learned man, who afterwards died a martyr to the truth, advised him otherwise, told him of Luther, of Luther's writings, and that he might learn a better theology in Germany than in the monasteries of Italy. F. first went to *Basel*, where Dr. *Grynæus* kindly received him, thence (1540) to *Tübingen*. There his countryman, Matthias Illyricus, gave him a home, and he soon found a friend in Leonard Fuchs. In 1541 he went to *Wittenberg*, where he sustained himself by giving private lessons in Greek and Hebrew, and became intimate with Dr. Eber and others. During the next three years he was tortured with the most terrible spiritual conflicts, so that he often longed for death. At length he was led to Luther, whose own, similar, temptations qualified him to minister to such afflicted souls. This explains F.'s glowing zeal for Luther's views. They were not merely a matter of theory with him, but of lively experience.—Simultaneously with this happy change in the state of his mind his temporal circumstances improved; he was appointed Professor of O. T. Literature, and married, Luther attending his wedding.

But this did not last long. New troubles broke in upon him, and the rest of his life was a concatenation of trials. The sad issue of the Smalcald war (1547) drove him from *Wittenberg*. He went to *Braunschweig* and taught school. It is true Prince Moritz recalled him to W., but his days of peace were past. Intestine eccl. agitations succeeded the wars without. The Emperor was bent upon carrying through the *Augsburg Interim*, and Moritz, who was greatly indebted to him, would have assented to this, but for the opposition of his subjects. The work of adjusting this difficulty fell upon *Melanchthon* (see *Art.*). The result of M.'s efforts was the *Leipsc Interim* (see *Adiaphora*), the concessions of which gave offence to many. Among these F. was prominent. With untiring zeal he employed every means to avert what he considered the danger threatening the truth; but unavailingly. The new order of things was put into execution. F. could no longer stay in *Wittenberg*. Committing his lectures to another person, and leaving his wife behind, he went to *Hamburg*, where he found friends of his own views. By their advice he returned to *Magdeburg*, from that point to contend against the evil. He addressed a letter in vindication of his course to the *Wittenbergers*, and offered to return if promised a free and safe avowal of his views. Receiving no answer, he published his letter. Stricter measures having been used to enforce the *Interim*, he published several writings against it. And although in these he earnestly denounced what he thought wrong, it must be acknowledged that he avoided all harsh personalities, and was prompted not by ambition, but by an all-absorbing zeal for views which he deemed essential to the safety of the Church.—In *Magdeburg* F. shared the dangers of the besieged city. He encouraged the citizens in their resistance, although the enemy threatened to hang him. But he escaped; for in the last extremity of the city Moritz raised the siege, turned his army against the Emperor, and espoused the evangelical cause.—As a proof that F. was not controlled by mere party spirit, we find that in the *Osiandrian* controversy he took *Melanchthon's* part, although the Duke of Prussia offered him a large reward if he would sustain *Osiander*, and the *Wittenbergers* were then insisting upon his being expelled from *Köthen*.—During the following years he was engaged in a series of theological controversies with *G. Major*, in defence of the pure doctrine of justification by faith; *V. Strigel*, in defence of man's natural inability to good; *Schwenkfeld* in defence of the efficacy of the means of grace, especially the sacraments.—He found time also for other labors. The want of a defence of the truth against some plausible Romish objections led him to prepare a *catalogus testium veritatis*, the object of which was to show that in every age of the Church there had been faithful witnesses for the truths advocated by the evangelical party. But he rendered still greater service by projecting the "*Magdeburg Centuries*" (see *Art.*), of which great work he was the animating spirit. Soon after commencing it (1557) he was appointed Professor at the new University of *Jena*, which became the citadel of rigid Lu-

theranism. It was the aim of this party, at whose head stood Flacius, to maintain what they deemed the pure doctrines, by unambiguous definitions of them, and the explicit exclusion of errors. By their advice the "Sächsische Confutationsschrift" was drawn up, which all the churches and schoolmasters were bound to observe, and which was to be publicly read in the churches every Sunday. The strict enforcement of this measure led to F.'s downfall. It threatened the prosperity of the University. The Duke began to think it best to check clerical authority. He instituted a consistory to which all the theologians, even, were to submit their writings for censorship. F. and his colleagues remonstrated, and came into collision with the court. At the close of 1561 F. and his associates were deprived of their offices. F. spent five years in Regensburg, then accepted a call to Antwerp, where he tried to dissuade his friends from all violent insurrection against the civil powers, and when they were driven from A. he went to Frankfort, where his large family had arrived before him. After one year he had to quit this refuge also. He went to Strassburg. There he hoped to be employed in the High-school, but was disappointed. His domestic circumstances pressed him sorely. But in the midst of all he commenced another great work, which the necessities of the times seemed loudly to demand: *Clavis Scripturæ Sacræ*, a kind of *Biblical Dictionary*. This was followed by his *Glossary* (or short commentary) of the *N. T.* An opinion maintained in the *Clavis*, that original sin was not something accidental, but the very substance of the natural man, subjected him to violent assaults.—He had to leave Strassburg; went to Frankfort, and died in the hospital there in his 55th year. — For an unfavorable account of F. see PLANCK, *Gesch. d. prot. Lehrbegriffs*. In his vindication: DR. A. TWESTEN, *M. Flacius Illyricus, eine Vorlesung. Mit autobiograph. Beilagen, &c., von Hermann Roszel*: Berlin, bei G. Bethge, 1844). KLING.*

Flagellants (*flagellantes*), *verberantes*, *crucifratres*, *cruciferi*, *acephali* (because they tore loose from the Rom. hierarchy), *albi*, *fratres in albis*, *bianchi*, are the names of diseased forms of religious life which appeared from the 13th to the 15th cent., and the causes of which must be sought in the character of Romish piety, in the laxity of Church discipline, the degeneracy of the prevalent eccl. means of grace, and the peculiarities of the age. — As P. Damiani's (see Art.) mode of scourging spread, true penitence assumed more degraded forms. The whole system of fastings and penances was an externalization of religion, based upon an extreme judaizing overvaluation of works. But the evil was magnified by the system of indulgences, which encouraged the hope that the offended justice of God could be satisfied by frivolous penances, performed without regard to inner feelings. However earnestly the Rom. C. declared priests to be God's vicars in pardoning sin, the levity with which such pardon was granted, awakened an unanswerable prejudice against its validity, in all deeply convicted persons. And this prejudice was aggravated by the frivolous readiness of the Church in dispen-

sing laws and excommunications, in numbers proportioned to the unworthiness of those who exercised eccl. authority. Hence, on the one hand, heresies multiplied and spread, especially such as enjoined the severest asceticism, and, on the other, the common people, who remained externally faithful to the Church, were ready to enter any road of error which might open.

The earliest flagellants arose under *Anthony of Padua* (1195–1231). In Perugia, also, after the terrible wars between the Guelphs and Ghibellines (1261), many citizens, of all classes and ages, were powerfully seized with a spirit of penitent sorrow, and began to go in pairs through the streets, scourging themselves with leather thongs, until blood flowed down their backs. From Perugia they spread even to Rome; and as the practice was followed by actual moral improvement, the Pope protected them, especially as he favored the Guelphs. The Ghibellines, however, forbid them to enter their districts. When this phenomena disappeared from Italy, and previous immoralities returned with increased force, similar movements arose beyond the Alps. Indeed, in 1261, large companies of flagellants marched through Carniola, Carinthia, Austria, Moravia, Bohemia, even reaching to Hungary and Poland. They marched two or three abreast, with the upper part of their bodies bare, faces veiled, carrying crosses, or banners, and scourged themselves for 33 days, twice a day, singing hymns under the operation, all in commemoration of the 33 years of the Saviour's life. Women scourged themselves privately. At first priests joined them; but they soon withdrew, and charged the flagellants with contempt for the hierarchy. They were denounced, and persecuted, and by the end of 1261 already had almost disappeared from Germany.

The 14th cent. was properly the period of these flagellant pilgrimages. The fanaticism first appeared, again, in Italy, but there excited only two small movements, the chief, that under the Dominican Venturinus, of Bergamus. The mightiest occasion for this fanaticism was furnished by the plague, which, beginning in China, was brought by merchant vessels, 1347, from the Levant to Italy, and swept through Europe. It was most fatal in Italy. In Florence 60,000, in Venice 100,000 souls perished. In Germany it carried off 1,200,000 persons, though it raged there less than in France and Italy. Of Barefooted monks 124,434 perished; a proof, probably, of their zeal in ministering to the suffering. This fearful visitation seemed to loosen all social and civil bonds. Some despaired, many abandoned themselves to sensual pleasures. — On April 17, 1349, in Easter-week, the first Flagellant society came to Magdeburg from Pirna; another entered Würzburg on May 2; about the middle of June 200 reached Spire from Suabia, whose example was so contagious that 200 boys, of 12 years, formed a society. Thus the fanaticism spread through Germany, to Denmark, and England. Many women joined the processions. These companies were organized with the following rules: the person joining had to confess, to forgive his enemies, to obtain his wife's consent, and have a certain

amount for his maintenance (at least 11 shillings and 4 pence, i. e., 4d per day), as begging was forbidden; obedience to the leaders was especially enjoined. All intercourse with women was prohibited under penalties. When a company approached a town they formed themselves into a regular procession. The candles, crosses, and banners were borne in front, then followed the penitents, two and two, wearing a red cross on their clothes. One of the company commenced singing, and all joined in. As they entered the town the bells were rung. On coming before the church all kneeled, and as certain lines were sung, they prostrated themselves on the ground with outstretched arms, forming a cross, and remained thus until the leader gave them a hint to rise. This was done thrice, after which the residents invited them to a meal. — Whenever they did penance, scourged themselves, they went to an open place, a graveyard or woods, took off their shoes, and upper garments, formed a circle, put on an apron, and laid themselves down in a posture which indicated the besetting sin. The leader then touched one of the brothers with the scourge, saying —

"Stant af durch der reinen martel ere
und huete dich vor den sünden mere,"

and thus passed around to the last one; but each one when touched rose and going over the rest touched them also. When all were up the scourging began, the company going round the circle, two and two, and striking themselves over the shoulders until the blood flowed. The scourge was of three knotted thongs having four iron nails through them. During the scourging they sang. When the hymn was sung they paused, all fell to the earth again, then rose to their knees, smote their breasts, sprang to their feet and commenced another round. The scourging over, a collection was taken from the bystanders. Then one of the penitents stood upon an elevation, and read a letter professedly received from Christ, and laid by an angel on the altar of St. Peter's in Jerusalem, which said that God was greatly displeased with the sins of Christians, and was about to punish them severely, but had delayed the penalty through the intercession of the Virgin Mary and the angel. It was added that the angel recommended a flagellant procession of 34 days, to propitiate God's favor. — After this the penitents returned to the town, and started on their march on the following day. Their hymns were new, emotional, in popular style, and rehearsed the character and popularity of the flagellants. And indeed the movement was exceedingly popular. Crowds thronged to witness, and weep over their scourging, and it was thought an honor to entertain them. Woe to the priests who dared to speak against them, or question the authenticity of that angelic letter! But the tide of their popularity soon ebbed. Their maintenance became burthensome. The people of Strassburg were wearied by the 9000 who had visited their city in three months. Now the clergy could speak out. In six months the excitement had died in S. In France the King and University denounced the movement. The bull of Clem. VI.,

Oct. 20, 1349, ordered its suppression. — Some *Crypto-flagellants* appeared in Thuringia early in the 15th cent., but they were soon checked. The last trace of them in Germany is met with in the trial of a flagellant in Anhalt, in 1481.

Of another character were the societies which appeared, c. 1395, in Italy, France, and Spain, whose obscure origin is also referred to a special command of God. It was said that Christ and Mary appeared to a peasant, and revealed Christ's purpose to destroy the world, but delayed to do so at Mary's intercession. The peasant asked how the evil might be averted, and was told by instituting flagellant-processions. They were to march around for nine days, veiled in white linen, and during that time neither fully clothe themselves, nor sleep on enclosed ground, nor enter a house. They were daily to visit three churches, to hear one mass, to fast, go barefooted, and sing the *stabat mater*, and other hymns. The sins of all places they should enter, would be forgiven. Accordingly, in 1398, large companies of such penitents sprung up in Genoa, and the vicinity, scourging themselves. Priests and bishops joined them; whoever refused was suspected of heresy. But when they reached Rome, and Boniface IX., 1399, ordered one of the leaders to be executed, the fanaticism soon disappeared. It is possible that *Ferrer* (see Art.) participated in this movement. — In France the penitent fraternities of the 16th cent. also practised scourging. Henry III. used them for political purposes; Henry IV. prohibited them. They continued, however, in South France to recent times. — (See FÜRSTEMANN, d. chr. Geisslergeseselsch.: Halle, 1828. Also Bd. I., d. Bibliothek d. liter. Vereins in Stuttgart, 1842).

HERZOG.*

Flavian, *Patriarch of Antioch*, near the close of the 4th cent., sprang from one of the first families of Antioch, and, as a layman even, was one of the most zealous opponents of Arianism. In connection with his countryman Diodorus (B. of Tarsus), he withstood the spread of that heresy, and even compelled Bishop Leontius to depose Aetius (see Art.). When Meletius, the Patriarch, was banished by Valens for his orthodoxy, Flavian and Diodorus, previously ordained priests, remained in Antioch in charge of the shepherdless flocks. — About the close of 381 Flavian was chosen Bishop. He had accompanied Meletius (who had returned to Antioch under Julian) to the Council at Constantinople, where M. presided — and died. The orthodox party in Antioch had long been divided among themselves — one party recognised Meletius, another Paulinus, as Bishop. To settle this it was agreed that whichever survived the other should be acknowledged by both parties. But upon M.'s death his party elected Flavian. His election was confirmed by the Synod of Bishops at Constantinople, despite the opposition of Gregory of Nazianzen. The Western Bishops, however, led by Damasus of Rome, declared in favor of Paulinus, and refused all fellowship with Flavian. This not only perpetuated the schism in Antioch, but widened the breach between the Eastern and Western churches. Flavian was accused of perjury (Soz., *H. E.*, VII.,

1, 15; Socr., *H. E.*, V., 15); but Paulinus ever seconded this charge. Paulinus, however, maintained his position until his death, and even nominated *Evagrius* his successor. But Flavian by his prudence, succeeded in preventing the appointment of a successor to Evarius, and in 398 was acknowledged by Innocent I. of Rome. The schism in Antioch, however, was not completely healed until after F.'s death in 404. — In 388 F. rendered Antioch an important service by going to Constantinople and averting the Emperor's displeasure, occasioned by an insurrection in Antioch. His address is said to have moved the Emperor to tears. — F.'s treatment of the *Messalians* (see Art.) cannot be commended. S.*

Flavian, successor (447) of Proclus as B. of Constantinople, at once showed himself a brave and upright man by opposing the wishes of the powerful favorite of Theodosius II. At the first Synod (particular) of Constantinople at which he presided (Nov. 8, 448), at which complaints were made against certain bishops by their metropolitan Florentinus, of Sardis, Flavian permitted Eusebius of Dorylæum, as the representative of the Christology of Antioch, to accuse Eutyches (see Art.). Eutyches was deposed, but Dioscurus, of Alexandria, received him into church fellowship, and thus became F.'s opponent. Leo of Rome, also, wrote to F. expressing his dissatisfaction at not having been consulted in regard to the deposition of Eutyches; he likewise complained to the Emperor of F.'s neglect. Meanwhile the party of Dioscurus seems to have excited suspicion at court against the Synod, and awakened some sympathy for Eutyches. F. was required to draw up a statement of his belief for comparison with the views of Eutyches. He felt himself compelled also to write to Leo of Rome, to whom he sent the proceedings of the Synod. In a second letter (March, 449) to Leo, after stating again the errors of Eutyches, he informed him that the Emperor was taking sides with E., and begged his approval of E.'s deposition, since the restoration of peace depended upon his decision. Leo, flattered by this implied recognition of his ecclesiastical precedence, now saw the heresy in Eutychianism (see Art.), and approved of its condemnation in a letter of June 13, 449. A general Council (the Robber Synod) was convoked in Ephesus (see Art.), at which Flavian was accused of being an agitator, and on his protesting against the decisions of the Synod was so violently maltreated that he died in consequence, if not in three days, at least during the following year. But his memory was soon avenged. Marcian (450) changed the theology of the court. Flavian's remains were brought to Constantinople and deposited with great solemnities in the Church of the Apostles, and his name was enrolled among the saints. — (BARON., *Martyrol. rom.*, Feb. 18. *Acta Sanct.*, T. III., Feb. 3). S.*

Flesh, as a biblical term, occurs in various senses both in the O. and N. T. In the former it is used exclusively in a *physical* and *metaphysical* sense; in the latter in an *ethical* sense, specially by St. Paul. — In the O. T. it designates, primarily, the literal flesh of beasts and

men (Gen. 2 : 21, &c. &c.), and is then extended to the entire body (Ps. 16 : 9, &c.), in distinction from the heart or soul, but still of the living body (Levit. 17 : 11; Job 12 : 10). Hence it is used of all living creatures that have flesh (Gen. 6 : 12, 13), and often involves the idea of perishableness, weakness. Thus it occurs as a predicate, particularly in contrasting the weakness of the creature with the strength of God, or of the spirit (2 Chron. 32 : 8; Is. 31 : 3, &c.; comp. Gen. 6 : 3). — The softness of the flesh (compared with the bones) is applied figuratively to the heart (Ezek. 11 : 19). — When the phrase, "my flesh" designates relationship (Judges 9 : 2, &c.), the sense is derived from the bodily relationship existing between members of the same family, tribe, or nation. — This O. T. use of the term is found, with various modifications, in the N. T. As a designation of the body, the outward manifestation of man's life, the term is readily used to express *external appearances* in general, in antithesis to what is inward and spiritual; outward circumstances, &c., in contrast with inner truth and reality (John 8 : 15; Philip 3 : 3, &c.; 2 Cor. 5 : 16, &c.; Rom. 4 : 1). — In instances referring to "works" (as Rom. 4 : 1, &c.) the *ethical* idea occurs; for in these "flesh" designates the moral impotence of man when left to himself, his inability to act in a way acceptable to God (comp. Rom. 6 : 19; Matt. 16 : 17; 26 : 41). This weakness is to be traced to the dwelling of *sin* in the flesh (Rom. 7 : 17, 18, 20), which has caused enmity between man and God, and even set man against himself (Rom. 7 : 7-25; 8 : 3). Hence "to be in the flesh" denotes such an activity of sinful affections (*παθήματα ἀμαρτιῶν*) in the human organism (*ἐν τοῖς μέλεσιν*) as brings fruit unto death (Rom. 7 : 5; 8 : 8, 9). So "to live after the flesh," &c., is to live in sin; carnal-mindedness is enmity against God (Rom. 7 : 12; 8 : 4, 5, 7, 12). Fleshly wisdom is a perverted, ungodly wisdom (1 Cor. 1 : 19-26). Thus, also, of fleshly boasting, striving, &c. (2 Cor. 1 : 17; 10 : 2; 11 : 18). The lust, the will, the works of the flesh, are all set in opposition to holiness (Gal. 5 : 16, &c.; Eph. 2 : 3). To "sow to the flesh" is opposed, in like manner, to "sowing to the Spirit" (Gal. 6 : 8). To "crucify the flesh," and "mortify the deeds of the body," is the proper work of the Christian, carried on by the help of the Spirit dwelling in him (Gal. 5 : 25; Rom. 8 : 13). — *St. John's* use of the term corresponds with Paul's (1 John 2 : 16). But both use it, also, to designate the physical nature of man, without including the idea of enmity to the will or Spirit of God (Rom. 1 : 3; 9 : 5; 1 Tim. 3 : 16; 1 John 4 : 2; John 1 : 14). — Thus we see how the import of the word was extended from its original, narrower, physical sense, to a metaphysical and then a deep ethical signification. But there is nothing in the biblical uses of the term to justify the opinion that *the flesh* (*σὰρξ*) is in itself evil, or necessarily productive of sin. It is the body in its living animate state, hence as including the soul; or it is the organism of the outer and inner senses, which, by virtue of its union with the Spirit, comprehends in itself the faculties of the soul, with their functions, and which, in its normal

condition, is wholly under the control of the spirit, insofar as this holds proper communion with God, from whom it springs, and is controlled by God. But sin, which interrupted this communion of the spirit with God, also broke the power of the spirit over the flesh. The physical-corporeal life of man, with its centre, I, departed from the life of God, and isolated itself; and being no longer sustained, and attracted by the powers of the world above, is drawn downwards, its tendency becomes earthly, worldly, and all its functions partake of this character. The spirit, under the influence of divine Revelation, attempts to regain its dominion, but fails. As an approving or condemning conscience it may sometimes prevail, but it cannot succeed in bringing the flesh truly to deny self and the world, and place itself under the control of divine love. All man's intellectual and affectional functions are impotent of good, and wholly perverted. And it is only by an immediate act of God, by which the flesh, withdrawn from its connection with the development of sin, is made the organ of the pattern man who has entered into historical union with humanity, that the original, right, relation between the flesh and the spirit, may be restored in man, the lost power regained, and the flesh brought back to its normal condition (the Word, became flesh, dwelt among us, full of grace and truth).

The origin of sin in man, therefore, can neither be found in the human spirit nor in the flesh, but in the heart, the centre of man's personality, where all influences, divine and ungodly or satanical, meet, and where a personal decision for the one or the other is made. If the heart yield to satanic influences, so as to doubt the truth of God, his love or his goodness, —and allow self to be exalted above God (Gen. 3), all loving communion between God and man is destroyed. Then the inner man loses its control over the physical-bodily life (the σὰρξ). This life in all its functions (its thinking, desiring, willing) becomes inimical to the divine government, becomes sinful; and this sinfulness, originating thus in the heart, consists in a perversion of man's personality, in an independence and self-willedness of the I, both in reference to God, the absolute personality, and to his fellow-men. Thus the individual self is made the centre and end of all things, and assumes a position of hostility to whatever opposes it. But along with this, the individual also falls under captivity to earthly things, over which he should rule, and becomes subject to carnal appetites and passions. That both egotism and sensual passions have their seat in the σὰρξ, and impress their peculiar character upon its functions is clear from Gal. 5 : 13, 19, &c. ; 2 : 20 ; Rom. 14 : 7, &c. ; 15 : 1, 2 ; 2 Cor. 5 : 15, &c. —Which of the two is chiefly meant, must be determined, in each case, by the connection, and on examination it will be found that sometimes both are taken together, sometimes one or the other predominates, or is exclusively meant. —It may be important to add one more remark. On the one hand it is easy to suppose that man was more readily exposed to temptation, with his physical-bodily organism (flesh), because his

manifold dependence through the flesh was in such strong contrast with his consciousness of possessing the image of God. On the other hand, however, we find in this very dependence a limitation to sin in man, which restrains him from demoniacal wickedness, and renders him susceptible of redemption. In this view, also, we see the significance of the fact that the flesh was chosen as the organ for the redemptive revelation and communication of God the Son. — (See THOLUCK, Theol. Stud. u. Krit., 1855, 3. STIRM, Tüb. Ztschr., 1834. NEANDER'S Planting and training, &c. SCHMID, Bibl. Theol. d. N. T. II., 264, &c. ROTHE, Ethik II., 183. J. MÜLLER, Doctrine of Sin. HOFMANN, d. Schriftbeweis, I., 470. BECK, Umriss d. bibl. Seelenlehre, p. 17, &c. ; d. chr. Lehrwissenschaft, 276, &c. DR. MEYER, Exeget. Handb.).

KLING.*

Flesh, the eating of, among the Hebrews. — Animal food has always been prized by the Israelites. The patriarchs, who led a pastoral life, like the modern Bedouins, by no means confined themselves, like these, to sour milk, dates, unleavened bread, but frequently slew of their flocks. In Genesis man is described as having received authority over animals, to use them not only for labor but for food; and the law of Moses even required the eating of flesh. Only the more wealthy, of course, could freely indulge in such diet (cfr. 1 Kings 4 : 22, 23 ; Neh. 5 : 18) ; but the promised land was so well adapted to pasturage, that it was rich in herds and flocks, and afforded abundant supplies for religious uses. Game and fish were also plenty, and were highly esteemed. — The use of animal food, however, was subject to the following limitations: — 1) the flesh of all unclean animals was forbidden (Levit. 11 : 1-31, 46, &c. ; Deut. 14 : 1-19). The reason of this prohibition is found in sanitary considerations, in agricultural circumstances, in relations sustained to surrounding heathen nations and their consecration of certain animals to idols, and in a natural aversion to certain animals. — 2) The flesh of all strangled animals, their blood, their fat, and the flesh of animals offered to idols (Levit. 22 : 30 ; Levit. 17 : 15 ; Deut. 14 : 21 ; Ezek. 4 : 14) ; also the flesh of animals touched by the carcass of strangled or torn beasts. The penalty of eating flesh with the blood in it, or fat pieces, was extreme (Levit. 3 : 14-17 ; 7 : 25, &c. ; 17 : 10-14 ; Deut. 12 : 16, 23 ; Ezek. 33 : 25 ; 1 Sam. 14 : 32, &c.). — 3) According to Gen. 32 : 32, the Jews do not to this day eat the sinew of the thigh, although the law is silent in reference to this point. Ex. 23 : 19 ; 34 : 26 ; Deut. 14 : 21, forbid the seething of a kid in its mother's milk ; but the Rabbins have interpreted this to imply a prohibition of the use of any milk with flesh, lest the law might be inadvertently violated ; indeed they have gone so far as to enjoin the use of different vessels for milk and flesh. This is daily practised in Israelitish families.

W. PRESSEL.*

Fleury, Claude, (born Dec. 6, 1640, in Paris ; † July 14, 1723), the talented son of a Rouen advocate, received a thorough education at the renowned Jesuit College at Clermont. Aesthetics, history, and jurisprudence were his favorite

studies. At 18 he became a counsellor of the Parliament, and for nine years continued in the profession. But he was destined for the clerical office. After taking priest's orders he became (1672) tutor of the princes of Conti, the playmates of the Dauphin; then the Duke of Vermandois, a natural son of Louis XIV.; the Duke died in 1683. Louis XIV. then gave F. the Cistercian abbey of Loc-Dieu. In 1689 he was appointed *Sous-Précepteur* of the Dukes of Burgundy, Anjou, and Berry. In 1696 he was chosen a member of the Academy. After completing the education of the princes, the King gave him the Abbey of Argenteuil, which, however, he did not keep. Thenceforward he devoted himself wholly to literature. After the death of Louis XIV., he was recalled to the court as confessor to the young King. The prince is said to have declared to F.: "I choose you because you are neither a Jansenist, nor a Molinist, nor an Ultramontanist." In 1722 he resigned this office, on account of old age. Lemaitre de Claville says, "No man was more learned or simple, more humble or exalted. He was kind, affable, true, even doing more than he thought himself capable of doing. He ever spoke courteously, ever acted virtuously."—As a writer he produced several able works: *Catéchisme historique*: Paris, 1679; "Manners of the Israelites," 1681; "Manners of the Christians," 1682; *Histoire eccles.*, 20 vols., coming down to 1414, written, as he says in the preface, for intelligent laymen, and in vindication of Christianity. He considered Ch. Hist. the history of true philosophy; and regarded the first six centuries as the happiest period of the Church.—In his canon law he vindicates episcopal authority. As early as 1682, at the Synod of Paris, he zealously defended the liberty of the Church.—His Ch. Hist. has been both unduly praised and condemned. He left behind in MS. a sketch of Eccl. Hist. from 1414–1517. After his death was publ. his *Discours sur les libertés de l'Eglise gallicane*.—(See REICHLIN MELDEGG, *Gesch. d. Christenth.*; DUPIN, *nouvelle biblioth.*, Vol. 18).

DR. PRESSEL.*

Fleury, a city with a renowned Abbey, *Floriacum*, or St. Benedict, on the right bank of the Loire, near Sully, in the diocese of Orleans. The monastery was founded by Leodebod, abbot of St. Anian, 638–657, under Chlodwig II. The monks lived under the rule of St. Benedict; the first abbot was Mummolus, who had the relics of St. B. brought from Monte Cassino to Fleury (653). These relics made F., as Leo VII. says: *caput ac primas omnium cœnobiorum*. Many rare wonders were wrought by them, the account of which filled 4 vols. (cfr. *Floriacensis vetus bibliotheca Benedictina*, etc., Op. Joannis a Bosco: Lugd., 1605). The reputation of F. was increased by a "*hospitale nobilium*" and a "*h. pauperum*," erected by Louis the Pious, by the addition of relics from St. Denis, and by an annual festival in honor of St. D., and one of St. B., Dec. 4, which was celebrated throughout France. At the invasion of the Normans the monks fled from F., taking with them their wealth, and the relics of St. B.; the empty cloister was burnt down by the barbarians. In 878 the Normans again marched against F., but

were defeated by the brave abbot Hugo. They subsequently made a third attempt. Reinald entered the cloister, and lodged there; but during the night St. B. revealed to him in a dream that he would soon die under fearful circumstances. The prediction was verified, and thenceforward the Normans feared St. B. above all the saints of France. Meanwhile the monks of F., grown rich and powerful, had cast off the earlier piety of the monastery, and many irregularities were practised. Count Elisiard, deploring this state of things, obtained authority from King Raul to restore the discipline of F. Elisiard took Odo, two other counts and two bishops with him. But the monks resisted. After three days ineffectual conference, Odo rode quite alone up to the monastery, and so astonished the monks by his bravery, that they cast away their arms and fell penitently at his feet. Odo remained some time at F., and soon restored such order there that the monks of F. were invited not only to different parts of France, but to England, as moral reformers and instructors. The school of the monastery became one of the most renowned, numbering at times 5000 pupils, each of whom, on leaving, gave the library (which the monks zealously sought to improve) two MSS. The celebrity of this school was owing mainly to Abbo (see *Art.*). But F. produced few authors. Its extensive collection of MSS. was greatly reduced by the religious wars. After these F. could not regain its ancient glory, and became annexed to the congregation of St. Maurus, one of the most faithful disciples of St. Benedict. The Fleurensians must be distinguished from the *Floriacensians* (see *Art.*).

DR. PRESSEL.*

Flodoard, or *Frodoard*, a presbyter and canon of the See of Rheims, was variously implicated in the events of the diocese for a time, lost his office, and even his liberty, in consequence of devotion to his Archb., was twice chosen bishop, but in vain, and died in 966. He was one of the best chroniclers of the history of his own and antecedent times. His *Chronica* for 919–966 are sources for the history of France, Italy, and Germany. His *Hist. eccl. Rhemensis* is remarkably accurate, though somewhat partisan. The *Chronica* may be found in DUCHESNE, *Scriptor. vet. hist. Normann.*, II., 590–622. The *Hist. eccl. R.* was first published by SIRMOND: Paris, 1611, 8vo.; then by PITHOËUS, in *Script. XII., cœtaneis*. II., 109, sq.—(See FABRICII, *Bibl. med. et inf. latinit. s. v.* SCHRÖCKH, *K.-gesch.*, XXI., 154).

HUNDESHAGEN.*

Florentius, a name frequently met with in the middle ages, especially in Martyrologies. One of them was Bishop of Vienne, and is said to have suffered martyrdom in 258; his anniversary is Jan. 3. Another suffered in 259, in Numidia; his anniversary is April 30. Another perished under Decius, and is commemorated in Perugia, June 1. Another, St. F., commemorated in Sevilla, Feb. 23, suffered there in 485. An African Bishop of this name, a zealous opponent of Arianism, was banished, c. 500, by Hunnerich to Corsica, whence he went to Trevigo in Italy, and there died. Another came to Elsass, after 650, and succeeded Arbogast as B. of Strassburg, 663, where he died in 675. An

English abbot, F. wrote the life of St. Joyce, son of an English King, and martyr of the 7th cent. Another, presbyter at Aouste in the Dauphiny, wrote the life of St. Rusticula or Marcia († 632). — More distinguished than any of these, is the English Chronicler F. surnamed *Bavonius*, a monk of Worcester, who improved the work of Marianus Scotus by various additions, bringing it down to 1118, when F. died. It was published in London, 1592, 4to.; a transl. with notes has been published in *Bohn's Antiquarian series*, London. — (See PERTZ, *Monum. Germ.*, VII., 495, &c. LAPPENBERG, *Gesch. v. England*, I., 58, &c.; II., 210, 294).

DR. PRESSEL.*

Florensiensians, or the order of Flore, also called *Floriensians*, *Floriacensians*. The founder of this congregation was Joachim, the prophet, abbot of Flora or Floris in Calabria (born 1111 or 1130; † 1202). After leaving school the talented youth, in his 14th year, was placed at the court of Roger II., of Naples. He soon grew weary of the vanities of the world, and went to Palestine, against his father's will. On his way he was about to repent of his purpose, but at Constantinople was so terrified by the prevalence of the plague that he renounced the world, changed his costly garments for a hermit's garb, and proceeded barefoot on his journey. Having reached Palestine, he passed the whole of Lent on Mt. Tabor, in devout meditations. For this, it is said, God rewarded him on Easter with the knowledge of all sciences, and the darkest mysteries of the Bible. But this seems to be in conflict with the condemnation of his work against the *Magister Sententiarum*, by the Lateran Council of 1215; though this sentence was only against his writings. — Having returned to Calabria, he remained for some time in the monastery Sambuca, as janitor, and then went to Corazzo, and joined the Cistercians. After the death of their abbot he was chosen prior. After three years (1183) he retired to a desert, and there wrote some of his works. Meanwhile two or three of his pupils joined him, and he went with them to Flore, where they built small huts. The number of followers increasing, he laid the foundation of the renowned monastery, Flore, which rapidly gathered members. Joachim drew up rules which Coelestine III. confirmed. It was enriched by large gifts. Affiliated monasteries were founded in Naples, and both Calabrias. Still the order was opposed on account of the suspected heresy of Joachim. Hence J. drew up (1200) a declaration of his faith, in which he enumerated his writings, apologized for the haste with which he had composed them, requested his followers to submit all to the judgment of the Pope, and declared that he condemned whatever in them was contrary to the Romish faith. He died March 30, 1202, in his monastery, St. Martin de Canale. Some years later his remains were removed to Flore, and many wonders were said to be wrought at his grave. His successor, *Mathæus*, was in such favor with the Pope that in 1224 the See of Cerenza was bestowed on him. In a short time the order had 34 monasteries, including nunneries, the chief that at St. Helena near Amalfi.

All recognized the abbot of Flore as their general. In 1227 Greg. IX. commanded the Cistercians to forbid the Florensiensians passing over to them, the rules of the F. being more strict. This excited the envy of the former, who, thenceforth, did not rest until the F. were dissolved. Still Flore was upheld as long as regular abbots ruled it. But after 1470 it fell into the hands of worldly men, and speedily declined. In 1505 most of the affiliated monasteries in Calabria and Basilicata passed over to the Cistercians; others were incorporated with the Carthusians and Dominicans. Flore itself united with the congregation of Calabria. — The Florensiensians wore a coarse white dress, similar in form to that of the Cistercians. They went barefoot. — (See HELYOT, *Klosterorden*, V., 454–464).

DR. PRESSEL.*

Fontevraux, order of (*Ordo fontis Ebraudi*), founded c. 1047, by a man of humble origin, Robert of Arbrissel (now Arbresec), in the forest of Craon. Fontevraux became the seat of the chief monastery. There were departments for men and women. Silence was one of the first rules. The order rapidly increased. At Robert's death (1125) there were 3000 nuns in F. alone, and in 1150, 5000. F. became a favorite of several English kings, of the house of Plantagenet, some of whom were buried there. The order never spread much, however, beyond France. The last abbess died at Paris in 1799, in great poverty. The French revolution abolished the order, and turned the monastery of F. into a prison; as such it is still used.

DR. PRESSEL.*

Foot-washing. — The use of sandals, the character of the climate, social custom, and religious purifications, tended to promote the Oriental washing of the feet. It was an act of hospitality, and a proof of respect for strangers (Gen. 18 : 4; 19 : 2; 1 Sam. 25 : 41). Hence the reproof of Simon (Luke 7 : 38–44). — At the last supper of our Lord with his disciples, he washed their feet (John 13 : 4, &c.). This was a *symbol* and *example*. *Symbolically* he desired to show them : 1) that only they who permitted the Lamb of God to cleanse them of their sins, had part in him; 2) that whoever were once purified in his blood, needed only to have their feet washed, but these repeatedly, as long as they wandered in this filthy world. Those once justified would continually need forgiveness unto sanctification. — The fact that Jesus performed this symbolical act in connection with the institution of the Supper, readily suggests that the "often" applied to the one, should be likewise associated with the other. At the same time the *example* of humility thus set by the Saviour, should be remembered afresh at every holy communion. His followers should anew imbibe the spirit of a fraternal willingness to perform the meanest service for each other. — It could hardly fail that in post-apostolic times (1 Tim. 5 : 10 refers only to an act of hospitality), not merely the *spirit*, but *form* of the Saviour's act, would be perpetuated as a command to be literally observed (see BINGHAM, *Ant.*, IV., 394). Augustine attests the existence of the rite (*Ep.* 118, ad Jan.), and also the uncertainty of the day of its observance. The Synod of Toledo, 694, c

fixed Thursday the 14th of Nisan, as that on which it was instituted by Christ. The Greek considered foot-washing a sacrament. Bernard of Clairvaux urged its observance as *sacramentum remissionis peccatorum quotidianorum*. But the rite never became a general, eccl. service. At the seats of princes and bishops it was often observed during the middle ages. In Greek monasteries, and at the imperial court of Russia it is still performed with great solemnity (LEO ALLAT., *de dom. et hebdom. græc.*, 21). In the Vatican, at the courts of Vienna, Munich, Madrid, Lisbon (Paris), in Rom. cathedrals and monasteries, the rite is also still performed by the Pope, Emperor, King, and prior, usually upon 12 poor old men, who then receive a small gift, or upon 12 secular and regular clergy. In Rome these representatives of the Apostles wear white woollen cowls, and sit in the Clementine chapel; the Pope also wearing a single whiteunic, sprinkles a few drops of water upon the right foot of each one, wipes it and kisses it. At the commencement of the ceremony the antiphony *mandatum novum de vobis* is sung; hence the rite (*pedilavium*) is also called *mandatum*. After the ceremony the 12 go and take a supper in St. Paul's church, at which the Pope, assisted by his chamberlains, serves them. After the meal the honored guests take all the articles used, with the fragments left, along with them excepting the silver cups used for drinking).—At the Reformation the proper conception of this rite was revived. Instead of a formal and hypocritical act of humiliation, the duty of imitating the true import of the example was urged. —The Anglican C. at first held to a literal observance of the rite, and instead of it, as many poor men and women as there were years in the king's reign, were furnished with garments, and pieces of money, in the chapel near Whitehall. —The Anabaptists insisted upon the strict observance of the rite, as literally enjoined. Among the Anabaptists in the United States, "the Church of God" (Winebrennarians), Mennoites, and River Brethren practice foot-washing. The United Brethren in Christ leave its observance optional with individual members.—(See ALT., *d. chr. Cultus*, 1851). M. MERZ.*

Formosus, Pope, successor of Stephan V. (or VI.), had filled important eccl. offices prior to his election. Under John VIII. he was excommunicated for participation in a conspiracy against Charles the Bald and the Pope, and to obtain peace he had to swear that he would never again enter Rome, nor arrogate the episcopal dignity, but rest content with lay privileges. In 883, however, Pope Martin released him of this oath, declared him innocent, and restored him to the See of Porto. The wave of political partizanism which had caused his fall, now raised him to the papal chair (891). *Serius* was chosen antipope, but could not maintain his ground. —Soon after his elevation ambassadors came from Constantinople to settle the disputes which arose out of the excommunication of the clergy ordained by the Patriarch Photius. But their mission was fruitless. The breach between the Eastern and Western churches widened. —F.'s entire reign was one of political agitations. He died in 896. S.*

Fortifications and sieges among the Hebrews. Although all ancient Hebrew towns, in distinction from villages, were more or less fortified, walled (1 Sam. 6 : 18), proper military fortifications are to be distinguished from these ordinary means of defence (2 Chron. 8 : 5; Ps. 31 : 22; 60 : 11). In the stricter sense Jerusalem was among the chief fortified cities of Palestine, and David continued to his death to strengthen its works (2 Sam. 5 : 7, 9; 2 Chron. 32 : 5). But Solomon fortified other places (1 Kings 9 : 15, 17, &c., &c.), and others were subsequently built, as circumstances required them, as at Ramah, Geba (1 Kings 15 : 17, 22; 2 Chron. 11 : 5, &c.), especially after the exile (1 Macc. 1 : 33; 4 : 60, &c. Jos. *Ant.*, 13, 16, 3; 14, 3, 4).—These fortified places were at first surrounded by one or more walls, very thick, surmounted with engines (2 Chron. 26 : 15, &c.), and towers (Ezek. 26 : 4; 27 : 11, &c.). Over the gates, which were overlaid with brass and iron, and barred with metal bolts (Is. 45 : 2; HEBOD., 1, 179; Deut. 3 : 5, &c.), were raised watchtowers (2 Sam. 18 : 24, 33; 2 Kings 9 : 17, &c.); the walls were also surrounded with trenches, and mounds (2 Sam. 20 : 15; Is. 26 : 1, &c.).—In addition to these general fortifications, there were separate towers and citadels, as Millo, Antonio, in Jerusalem (see Art. and Judges 8 : 9, &c.), forts (1 Chron. 11 : 7; Jer. 48 : 41, &c.), and watchtowers in forests and in the open fields (2 Kings 17 : 9; 18 : 8, &c.). Caves and cliffs were also used for military purposes (Judges 6 : 2; 1 Sam. 13 : 6; Jos. *Ant.*, 14, 6, 2).—If such a fortified town refused, in war, to surrender when summoned, a regular siege was commenced (Deut. 20 : 10; 2 Kings 18 : 17, &c.; Ezek. 4 : 2, 7, &c.). First a line of circumvallation was formed of wood, or piles, to cut off all access to the town (Deut. 20 : 20; Micah 4 : 14). Movable towers, were also used (2 Kings 25 : 1; Jer. 52 : 4; Ezek. 4 : 2; 17 : 17). On this basis of operation the enemy attempted to approach nearer to the fortifications, raising at each point higher mounds (2 Sam. 20 : 15, &c.). If possible the supplies of water were cut off (hence 2 Chron. 32 : 2, &c.). As soon as the walls were reached, battering rams and other engines were brought against them, to force openings (Ezek. 21 : 27, &c.; Jos. *B. J.*, 3, 7, 19; Jer. 33 : 4, &c.); or the walls were undermined (cf. LXX., Jer. 51 : 58; Jos. *B. J.*, 2, 17, 8); or attempts were made to fire the towers. At length the walls were scaled with ladders. Meanwhile the besieged used all means to drive the enemy away, either by building the walls higher, by raising new ones, by making sallies from the gates, and setting fire to the enemy's works, by hurling javelins, stones, and beams at them, pouring boiling oil upon them, &c. (Is. 22 : 10; 1 Macc. 6 : 31; 2 Sam. 11 : 21, &c.; Jos. *B. J.*, 3, 7, 28; 2 Chron. 26 : 15). The siege of well-defended cities lasted, sometimes, many years (see *Ashdod*, 2 Kings 17 : 5; 25 : 1, &c.). The besieged were often reduced to the last extremities of hunger (2 Kings 6 : 25; 18 : 27; Lam. 4 : 10; Jos. *Ant.*, 13, 10, 2; *B. J.*, 5, 10, 3).—In a siege the Israelites were required to spare fruit-trees (Deut. 20 : 19, &c.; cf. 2 Kings 3 : 25). Towns taken by

were demolished, rased, and the ground strewn over with salt, and thus devoted to perpetual barrenness (Judges 9:45, &c.). Its inhabitants were put to death, or led off as slaves (2 Macc. 5:13, &c.). Towns which capitulated were treated less severely (Deut. 20:11, &c.). Fortifications which have never been taken are appropriately called "virgins" by the Orientals. The Chaldeans were celebrated as besiegers (Is. 23:13; Hab. 1:10).—(See LAYARD'S *Nineveh*. BOTTA u. FLANDIN, I., 49, 52, 55, 68, 69, 70, 77; II., 85, 86, 89, 90, &c. PAULY'S *Real-encycl.*, I., 1050, &c.). RÜRSCHL.*

Fortunatus, Venantius, Honorius Clementianus, Bishop of Poitiers, an author of some reputation for his age, was born near Ceneda, in northern Italy. At Ravenna he devoted himself to grammar, rhetoric, poetry, and jurisprudence—but gave special attention to elocution and poetry—hence his surname "Scholasticissimus." From Italy he went, for unknown reasons, to France, where he soon gained favor as a poet, at the court of Sigbert, King of Austrasia. At Poitiers he found patronesses in Queen Radegunde, and her sister, Agnes, abbess of the convent there. He took priest's orders, and became their confessor. Meanwhile he zealously prosecuted philosophical and theological studies, sustained intimate relations with Gregory of Tours, and other eccl. dignitaries, to whom Radegunde had warmly commended him. In 599 he was chosen B. of Poitiers; he died c. 609. The church of Poitiers observes Dec. 14 as his anniversary.—Among his works we mention: eleven books of poetry; hymns, some of which are used in churches; letters; small poems upon his patronesses; the life of St. Martin, an epic poem; an exposition of the Lord's prayer,—his best production; numerous biographies of saints, &c.—A careful, but not complete edition of his works was published by the Jesuit, Chr. Brower, 4to.: Fulda, 1603; 2d ed., Mayence, 1617, which is followed in the 3d vol. of *Magna Biblioth. Patr. Lugdunum*, 1677. The best ed. of his works is that of the Benedictine M. A. Luschy: Rome, 1785, 2 vols. 4to.—(See *Biogr. univers.*, Paris, Michaud, T. 15). S.*

Fortunatus, Patriarch of Grado, Istria.—In consequence of the political relations of Istria to the East Roman empire, and that of Charlemagne, his position was a difficult one. Having become involved in these relations (whether innocently or not we are not told) he spent the greater part of his patriarchate in agitations, and away from his See in the home-province of Charlemagne, whose party he had joined in opposition to the court of Constantinople. After some time he returned to Grado; but on the approach of a Greek army he fled. He had hardly regained his chair, when he was accused before Louis the Pious (821). He again fled, and fell into the hands of the Emperor Michael. In 824 he returned, and was sent by Louis, before whom he personally appeared, to the Pope, to have his case investigated. Soon after this he died among the Franks. S.*

Forum Appii, Ἀππίου φόρον, Acts 28:15, a place in the midst of the Pontine marshes, founded by Appius Claudius. It is near the modern St. Donatus. On account of the bad

water, and the immoralities of the sailors, the place was in evil repute. Horace says of it (*Sat.* I., 5, 4): *Forum Appii differtum nautis, campibus atque malignis*. Hence travellers usually hastened through it to put up at the "Three Taverns" (CICERO, *Att.* 2, 10), situated on the Appian way, some 10 miles nearer Rome. There are said to be remains of the *taberna decursoria* still there. It was there that Paul was met by his brethren from Rome. DR. PRESSER.*

Fragments, the Wolfenbüttel, were treatises published by Lessing during the last century, which set all the theologians of Europe in commotion. It has been satisfactorily proven that the author of these MSS. was Hermann Samuel Reimarus, then a professor in Hamburg. They were to be entitled: "Apologie oder Schutzschrift für die vernünftigen Verehrer Gottes." The author seems to have been aware of the injury his work might do, and kept it concealed. It was thought, however, that if any fanatics should attempt to foist the errors of Popery upon mankind, these papers should be published.—The MS. in the Hamburg city library consists of two large quarto volumes of 972 and 1072 pages, exclusive of an extensive register. The chirography is plain and not crowded. The entire work was skeptical in its character, and an assault upon the orthodox faith of the Christian Church. And yet the work possesses value for the history of the theology of the period during which it was composed, 1747–68. On this account part of it was recently published in *Niedner's Zeitschrift*. W. KLOSS.*

Francis (Franciscus) of Assisi, and the order of Franciscans.—**Francesco Bernardone** was born, 1182, in Assisi, of Spoleto. His free and easy life as a youth disappointed the expectations of his father, *Pietro Bernardone*, a rich merchant who expended both pains and money in the education of his son, and, when grown up, made him a partner in business. His ambition, which had hurried him into a war waged by Assisi against Perugia, was considerably cooled by an imprisonment of one year's duration. On his return home a severe sickness despoiled the world of its charms, and in the loneliness of a retreat he invoked the aid of his Maker. At Rome, whither he had made a pilgrimage, while in the act of prayer he heard a voice commanding him to work for the re-establishment of the Divine Kingdom. He forthwith sold some goods belonging to his father, and his own horse, and gave the proceeds to a priest. After his return to Assisi a sermon on Matt. 10:9–10 so powerfully impressed him, that, laying aside shoes, staff, and purse, and putting on, instead of a girdle, a rope, he began to preach repentance. By the year 1210 he numbered eleven followers. It being his object to lift his countrymen out of the mire of sin, he drew up a method of life. His disciples were to preach repentance, not only by word of mouth, but also by the force of example, and, utterly regardless of human respect, to look to God for their reward. Poverty was to be their delight, and, renouncing the comforts of life, they were to depend on alms. Their bodies were to be brought under by fasting. They were to yield implicit obedience to their superiors, and no one was to undertake a mis-

sion to the Saracens and heathen without their consent. To preserve chastity, they were forbidden to speak alone with women. The rigor of their lives was to be softened by the exercises of brotherly love and all Pharisaic moroseness eschewed, whilst a merry, confiding spirit was to reign and rule over them. Special attention was to be shown to the sick. Francis named their society "*Fratres minores*," and placed over it a *minister generalis*, before whom were to appear once a year all the brethren living in Italy, and those beyond the Alps and the sea once in three years. — Having obtained from Pope Innocent III. a verbal authorization of his plans, F. returned to Assisi and devoted himself with his followers to the rigor of an ascetic life. *Clara Sciffi*, distinguished for her beauty and the wealth of her family, now joined his society, and became, 1212, the foundress of the *Order of Clarissima* which gradually extended itself to other countries. The Pope gave them the rule of life drawn up by Benedict; in 1224 they obtained one from Francis, which was confirmed by the Popes, and invested with general authority by Greg. IX. (1253). After her death (1253), Clara was canonized by Alexander IV. — In 1212 F. sent his disciples two-by-two into the different countries of Italy; he himself went to Toscana where Count von Casentius gave him the mountain Alverna; he made disciples in Perugia; established his first cloister in Cortona; whilst in Pisa and other cities monasteries were formed. Having obtained adherents in Florence, he returned to Assisi and sent six brothers to Maraco, who obtained the crown of martyrdom. Resolving to go to Africa (1213), he went through Piedmont to Spain, where a sickness interrupted his journey. Meanwhile the order flourished in Italy. In 1216 convened the first general assembly of the Franciscans, which determined that missionaries should be dispatched to every country. They established cloisters in Lisbon and other places; in France they were welcomed, but made no progress in Germany. — Though as yet unsanctioned in a formal way by the Pope, the order grew amazingly, there having been according to one account (no doubt exaggerated) 5000 brothers present at the general chapter of 1219, which resolved to send missionaries to Spain, Egypt, Africa, Greece, Germany, England, and Hungary. Cäsarius of Spire succeeded in planting the order in that town. Francis went to Ptolemais, where a captive of the Saracens he essayed the conversion of the Sultan and obtained his liberty. Elias, to whom F. had entrusted the management of the order during his absence, having undertaken some alteration in its original rule, F. returned to Italy. — In 1223 followed the formal recognition of the order by Honorius III. Francis died Oct. 4, 1224, at Assisi, and was canonized (1228) by Greg. IX. Twenty-four years after his decease, his society numbered 8000 cloisters and 200,000 monks in 23 provinces. The unprecedented growth of the order was owing in great part to the favors and indulgences the Popes lavished upon it.

While on the mountain Alverna (1224) — so the account runs — with the intention of fasting 40 days, as he was engaged in earnest prayer

on the day of the elevation of the Cross, and meditating on the sufferings of our Saviour, Christ appeared to him as a seraph and impressed upon his body the marks of his wounds. The veneration, accordingly, entertained for his memory waxed stronger and stronger. It is said that Francis himself related this occurrence, that the Franciscan Leo, who frequently bound up the wounds, was present when it happened, and that Pope Alexander IV., the sainted Clara, and many inhabitants of Assisi saw them. Greg. IX. confirmed the truth of these miracles in three bulls, Nicholas III. assented, and Benedict XII. allowed a festival in honor of them. Bartholomäus de Pisis Albrizzi († 1401), an Italian Franciscan, in his *liber conformitatum* points out 40 resemblances between Francis and Christ, and declares that O. T. prophecies spoke of him, that he performed miracles and foretold the future, that he was crucified and placed above the angels.¹

The sun of prosperity, however, began to wilt the fair flowers the order had cultured. It lost the simplicity and humility upon which it was originally based. Matthew Paris, an English Benedictine († 1259), in the second part of his *Hist. of England (historia major, 1243)* narrates that the Dominicans and Franciscans in England erected magnificent buildings, amassed immense wealth, interfered with the wills of the rich and noble, acted for kings as counsellors, chamberlains, treasurers, and orators, adapted their preaching to circumstances, despised the older orders, brought priests into contempt, and recommended themselves as confessors to the great and their wives. Such seems to have been the case in other countries. The commands of Popes Innocent IV. and Alexander IV. opened the way for their elevation as Professors in Universities. Thus, in 1257 the Dominican, Thomas Aquinas, and the Franciscan, Bonaventura, became Doctors of Theol. in the University of Paris (see Art.). The latter though defending his order against the attacks of William of St. Amour, was not blind to the abuses that had crept in, but in several treatises (*de non frequentandis quæstibus cavendisque discursibus*, and *de reformandis fratribus*) sharply rebuked them, and insisted on their removal. The favors which the Popes continued to grant the mendicant orders led to frequent collisions between them and the University. Boniface VIII. (1295 and 1296) freed the Franciscans from the judicial authority of the Bishops; John XXII. and Alexander V. confirmed all their earlier privileges. To obviate the bull issued by the last-mentioned Pope, the University obtained a royal decree which forbade the Franciscans and Augustines the right of preaching and bearing confessions in its churches, and Gerson discoursed against it from the pulpit (1409). And when Eugene IV. released the monks from the observance of important precepts drawn up by the theological faculty of the University, the faculty excluded them altogether (1441). Eugene

¹ Erasmus Alber († 1553) publ. in German an extract from this book, with the title, "*der Barfüßermönche Eulenspiegel oder Alkoran*," and Conr. Badius, of Geneva, 1556, one in French, entitled: *l'Alcoran des Cordeliers*.

having been overpowered by the Basle Synod, was temporarily suspended. — A vain ambition after pre-eminence, in the course of time, engendered disputes between the two mendicant orders. While the Dominicans plumed themselves on a higher antiquity, their pleasing dress and the Apostolic merit of their preachers, the Franciscans boasted of their superior humility and rigor. As regards doctrine, the former claimed to be Nominalists and Augustines, whilst they regarded the latter as Realists and Semipelagians. Besides, the Franciscans advocated the Immaculate Conception of the Virgin Mary, and the Dominicans combatted it. — In addition to these disorders, two parties now contended for the mastery in the Franciscan order. At the head of one stood Elias—the one above-mentioned — a worldly-minded, vindictive man who had previously attempted to soften the severe asceticism of the order, and now that he was called upon by Greg. IX. to erect a new church in honor of St. Francis, ordered contrary to the rule, collections in all the churches of the order. At the head of the other stood Antony, of Padua (see Art.), whose object was to preserve intact the ancient rigor of the order. After experiencing a series of fortunes and misfortunes, the election of Elias as superior by the gen.-chap. of 1236, was confirmed by the Pope. The rigoristic party selected as their superior John of Parent. The princes and prelates acknowledged Elias. The severity with which he, aided by the Pope, treated the adherents of his chief opponent Cæsarius, of Spire, induced Greg. IX. to depose him (1239). The strict party gained the ascendancy in the person of his successor, Albert of Pisa, and with the election of Crescentius de Jesu (1244) E.'s influence was finally destroyed. His party, however, still remained, and Innocent IV. encouraged it by modifying the rule (1245), and decreeing that the Franciscans might possess property providing it was subject to the authority of the papal chair. Even Crescentius, who was deposed 1247, inclined to the milder party. His successor, John of Parma, accused of heresy, voluntarily resigned, and Bonaventura, who favored the rigorists, was chosen. His three successors followed in the footsteps of B., who, though the changes introduced by Innocent III., were confirmed by the Pope, still insisted on the observance of the original rule. — Nicholas III. effected a new modification of the rule. He decreed that the Franciscans were simply bound by the evangelical counsels; that they might use—not actually possess—the Pope being the real owner—whatever was necessary to their support; that they should have nothing superfluous, nor borrow aught; that those who were engaged in study, or in Divine service, should not be obligated to manual labor; and that no Franciscan should preach in a diocese without permission from its bishop, nor any enter a nunnery without leave of the Pope. Against the bull of N. rose up in opposition the rigoristic party, Peter John, of Oliva, at its head, and fought against the mild policy of the superior, Matthias of Aquas Spartas (1287). Banished by the Inquisitor of Naples (1307), its adherents fled to Avignon. — Election to Clemens V. at Avignon. Un-

willing to abide the order of the Pope, who wished to effect a compromise by a conference between both parties, they elected a superior, and Clemens (1314) decided against them. After his death, they endeavored to make themselves independent in France, seized the cloisters Narbonne and Beziers, and simplified their dress. The majority of them succumbed to John XXII.; the refractory were punished, and some of them burned. Against their Tertiaries John XXII. issued a bull in which they are called *fratricelli*, *fratres de paupere vita*, *Bizochi*, *Beguini*, and aimed at the extinction of strife by referring points of difference to the superiors. The obstinacy of the rigorists called forth the power of the Inquisition, and many of them were burnt. — In 1321 the question: Whether Christ and his Apostles owned any property, divided the Franciscans and Dominicans, the former denying and the latter affirming. The Pope invoked the opinion (1322) of the distinguished Ubertinus of Casale, a Franciscan of the strictest sort, who affirmed that the apostles as prelates of the Church had a common treasury for the support of the poor and the servants of the Church, but that as individuals they possessed no worldly goods. Christ and his apostles, however, had by the law of nature what was necessary for their temporal needs, but no superfluities. — A temporary peace ensued, but in 1322 war again broke out. The Franciscans having, at a general chapter in Perugia, given an affirmative answer to the question propounded by the Pope to the prelates and doctors of theology, whether it were heresy obstinately to affirm that Christ and his apostles owned no property either as individuals or as a community, the Pope declared (1322) that it was unorthodox to teach the negative; that they used, sold, presented, and exchanged their goods according to their own good pleasure; that no difference obtained between the *usus facti* and actual property; and forbade the Franciscans to receive *syndicos et procuratores* in the name of the papal chair for the regulation of its revenues. The controversy waxed warm. The superior Michael, of Cesena, appealed from the decision of the Pope. The papal legate in vain attempted his deposition at Bologna (1328). The Gen. Chapter assembled in that city having renewed his election, the Pope deposed him, and he appealed the third time to the Catholic Church and a future Council, declaring that a general Council alone, to which the Pope himself was subject in matters of dogmas, could decide a charge of heresy. In 1329 terminated the bickerings between the F. and the Pope, and the true meaning of the bull of Nich. III., which had also been a bone of contention, was adjusted by a compromise. During the reigns of Benedict XII. and Clemens VI. the division in the order became extinct, and its different parties united in opposition to the Fratricelli and the Beghards who had been excommunicated by the Church. — Within the order itself, however, were now to be found the Observanti and the Conventuals; the former adhering pertinaciously to the rigorism of the ancient rule; the latter inclining to a milder interpretation and use of it.

Of the stricter Franciscan congregations the

Clarenines were the first established: in the district Ancona, 1302-17, by Angelus, a Celestine hermit († 1340). A second (about 1336) by John des Vallées, who built a cloister in the unhealthy Bruliano, near Foligno († 1351). His successor, Gentile of Spoleto, erected four cloisters, and had permission to receive monks and novices. The envious Franciscans accused them of hospitality towards heretics, and Innocent VI. annulled (1355) the bull Clemens VI. had granted in their favor. — Paolucci, of Foligno, aided the foundation of the Observanti, 1368, in the wilderness of Bruliano, the members of which, as they wore wooden sandals (*zoccoli*) were called *Zoccolanti*. His associates practised the most extreme poverty. The energy with which Paol. in a public conference with the Fratricelli, insisted on the duty of obedience to the Pope, induced the inhabitants of Perugia to expel them from their country. The name Observanti was first confirmed by the Synod of Constanz (*fratres de observantia, fratres regularis observantie*)¹ during its ninth session (1415). Between the milder party — Conventuals, and the Observanti, there were frequent collisions. Though Martin V. espoused the cause of the former, yet, influenced (1430) by the celebrated Observ., John of Capistrano, he convened a gen. chap. at Assisi for the purpose of effecting a compromise between them. A reconciliation was brought to pass, and, though the Conv. continued to persecute the Observ., the latter grew in strength so that in the 16th cent. they had nearly 1400 cloisters in fifty-four provinces, and four *custodia* in Palestine. — From the time when Leo X., failing in his design to unite all the Franciscans in one Observance, gave to the milder party the name of Conventuals, there sprang up a marked separation between the two sections of the order. Both had their own superior, called *minister-generalis* among the Observanti, who took precedence of the min.-gen. of the Conventuals. The Convent. gradually lost ground in Spain, Portugal, Germany, France, and Belgium. — The Council of Trent having granted permission to all regular orders (the *fratres minores de observantia* and Capuchins excepted) to possess some property in common, a gen. chap. of Conventuals (1565) obtained a confirmation of their privileges from Pius IV. (1565). The milder policy of many of the Conventuals having rendered the observance of them

¹ At a Gen. Chap. of the order, in Rome, Leo X. gave the Observ. and the different reformed Franciscan congregations, the exclusive right of electing a superior on condition of their assuming the common name of *fratres minores de observantia regulari*. Of this character were the congregation of the above-mentioned Clarenines, that established by Paolucci — called *Saccolanti, Observantini et Cordeliers*; the Minorites of the Ref. of Villacrezes, established at the end of the 14th century; the Colettanerins, by Abbess Nicolette of Corleni, in Picardy; the Amadeists, by Amadeus, a Portuguese; the Neutri, or Neutres, an order standing between the Conventuals and the Observanti, and the Caperolani. — The Spanish Count, Juan de la Puebla († 1493), established a congregation for the strictest observance of the ancient rule. His disciple, John of Guadalupe, founded the society of the "Barefooted;" they wore coats of rough, ash-coloured stuff, cowls of the form of a bishop's mantle, and walked either without shoes, or with wooden or linen sandals.

impossible, Pius V. (1566) revoked their earlier rights, and ordered that no superior should eat outside of the refectory, or own a room besides the dormitory, or dispense the goods of the cloisters, and that no monk should possess any property. — Boniface VIII. (1300), in case bishops refused the mendicant orders the privilege of preaching and hearing confessions in their dioceses, had himself given them the right, and also that of burying in their churches, providing they presented the priests with the fourth part of the income thus obtained. Clement V. (1311) confirmed this. As the people crowded to the indulgenced churches of the M. O., the Synod of Vienne attempted the abrogation of their exemptions, but without success. Urban VI. deprived them of the right (1384) of preaching and hearing confessions at will, and confirmed the prerogatives of bishops and priests. His successors, however, granted them favors. — Among the Franciscans the most influential were the Tertiarii. As many husbands and wives, moved by the preaching of Francis, declared their willingness to leave all and follow him, he advised them to remain true to their domestic obligations and to practise the Christian virtues, and drew up, accordingly, a rule of life for them. Thus originated the so-called third order of St. Francis. The Florentines built a house for women who desired to quit the world and exercise themselves in Christian practices. Their regulations were as follows: — None but faithful Catholics were to be received as members; neither the dissolute; nor any married person without the consent of his partner. One year's novitiate over, a vow was made to keep the Divine commands, never to leave the order except to become monks or nuns, and, three months after their profession, to make a will. Their clothing was to be of coarse cloth, neither quite white nor quite black; forbidden to attend theatres, balls and dances, and commanded to abstain from meat on Monday, Wednesday, and Friday, and to fast from Martin-mass to Christmas, and from Quinquagesima to Easter, also every Friday, except when Christmas came on that day; to prepare but two meals a day (cases of sickness excepted), to say the prescribed prayers, daily to hear mass, to confess on Christmas eve, Easter, and Whitsuntide, to take an oath only in case of necessity, to keep the peace with every man, and to avoid litigation. The *ministri*, or mothers, were to visit the sick, and exhort them to repentance. All were to attend the festival of a departed brother or sister, and the priest to say mass for the soul of the deceased. An annual visitation was to be made, and the incorrigible excommunicated. — Honorius III., Greg. IV., and Nich. IV. (1289) sanctioned this rule, the last mentioned with some alterations. Frederick II. persecuted them, and, as the heretical Fratricelli and Beghards had insinuated themselves into their ranks, John XXII. found it necessary by means of a bull to distinguish the genuine Tertiarii from them. Congregations of Tert. were formed in divers countries: in Spain (1403), Portugal (1444), Lombardy (1447), France (1289 and 1594). — The cloistered women of this third order claim as their foundress, St. Elizabeth of Thuringia (1229); in Foligno were established

(1342) the Tert. living in seclusion (*reclusæ*), and the female Hospitaliers (*sœurs grises*) were contemporary with the order itself. These last were divided into sisters of the cells, who lived off alms and served the sick promiscuously, the *sœurs de la faulle*, and the *sœurs grises* proper. In 1567 were established in Madrid the Hospital-brothers of the third order of St. Francis, sometimes called Obregoni from their founder, Bernhard of Obregon, and the Penitent Brothers by five mechanics of Armentieres, in Flanders (1615), called *Bons-Fieux*.—In our day have been published, in German, some poems written by Franciscans, e. g., the *cantico de la creature*, and that commencing: *In fuoco amor mi mise*, by St. Francis; the *Dies iræ*, by Thomas, of Celano; and the *Stabat mater*, by Giacomone da Todi.

It must be admitted that the Franciscan Order sprang from a sincere desire to improve the moral condition of the age in which its founder lived. Sincere and honest in his intentions, while F. rigidly adhered to the faith and discipline of the Romish Church, he aimed at reducing them to practice in the lives and manners of his contemporaries. To accomplish this object, he established an order, and, imposing on its members the rule of poverty, commanded them to go forth and preach penance to a corrupt world.¹ ENGELHARDT.—*Ermentrout*.

Francis, of St. Paula, founder of the order of *Minims*, which aimed at surpassing the austerities of the Minorites, was born, 1416, at St. Paula, Naples, in answer to the prayers of his childless parents. He early showed an inclination to seclusive asceticism. In his 12th year he entered the Franciscan monastery of San Marco, in Calabria, and excited admiration by his severe self-discipline. Having returned to St. Paula, he betook himself to a grotto near the sea, and there practised his devotions and lived on herbs and the gifts of pious people. Scarcely 20 years old, some persons, attracted by his example, came and erected a cell and chapel near his grotto, and placed themselves under his direction. The number of these soon multiplied, and the Archb. of Cosenza gave them permission to build a monastery and church. In 1436 these buildings could accommodate a numerous corporation. This is, properly, the date of the foundation of the order; they called themselves "Eremites of St. Francis." To the three usual vows they added another of continual fasting, i. e., entire abstinence from all flesh, eggs, butter, cheese, milk, and food prepared with any of these articles; except in severe illness they allowed only bread, oil, and water. F. himself slept on a hard floor, never ate till after sunset, &c.; in a word, endeavored to outdo F. of Assisi. Still the order grew; a number of houses were established in Naples and Sicily. Paul III. sent, 1469, a chamberlain to investi-

gate the truth of the wonders said to be wrought by F. The Archb. of Cosenza testified that F. was an extraordinary man, raised up by God to display his power. The chamberlain, however, made objections to Francis's extreme austerities, who then took glowing coals into his hands without being burned. The chamberlain went away convinced in F.'s favor, and reported accordingly, and Sixtus IV. confirmed the order (May 23, 1474), made F. superior-general, allowed him to found as many colonies as he could, and granted exemption from episcopal jurisdiction. Afterwards the statutes were renewed, with some modifications, by Innoc. VIII., Alex. VI., and Julius II. Alex. VI. changed their name to *Minims*.—The biographers of F. report many wonders as wrought by him—similar to the miracles performed by Jesus Christ. Louis XI., of France, sent for him, on his death-bed, and begged F. to pray that his life might be prolonged. F. counselled him, however, rather to be resigned to the will of God. Charles VIII., Louis' successor, retained F. at his court as a counsellor, and allowed him to build two monasteries in France, one in the park of Plessis-les-tours, where F. died. In 1519 Leo X. canonized him. The order spread over Italy, France, Spain, and Germany. At the beginning of the last cent. it numbered 450 monasteries, including 14 nunneries. Now there are but a few in Italy. Their dress is a long black woollen coat reaching to the heels, and a cowl of the same material.—(See HILARION DE COSTE, *le portrait de S. Fr. de Paul, &c.*: Paris, 1655).

KL.*

Francis, St. de Sales, was born, Aug. 21, 1567, at the castle of the Count de Sales, 9 miles from Annecy, in the diocese of Geneva. He received a careful education, studied law and theology in Paris, where he took the vow of chastity in the church of St. Stephen de Grez, and Padua, where the Jesuit Possevin impressed him with the necessity of combining piety with learning, in order effectually to resist Protestantism. He travelled through Italy; the catacombs roused his devotional sentiments. In 1593 he returned home, and became an advocate. His father had planned a marriage for him, but the scheme was frustrated. He was appointed cathedral provost of Geneva, and the expelled B. of Geneva ordained him a priest. Immediately he adopted measures to regain for Rome what it had lost through the Reformation. Thus Chablais was recovered. His chief residence was at Thonon. As soon as he gained a footing, he urged the imprisonment and banishment of the supporters of the Reformation (cf. St. BEUVE, *hist. de Port Royal*, Vol. I.). With the Pope's knowledge he promised Beza a cardinal's-hat if he would recant.—His success in producing a reaction in favor of Rome in several districts, led the B. of Geneva to appoint F. his coadjutor (1599). F. zealously improved the invasion of the French, by establishing 35 priests in the diocese. Gex having fallen over to France, F. went to Paris to arrange the affairs of that portion of the diocese of Geneva. He preached there with such effect that 72,000 "conversions" were attributed to his instrumentality. His reputation was further raised by

¹ Upon F.'s life see MALAN, *hist. de S. Fr. d'Assis*: Par., 1841 (German, Munich, 1842). Upon the hist. of the order: LUCAS WADDING, *Annales minorum s. trium ordinum a s. Fr. institut.* (ed. 2, T. I.—XVII). For a hist. of the order until the commencement of the 18th cent., see Vol. VII. of HELYOT: Paris, 1714–19, VIII., 4to.—Concerning Franc. poets: A. F. OZANAM, *les Poètes francisc. en Italie au treizième siècle*: Paris, 1852, 8vo. (German, by JULIUS: Münster, 1853).

he report that the Protestants had tried to poison him. After the death of Claudius de Granier, F. was consecrated Bishop (1602). He soon announced that he would not tolerate ignorant priests. He thoroughly reformed the monasteries — although a mendicant monk reproached him for allowing the people to dance. By the aid of Francisca of Chantal he founded the mild order of the *Visitation (Salesianesses)*. He also effected an intimate relation between Chantal and Port Royal, over which, from 1619, he had great influence. To Angelica he confided his most secret grief at the immoralities of the priests and monks, of whom he often spoke also in ridicule. St. Charles Borromeo was his ideal of an ecclesiastic.—F. died Dec. 28, 1622, at Lyons, and was canonized in 1665. His anniversary is Jan. 29. His works, chiefly ascetic, were collected: *Oeuvres compl. de S. Fr. de S. Paris et Lyon, chez. Gruyot*, 1830–34, 5 vols. See BAUDRY, *suppl. aux œuvres*: Lyons, 1836. Bossuet says of him, that as he read the later scholastics more than the ancient Fathers, he was not very decided in his views. Having been associated with the French Academy, his name belongs to the history of French literature. His numerous, often somewhat far-fetched comparisons, indicate a predominant Spanish taste. His masterpieces: *traité de l'amour de Dieu*, and *Philothea*, are still worth reading.

REUCHLIN.*

Francis Xavier, a most remarkable man in the history of Missions. He possessed rare qualities of mind and heart, was full of energy and zeal, and yet humble and meek; severe towards himself, forbearing towards others. He was fired with self-sacrificing zeal for the glory of Christ and the salvation of men, especially of heathen. He is not inappropriately called the Apostle of India — having resumed the (traditional) labors of the Apostle Thomas there. — He was born April 7, 1506, at the castle Xavier, near Pamplona, Spain, of a wealthy old noble family, and early displayed unusual talents. He studied at St. Barbara's College, Paris, obtained the degree of *M. A.*, and lectured upon Philosophy. Literary distinction was the aim of his ambition. Ignatius Loyola was then studying theology in Paris, and Xavier became his roommate. At first X. ridiculed Loyola's fanaticism, but he was soon subdued by L.'s kindness and piety. At one time he inclined to Protestantism, and attended Prot. meetings; but L.'s warnings prevailed. He became daily more attached to L., shared his fastings, and at length concluded to study theology. There were six young men of talent and pious zeal, whom L. induced to take a religious pledge in Montmartre; of these Xavier was the chief. Upon the host they vowed perpetual chastity and voluntary poverty. After completing their studies they would go to Jerusalem and devote themselves to the service of Christians or the conversion of the Saracens. Should they be hindered in this they would unconditionally and without pay go whithersoever the Pope might direct. They designed setting sail from Venice, but as Venice was then at war with the Porte, they delayed, meanwhile serving in hospitals. X. had that of the Incurables assigned to him, where he spent the day in the

humblest services, and the night in prayer. He paid special attention to persons with contagious or offensive diseases, in spite of the disgust at first excited. In 1537 he took priest's orders, lived in a wretched hut near Padua, preached repentance, and got his daily bread from door to door. After the Jesuit order was fully constituted, the ambassador of the King of Portugal asked for six Jesuits for the E. India mission. X. was chosen as one. John III. would gladly have retained him, but he was determined to bear the gospel to the heathen. The Pope appointed him apostolic Nuntius for India, with extensive powers. In 1541 he, with two other Jesuits, set sail. On the way he labored with the sailors. At Goa he found but feeble remains of Christianity; the heathen in a miserable condition; the Portuguese intent only on getting rich. To correct the low state of Christian morals, he instructed the children, and revived the seminary there. He attended the sick, visited prisoners, and early every morning he might be seen going around the streets ringing a bell to gather children and servants to the place of instruction. The power of his meekness and love seemed irresistible. A great revival followed his labors, and the vilest persons were reclaimed. He heard that the Paravas, on the coast of Coromandel, were in want of religious teachers, and immediately went thither with three assistants, and in answer to a prayer the entire tribe embraced Christianity and were baptized. Orlandini reports that in answer to his prayers the sick were healed, evil spirits cast out, and even two dead persons restored to life. He is said to have twice exercised the gift of tongues; to have smitten robbers with terror; and to have stayed a plague. At one time Malacca was beset by foes on sea and land, and the people were greatly alarmed. He ascended the pulpit, prayed and exhorted to trust in God: suddenly he paused, and after a few moments said the enemy had been routed; in a day or two the news of their defeat reached the place. He established, or restored, Christianity in many places. Jews, heathen, Mohammedans were converted, although the Brahmins and Bonzes violently opposed him. In Travankor he is said to have baptized 10,000 in one month, and whole villages in a day. Of course these conversions were too rapid to endure. He exerted greater influence by his ascetic life, and his kindness, than by wonders, although the truth of many of these seems well attested. He had a small catechism translated into the native language, from which he taught. He also urged the people to commit to memory the creed, the Lord's prayer, the ten commandments, the Ave Maria, and other prayers. In every place he appointed the fittest converts teachers. His plan was to establish a network of missions over the whole country, though he erred in thinking the Inquisition a necessary help. From 1547 he directed his eye to Japan, which the Portuguese had just discovered. In 1549 he went thither, learned the language, and preached. He baptized over 100 Japanese, and did some wonders there. But the Bonzes excited the hostility of the people and Emperor against Christianity, and its promulgation was forbid-

den on pain of death. Next he turned towards China. Although foreigners were threatened with perpetual imprisonment if taken on Chinese territory, and although many hindrances were put in his way, he determined to go there. He was willing to be imprisoned, for the sake of access to other prisoners. But when he reached the island Santhian, he was overtaken by death, Dec. 2, 1552. He died exclaiming: *In te Domine speravi, non confundar in æternum*. In 1662 Greg. XV. canonized him. By a breve of Benedict XIV., he was pronounced the patron of India. His statue, near Cape Comorin, is visited by heathen from far and near.—(See *Hist. Soc. Jesu pars prima s. Ignatius auctore N. Orlandini*: Antw., 1620. His biogr. by *P. Bouhours*, 1621, 4to. A critical biogr. of X. is still needed. Comp. *Schröckh*, chr. K.-gesch. seit d. Reform., III., Th. 528, 653, &c. *Gieselr*, Lehrb. d. K.-gesch. *Ersch u. Gruber*, Encycl.).

FRONMÜLLER.*

Francke, Aug. Hermann, was born in the city of Lübeck, March 23, 1663. His parents were highly respectable, and spent the utmost care upon his intellectual and religious training. His youngest sister, during her short life, exerted especially a salutary influence over him. In 1666 the family moved to Gotha, where F. passed through the gymnasium. In 1679 he visited the University of Erfurt, where he applied himself diligently to the Hebrew. Six months after he visited the University of Kiel, where he became an inmate of the family of *Kortholt*, whose lectures, conversation, and friendship were powerful agents in forming his mind. Having heard of his teachers that the Hebrew and Greek languages were the "two eyes in studying theology," he now applied himself to enlarge his knowledge of the former; in the latter he was already well versed. To gain his end he visited Hamburg, and enjoyed for two months the instructions of the celebrated Hebrew scholar, *Esra Edzardi*, who advised him to read, in course, the original Old Testament. In compliance with this advice, F. read the entire Hebrew Bible seven times in one year. He was encouraged in this not only by his respect for the Word of God, which, in its deeper meaning, was as yet little known to him; but also by a happy talent for acquiring languages. The French and English he had already acquired. It seems as if the Christian spirit, tired of the fetters of doctrinal scholasticism, had driven him instinctively to the study of the S. Scriptures. An engagement as companion and teacher of Hebrew to a young theologian, who was studying at Leipsic, enabled him, in 1684, to visit the latter University. This gave him an excellent opportunity of enlarging his theological and humanistic acquirements. Here he learned the Italian and Rabbinical languages, in 1685 became A. M., and founded, in connection with Paul Anton, the *Collegium philobiblicum*, which afterwards became very flourishing under his guidance, but also stirred up much hostility against him. During this his first sojourn at Leipsic, he gave offence only by a translation of two works of Molinos. Although we implicitly believe the translator, when he tells us that he does not assent to every opinion of Mo-

linos; yet it cannot be denied that F. might have furnished the German reader with more wholesome nourishment. But he did not see the ultimate tendency of the works: he wished merely to lead the mind away from scholastic subtleties to an inward Christianity. — At this time his maternal uncle, Gloxin, minister at Lübeck, gave to him a second time the Shabelian family stipend, on condition that he should visit Lüneburg, in order to be instructed by the pious and learned superintendent, *C. H. Sandhagen*, in scriptural interpretation, especially of the prophets, and in the harmony of the gospels. This furnished the decisive factor in F.'s religious development. His youth had never been frivolous, but had been spent in diligent study: nevertheless he accuses himself that his theology was merely of the head, and not of the heart: that he studied the Scriptures to become learned, not to apply it to his heart and life: and that he had not considered it wrong by means of knowledge to attain to honors, wealth, and ease. With this state he became wholly dissatisfied, and there arose in him a longing for true godliness, and for an entire surrender to the cause of God. But he was to be brought to a deeper knowledge of sin and grace, of his sinful self and the Saviour, and to a living faith. This happened at Lüneburg. When on one occasion he had to preach on John 20:31, he saw that this faith was yet wanting to him. He tells us: "My entire life passed before me; I could enumerate every single sin; but soon the chief fountain came to view, viz: unbelief, or misbelief, with which I had so long deceived myself." He sank into a deep distress. He found how hard it was to have no God, to whom the heart might turn; to bewail his sins, and yet not to know why; nor who it was, that pressed out such tears, and whether there really was a God, whom he had offended. In this condition he knelt and prayed for deliverance from it, if there really was a God and Saviour. The Lord heard him suddenly. "Every doubt had vanished; I was assured in my heart of the grace of God in Christ; and I could now call Him, not only God, but also Father. All sadness and distress of the heart was removed; a flood of joy poured upon me, that from a full heart I praised and magnified God, who had granted me such abundant grace. In deep distress and doubt I bowed the knee; with inexpressible joy and assurance I arose again." A few days after he preached on John 20:31. "From that time," he tells us, "I became earnest in religion; and it also became easy for me to deny all ungodliness and worldly lusts. From that time also I began to suffer more for the sake of the good." He had experienced, what is wanting in so many theologians and clergymen of his age. Hence his incessant efforts to impart his discovered treasure to others.—F. made known his new faith in his "*auf Veranlassung christlicher Freunde aufrichtig und einfältig entworfenen Bekenntnisse seines inneren Wandels vor Gott*" (in F.'s öffentl. Zeugn. v. d. Dienste Gottes, p. 13). A mind most deeply imbued with Christ is manifested in it; nor does it discover, even to the most rigid scrutiny any trace of heterodoxy. It could be easily foreseen, however, that the

new spirit would burst many of the old and now effete forms.—F. left Lüneburg in the spring of 1688, and went to Hamburg, where he remained to Christmas of the same year. Here he became intimate with the lic. *Nick. Lange*, afterwards superintendent of Brandenburg. In conversations with the latter concerning prevalent errors in the education of children, the idea of establishing in Hamburg a private school for children suggested itself to him. He tells us that in this way he not only acquired patience and forbearance in the treatment of religious errors, but also learned how corrupt was the existing school-system, and how defective the training of children; and at this time already he entertained a strong desire to contribute something towards a reformation in the education and training of the young. He often said that his experience at Hamburg was the foundation of all that God had accomplished through him afterwards. The results of this experience he summed up in his "*Von Erziehung der Kinder zur Gottseligk. u. christl. Klugheit.*"—His uncle permitted him to use his Shabellian stipend in visiting any university which he might prefer. He went to Leipsic, not without an anticipation of various struggles, but also fortified by a confident faith to meet them. He first visited Dresden, in order to derive strength and counsel from *Spener*. The latter approved of his design of giving practical exegetical lectures. On his return to Leipsic in the spring of 1689, F. lectured on several epistles of Paul, and this in the German. His room was soon too small for the crowd of hearers: *Dr. Olearius*, rector of the University, granted him the use of one of the academical halls, but even this became too small. Being charged during the summer vacation with the so-called *lectiones cereales*, he explained to nearly 300 hearers the 2d Ep. to Timothy. The *collegia philobiblica* were also still continued, and F. at the same time caused the more advanced students to deliver in his presence homilies on passages of Scripture. These exercises had a very happy effect on the students, who were led by them to the sadly neglected Scriptures, and thus also to Christianity. A new spirit, one of patience, self-examination, of active faith, seemed to animate the scholastic youth. At this time arose the name of *Pietist*. Other foreseen annoyances did not fail to arise: the new teacher was envied his brilliant success; the pedantic objection was urged, that the use of the German was intolerable; it was a fault that he made the way of salvation no easy thing; to many he seemed pretentious, as wishing to know more about this way than old doctors; he was already charged with deviating from true doctrine, and decried as the head of the new sect of Pietists, and as a hypocrite. Thus it happened that in 1690 the theological faculty prohibited his theological lectures; in the same year he left Leipsic, and in the year after, *Schade* and *Anton*, his colleagues in the *collegia philobiblica*, followed his example. After a short usefulness at Lübeck, he was appointed in June, 1690, to the diaconate in the Augustine church at Erfurt. Here, also, in union with *Breithaupt* (see Art.), he labored with much success. It appeared here, that the preaching

of the pure gospel, however pungent, was most attractive. His sermons were listened to by persons from all the country around; even by Rom. Catholics some of whom came over to the Protestant Church. F. sought to increase the usefulness of his sermons by repeating them at home, and by spreading the N. Testament, and other good books. But here also, as was foreseen, trials were not wanting; some of them were prepared for him by his colleagues; others, by the fanatical Catholics, whom the government of electoral Mayence, to the jurisdiction of which Erfurt belonged, stirred up against the bold and powerful preacher of the gospel. After he had been vainly accused of scattering heretical books, an Electoral rescript ordered that he should be removed from the city as an originator of a new sect. F. complained of this order to the Council; but he was commanded to leave the city within two days. Having employed these days in comforting the members of his church, he left Erfurt in Sept., 1691,¹ and went to Gotha. Here he received a letter from Berlin, inviting him over into the Electorate of Brandenburg. Dec. 22, 1691, he was appointed Professor of the Greek and Oriental languages in the new University of Halle, to which the pastorate of the church of St. George at Glaucha, a suburb of Halle, was added.—He arrived at Halle Jan. 7, 1692, entered upon his pastorate in February, and commenced his lectures at Easter. For the latter he received no salary, since the pastorate had been given him for this purpose. He was now at the place, which, to the day of his death, was to be the sphere of his ever increasing labors.—In mentioning the name of A. H. Francke, the Orphan Asylum at Halle, and other institutions connected with it, are always suggested to the mind; these, however, form only a part of F.'s labors; his labors as pastor and teacher of theology are the true key to his other labors.—As *pastor*, he came into a long neglected congregation. His predecessor had been deposed for adultery; religion was at a low ebb, and luxurious vices stalked alongside of the bitterest poverty. The clergy were such as we generally find them at the origin of Pietism. They held stiffly to the pure doctrine and to the old routine of a comfortable pastorate. His field not only demanded great labor and patience, but he had also to expect that his colleagues would act towards him as they had done at other places. He first secured a position for himself by his sermons, which, as in Erfurt, made a deep impression, and attracted crowds from the entire city; for, although they were not marked by elegant rhetoric, gorgeous imagery and piquant anecdote, they nevertheless conveyed such a warm faith, simplicity, and love, connected with a bold condemnation of prevailing vices, that they could not otherwise than awaken and nourish Christian life. The citizens of Halle gladly turned from the dry, abstruse disquisitions of a dead orthodoxy, which were generally heard in the churches, in

¹ At Erfurt he yet wrote his "*Abgenöthigte Fürstellung der ungegründeten und unerweislichen Beschuldigungen und Unwahrheiten, welche in dem jüngst in Leipsig publicirten Pfingstprogramm von Carpsov enthalten sind.*"

order to be once more edified by truly apostolical sermons. Francke's sermons, compared with those of our own age, are often very lengthy; but this was no objection then, and was, besides, more than atoned for by their rich matter. But F. trained his congregations in other ways also. Social meetings, held at first daily in his own house, and afterwards, in order to prevent evil reports, in the church, became to many a source of awakening and edification. For the neglected youth he instituted public catechizations, which were numerous attended by adults also. To his pastoral labors he devoted himself with untiring zeal, gaining the hearts by his mild and affectionate manner, and thus also securing a hearing for his admonitions. As confessor also he exerted a salutary influence by scrupulously attending to the wants of every individual. A rule of his own, that application to attend the Lord's Supper should be made in person at his house, assisted materially in this; for he improved the opportunity to examine their spiritual condition and to impart wholesome admonition. In order to engage with more freedom in this work, he declined the customary confessional fee. Besides this, he tried to increase his usefulness by various literary labors treating of different points of practical religion, such as the reading of the Scriptures, the true knowledge of Christ, prayer, also on dancing. That F., like Spener, combatted the errors connected with the pietistic movement, is well known. Thus he admonished separatists, who were fond of denouncing the established Church as Babel, that Babel was in their own hearts, so long as they uncharitably judged others. His knowledge of Christianity was also too deep to let him mistake an outward for a true renunciation of the world. — With his pastoral labors, those as academical teacher stand in close connection; this, in fact, is a peculiarity of the latter. We are thus led to the founding of the University of Halle. This University was from its beginning a nursery of the new spirit introduced by Spener and his friends, and S. had a decided influence on the appointment of its first theological teachers. A new institution could accommodate itself to the new spirit more readily than one that was hampered by ancient forms. But to form a just estimate of the labors of F. and his colleagues, it would be very improper to judge them by the standard of the later excrescences of the University. Francke is unjustly made a kind of forerunner of vulgar rationalism. Pietism, so far from being a bridge to modern neology, rather prevented its earlier appearance. Like the Reformation of the 16th cent., it possessed the great merit of bringing back an apostatizing age to the foundation of salvation, and of preventing the spread of indifferentism. It gave to the 18th cent. in Germany its religious impulse and character, which German rationalism in its utmost aberrations could never wholly ignore, and by which it was distinguished from the contemporary French philosophy. All human labor is modified by time and place both in its results and its essential qualities. In the German Lutheran Church orthodoxy had taken the place of the Scriptures, and scholastic forms that of a living, active faith.

Pietism saw the deepest want of the age when it reversed the order. In this, of course, it manifested a certain onesidedness; but this was necessary and fully justified. — Francke was not a theological teacher; but how intimately he connected his professorship with theology, appears from his Easter programme of 1692, in which he commends the study of the Hebrew and Greek, the languages of the S. Scriptures. He held this office to 1699; in 1698 he became Professor of Theology, and continued such until his death. From 1716–17 he was prorector. His colleagues were *Bayer* (for a short time only) *Anton, Breithaupt*; after 1709, *J. H. Michaelis* and *Joach. Lange*; and, after 1716, *Herrenschmid*, who all labored in his own spirit. The theological faculty seemed thus peculiarly fitted to spread Spener's principles. F. began his theological labors in 1698 with an introduction to the O. T., and afterwards he extended these lectures to the N. T. Hermeneutics also seemed to him of great importance; he regarded it a chief requisite of the theological teacher to be a good interpreter of the S. Scriptures. Up to 1726 he lectured repeatedly on hermeneutics, and in 1712 he published his *prælectiones hermeneuticæ*. His rules he applied moreover in his expositions of portions or entire books of the Scriptures, especially of the Psalms and the Gospel of St. John. His maxim was: *theologus nascitur in scripturis*, and he lamented the fact that during his studies he had heard scarcely any exegetical lectures. Thus also in his *Methodus studii theologici*, he strongly commended the study of the originals of the Scriptures, and even of the Chaldaic. He desired that the Hebrew text should be as familiar to the theologian as the German. To this end the *Collegium orientale*, founded by him, rendered essential service. That his exegesis was sound, appears from the fact that he insisted strenuously upon the investigation of the literal sense. Nor, as appears from the above *Methodus*, did he suffer the other theological branches to be neglected. He did not even wish the so-called polemical theology to be set aside, but only that it should be properly regulated; since an intimate acquaintance with heresies helped to purify and protect piety: "that many, from ignorance of Ch. History, expressed opinions, which are untenable." *Meth. st. th. c. III., § 31*. He remarks, *ibid.*, § 28, that in dogmatics two extremes must be avoided; we must assign to the study of it neither too much nor too little importance. As regards the first, he assails the reigning scholasticism, as calculated to lead some into skepticism; as regards the second, he rejects, with Spener, an error of pietism, which pretended that the study of the Scriptures made the study of doctrinal works unnecessary. Besides the courses of study already mentioned, he gave to his students careful instructions in everything needed for the discharge of their future duties; such as in catechetics, homiletics, pastoral theology, and even in casuistry. His *lectiones paræneticæ* were especially useful and instructive. These took place on Thursday, from 10–11, during which hour, by special arrangement of the faculty, no other lectures were given, so that every theol. student might

be able to attend. They were intended to enforce upon the students all that belonged to an earnest religion, and to a proper discharge of official duties. He confined himself to no particular theme. In these lectures he also gave hints to his students as regards the proper arrangement of their studies. At first he gave special parænetic lectures on the *Methodus studii theologici*, which afterwards appeared under the same title; and gathered at the same time the materials for his *idea studiosi theologiae* (publ. 1712). After 1720 he gave special *lectiones methodologicas*, which had no connection with the parænetic lectures. These latter suggested also the *Monita pastoralia theologica*. From what has been said it is evident that F.'s theological strength is not to be sought in the field of strict science; his works also show this. The religious moral interest was so prominent with him, that he defined theology to be *uberior christianismi cultura*. He taught in connection with this, that Christ was the special aim of theological studies. In his *Method. st. th. c. II.*, § 3, he expresses some beautiful sentiments on this point. Indeed such principles furnish a fruitful germ for a prosperous development of theological science. In his theological labors F. manifests an organizing talent similar to that which gave rise to the Orphan Asylum. — But if F.'s labors were crowned with important results, opposition also was not wanting. The clergy of Halle, even before F.'s arrival, had in their sermons made violent attacks on the Pietists, and drawn upon themselves thus a sharp reprimand from the government. The spirit of F.'s labors, the applause awarded to him, his influence among the citizens, the small numbers attending at the other churches compared with the crowds attending his, all this brought the ill-feeling against him to an outburst. Some excesses of his adherents, also, gave to his enemies welcome occasion for an attack upon him. See, it was said, what his doctrines lead to. The vilest reports were spread concerning his meetings for social prayer. Matters came to such a pass, that in Nov., 1692, the Elector appointed a special commission to settle the odious quarrel. The articles of agreement, which were far more favorable to F. than to the city clergy, were read on the last Sunday in Advent in all the churches within and without the city, and thus the peace restored until 1698. In this year F. gave new offence by a sermon on False Prophets. Although he avoided all personalities, it was nevertheless evident to his hearers that he referred to abuses near at home. The clergy of Halle applied the sermon to themselves, and again from their pulpits fulminated against the Pietists, and even brought complaints against F. before the *Consistorium*. The latter called upon F. to answer, and to state his objections to the clergy. F. answered that it was not his fault if some of the clergy felt aggrieved by his sermon; at the same time he gave a manly statement of things which he censured in his colleagues, and complained especially that they had warned the people not to attend his church, since this was the road to hell. The clergy defended themselves, and accused F., with Breithaupt and Anton, of vari-

ous errors. A second commission effected a compromise between the parties, which again was more favorable to F. and his colleagues than to the clergy. After this F.'s influence extended more and more. In 1715 he became pastor of St. Ulrich's, and thus member of the *ministerium*. At his death only two of his former opponents were still living, one of whom, J. G. Francke, but no relative, called him in a funeral discourse a theologian of the highest merit in the Luth. Church. He had various opponents abroad also, who attacked especially his labors as theological teacher. — F. suffered also violent attacks as founder of the Orphan Asylum and the other institutions connected with it; for they were, indeed, the most faithful expression of his spirit, and contributed most largely in establishing and extending his influence; but to these attacks, also, we owe an extended account, by F.'s own pen, of the origin and progress of this grand creation of the newly awakened Christian spirit. — Being pained to see the coarse habits and ignorance of many members of his church, he took occasion at the stated distribution of alms to instruct the poor in the concerns of the soul. From 1594 he had them all to come to his house, questioned the young from the catechism whilst the old listened, then addressed to them an exhortation and closed with prayer, after which he distributed the alms and announced that he would continue thus every week. The great ignorance which he thus discovered, led to another step. He sought to bring a number of children to school by presenting the school-fees to the parents; but the latter, though they punctually came for the money, did not send their children. Meantime, in order to relieve the distress of the poor, he had also commenced to send around a savings box for the charitable gifts of pious Christians; but afterwards he put up such a box at the door of the parsonage, and inscribed upon it 1 John 3 : 17, and 2 Cor. 9 : 7. One day, about Easter of 1695, he found that a charitable hand had deposited 7 florins. It was by a pious widow of high connections named Knorr. He at once determined to begin with it a charity school. On the same day yet he purchased books for two thalers, and engaged a poor student to give instructions two hours daily, paying him two groshen a week for his services. This is the beginning of Francke's institutions, which, by the blessing of God, have benefitted so many thousands both for time and eternity. The school was opened in an antechamber of F.'s study. But his first experience was discouraging; for of 27 children which had received books, only four returned; the others sold their books and staid away. New books were purchased, which were always left in the school. To encourage the children, a small alms was distributed to them weekly. After the 7 florins were spent, new contributions flowed in. It was soon known with what care the children of the poor were taught, and a number of citizens offered to pay a weekly fee, if their children also were admitted. The number of scholars increased so much, that a second and third room had soon to be rented. The paying were now separated from the charity scholars, and sepa-

rate instructions given to each. But as F. always found that home example destroyed the impressions made at the school, he resolved to take a few children under his constant care. An unexpected legacy enabled him to support an orphan from the yearly interest. Looking around for such a subject, four were named to him, and he determined to receive them all (Nov. 5, 1695). On the 16th of Nov. they numbered already nine. The supervisor of them was G. H. Neubauer, a pious student, who ever after was F.'s zealous and disinterested assistant. During the next year a house adjoining the parsonage was purchased; and the year following a second one. The number of orphans soon rose to 150, for whom free boarding was provided. From these the teachers for the charity school were now divided into males and females, the number of classes increased, and a class for the elements of the higher studies added to the school for paying scholars. At the same time a school was established for the sons of the nobility.—As there was not sufficient room for all demands, F. resolved to build an Orphan Asylum, the corner-stone of which was laid July 24, 1698. To this, kings, princes, and menials contributed their portion. It was completed in 1701, and occupied by the orphans. New additions were made to it from year to year, as circumstances demanded. In 1698 the number of orphans was 100, and at F.'s death 134. The pupils in the different schools numbered in 1698, 500; in 1709, 1100; in 1714, 1775; and at F.'s death, 2207.—In all these labors F. was energetically supported by a number of excellent men. This was natural; for an activity like that of F. creates its own agents and instruments. We mention *Elers*, founder of the book establishment of the Asylum (see his life by *Dr. Knapp*, in his *Leben from. Männer des 18. Jahrh.*; Hal., 1829); *Chr. Fr. Richter*, author of well-known hymns, and physician to the Asylum, † 1711; and *Herrenschmid*, after 1715 his colleague in the theol. faculty, and after 1716 subdirector of Asylum; † 1723.—Notwithstanding the faithful assistance of these men, F.'s immense labors soon injured his health. To restore this, he made various journeys through Germany as far as into Holland. These journeys helped to create supporters for his undertakings, to remove prejudices, and to convert enemies into friends. In 1726 he felt his strength diminishing. May 15th he gave his last parænetic lecture. May 24th he spent for the last time with several friends in the garden of the Asylum, when he offered a fervent thanksgiving for the merciful providences of God. He died June 8, 1727. He left a daughter and a son. Rich materials for F.'s biography may be found in the collected *Epicedien*: Halle, 1727, fol.—*Francke's Stiftung., eine Zeitschr.*; herausg. von *Schulze, Knapp u. Niemeyer*. On F. as academic teacher, see especially in the latter, Vol. 2, p. 221, an essay by *Schulze*. Also, *Guericke, A. H. Francke, eine Denkschr. zur Säc.-Feier seines Todes*: Halle, 1827. *A. H. Francke, od. Macht u. Segen des Gebetes u. Gottvertr.*, by *Rosalie Koch*; Breslau, 1854; a book for the people. *HERZOG. — Reinecke.*

Frank, Sebastian, born about 1500 at Donauwörth, was one of those fanatical sectaries of the age of the Reformation, who have furnished modern Don Quixottes of the spirit, and Romanists a welcome opportunity for traducing the Reformation, and for opposing the positive philosophy and faith of the Evangelical Church. His first appearance was at Nuremberg, where, in 1528, he translated and prefaced a work of Althamer, Luth. preacher at N., entitled "*Diallage od. Vereinig. d. streit. Sprüche i. d. Schrift.*" He also published a work against drunkenness, in which already the germs of pantheism and false subjectivism become apparent. His views found no favor with Luther and the Nurembergers, and F. therefore sought a field more congenial to his taste in S. W. Germany, to which the contagion of the Anabaptist disturbances of North Germany had spread. He went to Strassburg, where he published his "*Chronika, etc., von Anbeg. bis, 1531.*" His lively, attractive, and popular style shows him to have been one of the best German prose writers of his age. But his history, though it evidences immense reading, shows little tact and judgment. Melancthon called him an "*indocta conditor historiae.*" Whatever his defects, his is still the merit of having written the first universal history in German.—The work gave him no abiding place at Strassburg. Bucer seems to have opposed him. We find him next at Esslingen on the Neckar, where he gained a living as soap-boiler. In 1533 he moved to Geislingen, in the territory of Ulm, which latter city, in 1534, offered him *gratuitously* the rights of citizenship. He now lived by his pen. But his liberal-minded patrons in Ulm sustained him with difficulty against Melancthon, Bucer, Frecht von Ulm, and the landgrave of Hessen. When, therefore, in 1535 his "*Paradoxa*" appeared, the storm burst over him. His citizenship was taken from him, and he was warned to leave the city; but being well represented in the council, he was suffered to remain until 1538. Meantime Schwenkfeld had also created disturbances, and F. did not avoid all contact with him. On the 3d of July, 1539, he was forced to leave the city, and henceforth led a vagrant life until he died in 1545, at Basel. His doctrines were condemned at the convention of Smalcald in 1540. Luther, also, denounced him in the strongest terms.—(See *ERBEK, Gesch. der prot. Sekt. im Zeitalt. der Ref.*—*SCHENKEL, das Wes. des Protestantismus. WALD, de vita Franci*: Erl., 1793.—*CH. K. AM ENDE, Nachlese zu F.'s Leb. u. Schriften*: Nurnberg, 1796). *H. MERZ. — Reinecke.*

Frankenberg, John Henry, Count of, Archb. of Mechlin, and primate of Belgium, played an important part as chief defender of the Catholic Church in B., against the reforms of Joseph II. He was born Sept. 18, 1720, at Grossglogau, in Silesia, and showed in his earliest youth such a strong inclination to the clerical office, that he was sent by his parents, who were zealous Catholics, to the Jesuit College of his native city, and afterwards, also under Jesuit supervision, to the University of Breslau. In his 19th year already he received the four lower orders, and a

leanery at the Cathedral. Without, however, entering upon his office, he went to Rome, and continued for five years longer his theological studies in the German Hungarian College. A discussion on canonical law, which he held shortly before he left the College, so much delighted Pope Benedict XIV., that the latter embraced him and remarked: "In this youth the Church will receive a great man." Having returned to Germany, he was appointed coadjutor by the Archb. of Görz; and ten years later, in 1759, Archb. of Mecheln, and member of the Belgic Council of State, by Maria Theresa. In this position he had an extensive influence, preached frequently on festive occasions, endeavored to reform his clergy, and by his charities gained the affections of the poor. On account of his influence and his labors for the Church, Pius VI. created him (June 1, 1778), cardinal. The Emperor Joseph himself placed the cardinal's hat upon his head. Several years later, however, we find him leading a violent opposition to the ecclesiastical reforms of the Emperor. For when the latter, in order to elevate the standing as regards learning of the Belgic clergy, endeavored in 1786 to abolish the Episcopal seminaries, in which alone the clergy were educated, and to substitute a general seminary located at Louvain, and under the direction of the government; F. was the first to remonstrate earnestly to the Emperor, claiming theological instruction as belonging to the Church and the bishops. In spite of this remonstrance, the seminary at Louvain was established, with an affiliated one at Luxemburg; and an order, moreover, issued that only such as had studied five years at this seminary could obtain the higher orders. The Episcopal seminaries were also abolished. F. once more remonstrated, showing that the bishops had good reasons to suspect the general seminary, since in the edict by which it was established, expressions such as "rational theology," "pure and rational worship," created a strong suspicion that by means of it certain principles (Jansenism) were to be introduced. The seminary was nevertheless established, and the bishops had to send in their pupils; the latter, however, had been well filled with prejudices against the new school and its teachers. The government had very unwisely appointed as teachers not only Jansenists, but also fanatical illuminati and rationalists, who rudely assailed whatever their pupils had been taught previously, and derided their zeal in observing the ceremonies of their religion. The dissatisfaction of the pupils, inflamed already in advance, broke out in open resistance; the military was sent out against the young theological rebels, a part of them imprisoned, others dispersed, and thus, after a few months, the seminary, which had opened with 300 pupils, was dissolved. The cardinal, suspected of being the instigator of these troubles, was summoned to Vienna, where he was kept prisoner for some time; but, as the troubles in Belgium were constantly increasing, was sent home again, and welcomed on his return with universal joy. Repeated efforts to restore the seminary at Louvain were unsuccessful; for F. continued his remonstrances and restored his own Episcopal semi-

nary. When by a decree of Jan. 21, 1788, he was forbidden under a penalty of 1000 thalers to have theology taught in his seminary, and a penalty of 50 thalers imposed upon any professor violating the decree, F. declared it illegal, and refused obedience for himself and others. Hence on Aug. 1, imperial commissaries, accompanied by a considerable body of soldiers, were sent to the different Episcopal seminaries in order forcibly to conduct the pupils to Louvain. At Mechlin and Antwerp this occasioned bloody scenes. Cardinal F. was ordered to proceed to Louvain in order to examine the doctrines taught there, and to state his objections. After various delays and evasions, he gave, June 26, 1789, an extended report on the instructions given in the seminary, the opinions of its teachers, and the text-books; all which he pronounced unorthodox and Jansenistic. His chief objection however, was, that the seminary was a violation of the rights of the Church. This report was at once scattered in numerous copies in all the Belgic dialects, and employed as a means of agitation. Being accused by the imperial minister of its publication, F. protested his innocence, asserting at the same time his right to publish his judgment in a matter of such importance to the entire Belgic Church. In the meantime the troubles increased, but, in consequence of the French revolution, assumed a more political character until it came to an insurrection of the whole nation. F., regarded by the Austrian party as the instigator of it all, and repeatedly threatened with imprisonment, retreated to a place of safety. The Emperor in the meantime died: Belgium became a victim of the French revolution, which proceeded against the church in a still more radical way. Here also F. resisted boldly, and was therefore condemned by the National Convention, Oct. 10, 1797, to deportation. He died at Breda, Holland, June 11, 1804. See AUG. THEINER, *der Card. J. H. von Frankenberg u. s. Kampf für d. Freiheit der Kirche*, etc.: Freib. im Breisg. 1850. A partisan work, though reliable as to facts.

KLÜPFEL.—*Reinecke.*

Frankfort-on-the-Main, Reformation and Ev. Church of. Among the cities which felt the salutary and quickening spirit which arose at Wittenberg. F. must also be mentioned. Many distinguished men, such as Conr. Hensel, Pastor at St. Bartholomews; *John ab Indagine*, the learned dean of St. Leonards, who thought that he had read the approaching revolution in the stars; and Th. Murner, a Franciscan of original mind, had prepared the way. Among the old families of the city there was a lively taste for science and literature. The excellent Philip v. Fürstenberg spoke and wrote both Latin and Greek, and stood in correspondence with the best minds of his age. The immortal Amandus v. Holzhausen rivalled him in his labors for the common weal and in his love for studies. These men, with others of a like mind, resolved no longer to send their children to the Catholic school; and by the advice of Erasmus, they called, in 1521, the ardent young humanist, Wm. Nesen, from Louvain to F., as a teacher for their sons. He was an admirer of Luther and Melancthon. From his school the gymna-

sium subsequently arose. When in April of the same year Luther, on his journey to and from Worms, remained twice over night in F., he was joyfully welcomed by these men. They were also the chief agents in F. for the reformation of the Church. On Invocavit Sunday, in 1522, Amandus opened the Church of the monastery of St. Catherine, of which he was the pastor, to the first Ev. preacher, Hartm. Ibach. The elector of Mayence, to whose diocese F. belonged, at the instigation of P. Meyer, the city pastor, made indeed the most strenuous efforts to check the innovations; but since on the other side the neighboring nobility, with Hartmuth v. Kronberg at their head, arose menacingly, and Ulrich v. Hutten also joined in the opposition. Ibach continued to preach for some time longer, until he thought it more safe to retire from the city. A second Ev. preacher, Dietr. Sartorius, whom Amandus appointed for the same church, could maintain himself only for a short time; in return for which the enraged burghers in 1524 expelled the hated Meyer, who had by his intrigues, even more than by his violent sermons, excited their ill-will.

The year 1525 with its storms did not leave F. unscathed. On the 2d. day of Easter, the guilds, instigated by foreigners, assembled in the church-yard of St. Peters. All the authority of the esteemed Amandus was required to lead the raging flood into a regular channel. Of the articles which, at his advice, were handed in to the magistracy, several demanded the abolition of ecclesiastical abuses. During these disturbances, preachers from abroad also made their appearance in the city; two of whom, Dionysius Melander, a former Dominican from Ulm, and J. B. Algesheimer, formerly priest at Mayence, were detained by the council in order to satisfy the congregation, and they at once made themselves masters of the parish Church, which had been vacant since the departure of Meyer. They were, indeed, men of bold daring, regardless alike of existing circumstances and future consequences; but they were just the men needed in those times to clear the ground upon which more sober minds could afterwards build. How cautiously the council steered between the demands of the parties, appears from the fact that in 1526 it called, on the recommendation of Card. Campegius, Dr. Fred. Nausea to the place of the expelled Meyer; but the preachers had so successfully wrought upon the guilds, and Dr. N., by insisting upon the expulsion of his opponents, had prepared for himself such an unenviable position, that at his first appearance in the Church, a fearful clamor of the assembled multitude prevented his being heard. He quitted the pulpit and the city. Whilst the council from motives of policy refused a closer union with the Elector of Saxony and the Landgr. of Hessen, the aversion to the old Church was constantly increasing. In 1527 the procession of Corpus Christi was interrupted by an unseemly farce; the fraternities dissolved, and the nuns returned to the world. In 1529 the bare-foot friars surrendered their monastery to the council; their guardian, P. Chomberg, became a preacher, and in the monastery church the Lord's Supper was for the

first time dispensed under both kinds. In the following year the council appointed a fourth preacher, M. Limperger. In the other monasteries an inventory was taken of all articles of value, and these carefully locked up. All benevolent foundations in the hands of the clergy were abolished, and united in a common fund. The parish Church was still divided between Catholics and Protestants; violent animosities necessarily followed, and became ever more threatening. The preachers were often so lengthy, that the mass had to be omitted. At the beginning of 1533, Dion. Melander buried from the pulpit the anathema against the pope and the entire clergy; the effect was electrical; the rabble burst madly into the church, and destroyed its altar and images. The council was now placed in a critical position. The collegiate churches of St. Bartholomew, of Our Lady, and St. Leonhard, had brought suit against it before the imperial chamber for a violation of their franchises, and a mandate had already threatened the ban of the empire; Mayence and Aschaffenburg had cut off their supplies of wood and provisions: whilst from the other side the impetuous preachers, at that time the most potent men in the city, were urging that the congregation should accomplish by force what the council was neglecting. When the council represented the threatening danger to the guilds, and received from them the bold answer: that, whatever might happen, they would cleave to the council and the gospel, the city fathers thought that they could no longer observe moderation. April 23, 1533, the col. churches were commanded to discontinue the Catholic worship; the Catholic citizens were even forbidden to attend the mass in the neighboring villages; and a Catholic who had taken his child to another town for baptism, was fined 100 florins. The preachers now constructed a complete order of worship, on the basis of which the young Ev. Church consolidated its religious life, and increased so surprisingly, that in a short time only a small fraction of the citizens continued faithful to the old Church. But since the negotiations with Mayence, and the elector Palatine, who had been appointed mediator by King Ferdinand, had accomplished nothing; and since the request of the city to be received as a member of the Smalcald league was still ungranted; the Council found itself forced to compromise with the clergy, and in Nov. 1535 to reinstate the Catholic worship; although in the parish Church the preachers still maintained themselves alongside of the priests. Melander, the most impetuous of the preachers, was fortunately no longer in the city; he had left on account of difference with his colleagues. On Feb. 2, 1536, the city was received into the Smalcald league; in April the confederates held a convention in Frankfort, which was attended also by Melancthon and Bucer, through whose efforts was effected the compact between the theologians of Saxony and of Upper Germany, which afterwards was called the Wittenberg Concord.—In polemical works against the Reformed, it has often been asserted that the Evangelical Church of Frankfort was from the beginning of a clearly Luth. type; original sources

how, however, that the prevailing tendency was to the Swiss type. Luther, as is well known, in 1533 sent an energetic warning to the Council against the concealed Zwinglianiam of their our preachers. The latter in their answer deny the odious charge; but proceed to a statement of their views on the Lord's Supper, which, in form and matter, differs in nothing from that of the cities of U. Germany. Confession, also, is a mere personal want; absolution is a mere announcement of grace, without sacramental character; to announce it is a right of every believer (See STEITZ, *die Priv. Beichte u. Priv.-Absol.* in *ler Luth. K.*: Frankf. 1854, pp. 160-63). For this reason, too, it was, that in 1536 the Frankf. preacher, J. B. Algesheimer, proceeded with the deputies of the suspected cities of Upper Germany to Wittenberg to subscribe the *Concord*. The form of worship introduced at first into the churches of F., shows the same inclination to the views of the Reformed. For whilst the Saxon Church regarded the celebration of the Lord's Supper as the culmination of every principal Lord's day service, and gave to the Roman mass only a purer and more scriptural form; the services in F. were held in that simpler form which agreed so well with the puritan sense of the Reformed Church, and the celebration of the Lord's Supper was restricted to every third Sunday. But a Luth. tendency gradually found entrance into the ministerium. In 1536, P. Geltner, a disciple of Luther, was called to F.; and in the name of this city subscribed, in 1537, the Articles of Smalcald. Notwithstanding this, a violent controversy arose a few years after between his party, and Ambach, Lulius and Ligarius, who were of Reformed tendencies, concerning a catechism by Ambach, in which sufficient prominence had not been given to the Luth. doctrines. In order to calm the minds heated with doctrinal zeal, the council again invited Bucer to Frankfort, who succeeded, Dec. 9, 1542, in restoring peace by the so-called Frankf. Concord. Geltner's equivocal character did not suffer him to gain in F. any decided advantages for Lutheranism; the victory of which is due to H. Beyer, a man of uncommon force and energy, who about this time commenced his labors in the imperial city. Born in 1516 at F., he had spent 12 years at Wittenberg, and adopted entire Luther's thoughts and language. Called in 1545 by the Council to the ministry, he not only preached decidedly in the mind of his great teacher; but also determined to assimilate the form of worship of the Church of F. to that of Saxony. The Interim diverted him from this plan forever. — After the unfortunate issue of the war in Upper Germany, the disheartened Council, in spite of the opposition of the preachers and the guilds, opened Dec. 29, 1546, the gates of the city to the imperial troops, renounced the league, and bought with heavy sacrifices the Emperor's forgiveness. When the latter published, May 15, 1548, the Interim at Augsburg, the deputy of F. ventured a hint about conscience, but was intimidated by the threats of the imperial vice-chancellor. At F. they could venture to enforce the new law only gradually. When, on July 5th, a committee of the Council warned the preachers to be silent in their ser-

mons with regard to the Interim, and not to attack papal doctrines and ceremonies, they answered that their office required them to be watchful shepherds of their flocks. By the Church constitution of 1533, all festivals except Sunday and one day of Christmas had been abolished; in consequence of the acceptance of the Interim, the Council ordered, Aug. 10, 1548, the preachers to announce on the following Sunday the restoration of the festivals ordered by it, and the prohibition of meat on fast-days. Ambach, Lulius and Beyer, positively refused to do so, and only Geltner yielded. The Council, on Feb. 25, 1549, once more besought the clergy to comply with the Interim; at least so far as to use the surplice, and to place lighted candles upon the communion table; but the result was the same. Beyer at the same time consulted Melancthon, Aepinus, Pistorius, Brenz, and other theologians; and wrote out in full his own reasons, why he declined every equivocal compromise between considerations of prudence and the positive demands of conscience. One concession, however, the preachers could not escape; they announced the festivals, but "without prayers." The most painful sacrifice which they had to make, was the parish church of St. Bartholomew, which they vacated, Oct. 4, 1549, to the Catholics.

During the siege of F., in 1552, by Maurice of Saxony, and Albert of Brandenburg, the citizens had to serve in its defence, stand guard, etc.; hence the churches were unvisited, and the week-day festivals again went into disuse. Nor did the preachers, after the siege had been raised, resume the load imposed upon them; and on second Christmas the churches were consequently closed. Although the Interim had been set aside by the compact of Passau, the Council nevertheless from unknown motives ordered, Jan. 5, 1553, the restoration of the festivals commanded by it. The preachers, who saw in this an effort to foist in again the entire Interim, refused in language which exceeded all that their excited anger had ever dictated. The Council was silent, until on Saturday before Easter the senior Mayor, through the sexton, commanded the preachers that they should observe Easter Monday as a festival. Geltner alone complied. Beyer on Easter Sunday admonished his congregation that if on the following day the church-bells should be rung, they should remain at home. For this he was promptly dismissed from his office, but restored again through the solicitation of his colleagues. In the main points the preachers remained victors; only as late as 1576 the Council after repeated efforts succeeded in enlarging the original simple cycle of festivals by the festival of the Circumcision of Christ and the Ascension.—Through Beyer's labors and force of character, Lutheranism had found entrance among the congregation and the preachers; of the latter only Lulius and Ambach yet represented the views of Upper Germany; they, however, on account of their great age and lengthy sermons had been dismissed from their pulpits. At this time, 1552, the fanatical Westphal renewed the sacramental controversy; in F. also the unhappy quarrel flamed up and aided rigid Lutheranism to a decided victory.

In 1553 the persecutions of Mary of England compelled the Netherland refugees to seek securer homes in other countries. The sacramental controversies had just inflamed the minds, and since the strangers held the Calvinist doctrine, they were refused a home nearly everywhere on the continent. A part of them at last found a home in East Friesland; others in the imperial cities of Wesel and Strasburg, and in Geneva. In 1554 Valerandus Polanus, a Reformed preacher, arrived in F. also. He was born in Ryssal, Flanders, and had in a work of his own defended Calvin's doctrine of the Lord's Supper. In 1547 he had gone with his countrymen to England as superintendent of the exile congregation Glassenbury. After the accession of Mary he proceeded to Frankfort. He at once called upon several preachers, especially Beyer, but avoided all discussion concerning the Lord's Supper, and also concealed his design of forming a congregation. March 15, he sent a petition to the Council, requesting that he and others might be received into the city, and that a church might be granted them; since, though *one in faith* with the citizens, they yet had a different language. Both requests were granted. Many other exiles followed them; they established a presbytery and a French school, and on Sunday, April 21, they opened divine service in the French language. On May 5th the two preachers, Beyer and Ritter, discovered that on the next day the Lord's Supper was to be celebrated; and this with rites so different from their own, that they were confirmed in their suspicions of Calvinism. On their information this celebration was forbidden by the authorities, and the preachers warned their congregations against errors. But when, soon after, the communion was observed, and this with glasses and the breaking of bread, and the faces of the pictures in the church of the exiles were covered with paper, the former ill-will broke out in open hatred. On June 27, a party of English Protestants, with their preacher, Wm. Whittingham, arrived at F., and obtained the use of the same church as the other exiles. In June, 1555, a party of Flemish Protestants followed, who had called John de Lasky and P. Dnthen as their preachers; these also established their worship in the Dutch language in the same church. In the English congregation John Knox labored from Nov., 1554, until March, 1555. At his arrival the congregation was divided into two parties; the one insisting upon the use of the Angl. ritual, the other upon the introduction of the Genevan liturgy. Under the supervision of Knox the Angl. liturgy was revised, and several rites were excluded as savoring of Popery and superstition. Peace had scarcely been restored, when several other Anglicans, Dr. Cox, teacher of Edward VI., among them, arrived at F. and sought by forcible means to restore the discarded ceremonies. Notwithstanding Knox's admirable moderation towards them, the Cox faction endeavored to secure his suspension. Failing in this, they denounced Knox, on account of an expression used in his last work with regard to the contemplated marriage of Mary with Philip of Spain, for violating the majesty of the Emperor, his son, and the

Queen. The Council fearing that the denouncers would apply to the Imperial chamber, requested Knox to leave the city; which he did March 26, 1555. — If the protection awarded to the exiles by several respectable patricians displeased the preachers, they were still more displeased when the Anglicans in the Fall of the same year, on account of great inconveniences arising from the common use of one church by three congregations, applied for the common use of the Luth. Church of St. Catharine; in which request they were also energetically supported by their patrons. On complaint (Sept. 5) of the preachers, the latter were charged by the Council to report on the deviations of the exiles from the Augsb. Confession; and now commenced that series of controversial tracts, which continued nearly two centuries, and forms a dark shadow in the Ch. History of F. — In this deluge of controversial tracts we mention as most important only the *Purgatio* of *de Lasky*, in which he admirably portrays Calvin's doctrine on the Lord's Supper, and defends it with the altered Augsb. Confession. In the same year, 1556, in which, in his own name and that of his colleagues, he sent this work to the Council, he returned to his own country. Calvin being at F. at the same time, hoped in vain to change the preachers to more moderation; they refused every personal meeting. Melanchthon's efforts to the same purpose had no better effects. But the exiles were still more injured in the Council by their own quarrels; nor were fanatics wanting among them who expressed Anabaptist views. After long and fruitless negotiations the Council at last resolved, April 22, 1561, that the foreign preachers should abstain entirely from preaching, until they had united in their views with the native preachers. All remonstrances were unable to alter this decree. In the following year, therefore, a large number of the exiles emigrated to the Palatinate, where they enjoyed the free exercise of their religion. The Anglicans had before already returned to England, Elizabeth having now ascended the throne. — The remainder of the Walloons, the germ of the modern Fr. Ref. congregation, continued their worship for a time longer in a private house; that of the Flemings, the founders of the Germ. Ref. congregation, in a barn. In 1594 Dr. F. Gomarus, who from 1588 had been minister among the Flemings, was expelled the city on pretence that contrary to a decree of Council he had married a foreign wife, and his congregation was forbidden to appoint a successor. Aug. 11, 1596, the Walloons had to discontinue their private assemblies. In consequence of this 200 families removed to Hanau, where they opened divine services in French and Dutch. The remnant at F. assembled for worship in the neighboring Bockenheim and Offenbach. During the thirty years war the Walloon congregation came near to entire dissolution. In 1633 the Flemings restored their worship at Bockenheim, but used the Germ. language. The Walloons also built, in 1638, a church for themselves in the same place. The oppression endured by the Reformed F., necessarily awakened a fraternal feeling among them. When the revocation of the edict of Nantes and the persecution of the Waldenses

n Piedmont occasioned a large emigration, large companies of the exiles arrived at F., in the vicinity of which many of them settled and established French congregations.—The history of the Luth. congregation presents little that is interesting. Its domestic peace was temporarily disturbed by several adherents of M. Flacius Illyricus, who, in 1575, died at F. in exile. Petreus, rect. of the gymnasium, who had married the widow and adopted the principles of this restless man, was driven, in 1681, from his office and from the city. The disaster at Antwerp, Nov. 5, 1576, by the Spaniards, brought a new accession to the congregation. These numerous exiles were welcomed the more heartily to F., as they adhered to the unaltered Augsb. Confession. Among them was the preacher, C. Reinus, from Sevilla in Spain. They connected themselves with the Luth. congregation, which allowed them, up to 1788, to hold divine services in French in the Weissfrauen church. For the purpose of taking care of the poor they have, however, an independent organization with deacons and elders.—An excellent arrangement of the Luth. Church at F. was the Seniory. The senior clergyman was the chairman of the Luth. ministerium and provost of the rural clergy; he was director of the Theological Seminary, superintended the studies of the students, conducted the examinations, and ordained and inducted into office. He was, in short, to give unity to the labors of the ministerial office. He was called from abroad, and through his position and character exercised generally an important influence. Among the 12 seniors, who were invested with this office from March 25, 1618, to Nov. 1822, the most celebrated was Dr. Phil. Jac. Spener, from 1666 to 1686 (see Art. *Spener*). After him Dr. J. P. Fresenius, the well-known author of numerous works, and opponent of the Reformed and Moravians, deserves to be mentioned. He was senior from 1748–1761 (see concerning him, *Lappenberg*, Reliq. l. Fräul. v. Klettenberg: Hamb., 1849). With the last senior, Dr. W. F. Hufnagel, who was called to F. in 1791, rationalism entered the ministerium, which held on to Lutheranism in the way of a petrified orthodoxy; and, being represented with spirit, learning, taste, and social act by so gifted a mind, spread rapidly among the higher and middle classes of society. After his death the seniory remained vacant. Nor were the evils which thence arose to the congregation removed by the appointment of the oldest pastor as vice-senior.—After all the efforts of the two Ref. congregations at F. to obtain the free exercise of their religion, as also in the interposition of prominent sovereigns, such as Frederick the Great, had been useless, this opposition was at last softened by the milder spirit of the age which, in the latter half of the last century, not only melted away denominational differences, but also weakened all denominational consciousness. On Nov. 15, 1787, a decree of the Council allowed the two Ref. congregations to build houses of worship, but their preachers were still forbidden to administer baptism and marriage. On Oct. 10, 1806, all concessions were placed upon an equal footing.—These rights were again ratified to the Reformed

congregations in 1816. Each of them had its own presbytery and diaconate, as also unrestricted liberty of electing its pastors. In order to give them a part in the direction of the Protestant schools, a common *Consistorium* was established in 1820, in which each church is represented by a Senator, its oldest minister, and a member of the presbytery. This Consist., however, has no ecclesiastical authority, but is a mere school-board.—The Luth. Church, though very numerous, has attained to a far less satisfactory development. It consists of 7 rural and one city congregations. In the latter there are 12 pastors. But as the parishes are undefined, and hence each member is at liberty to select any pastor, an equal distribution of duties and well ordered pastoral labors, are an impossibility. Since the beginning of this century the government of the Church is invested in a Senate, selected from all Christian denominations. Its executive is the Consistorium, composed of two Senators, the three oldest city pastors, and a lawyer. The pastors are elected by the Senate on the recommendation of the Consistorium. After 1832 the latter was ordered always to consult the congregational authorities, consisting of 18 elders and an equal number of deacons. On Feb. 2, 1849, a commission was appointed to prepare a plan of a new congregational organization; but this plan, in preparing which a deputation of the ministerium also participated, bore too deeply the impress of those unquiet times, for it to be recommended to the Senate by the Consistorium. These efforts to effect a new organization were resumed some years ago, the *ministerium*, however, being excluded from participating. Although a successful result is very desirable under present conflicting circumstances, yet a satisfactory accomplishment of the task seems as yet very doubtful; since the first requisite of a prosperous congregational life, a division into parishes, is decidedly refused by the representatives.—(See Frankf. Relig.-Handlung., 4 vols. fol., 1735.—K.-Gesch. v. den Ref. in Frankf. a. M., etc., with a preface by Dr. J. PH. FRESENIUS: Frankf. u. Leipz., 1751.—Whittingham, A brief discourse of the troubles begun at Frankford in Germany, A. D. 1554: Lond., 1575. A literal reprint, Lond., 1846.—RITTER, ev. Denkw. d. Stadt Frankf. a. M. od. ausführl. Bericht, etc.: Frankf., 1726, 4to.—KIRCHNER, Gesch. d. St. Frankf. a. M. Bes. II. Thl.: Frankf., 1810.—STEITZ, der Luth. Präd. H. Beyer. Ein Zeitbd. aus F.'s K.-Gesch. im Jahr. der Ref.: Frankf., 1852.—BECKER, Beiträge Z. d. K.-Gesch. der ev. Luth. Gem. zu Frankf. a. M., etc.: Frankf., 1852.—SCHRADER, Mittheil. aus der Gesch. der deutsch. Ref. Gem. in Frankf. a. M., in den "Vorträgen bei der Feier des 50. Jahrest. der Einweih. d. K.," etc.: Frankf., 1843.—SCHRÖDER, Disc. sur l'hist. de l'église reform. franç. de Fr., in the troisième jubilé sécul. de la fondat. de l'église ref. franç. de Fr.: Francf., 1854.

G. E. STEITZ. — *Reinecke*.

Fratricelli.—The origin and character of these persecuted fanatics, has long been involved in obscurity. They have been variously described, according to the different feelings with which they were contemplated. The name is

used by mediæval writers often in a broader and in a narrower sense, and thus the difficulty of ascertaining facts in regard to them is increased. *Guido of Perpignan* (*Summa de hæc. Hav.* 1528, fol.), considers them adherents of Segarelli, and Dulcino. *Mornay* (*Myst. iniq.*), adopting this view, calls them, and the Apostolic Brethren, a branch of the Waldenses. *Trithemius* (*Ann. Hirsaug.*, II., 74), traces them to Tanchelin, and Flanders. Others consider them the pantheistic brethren of the free Spirit, or even dualistic Cathari. Raynaldus thinks they were fanatical Franciscans. This is the general opinion. Even the Franciscan Alvarus Pelagius, who wrote in 1330, expresses this view (*de planctu Eccl.*, II., 51). *Wadding* (*Ann. ord. Min.*, ad ann., 1317. Nr. 24, &c.), endeavors to vindicate his order against this opinion; but he sacrifices facts to his zeal. These facts are as follows. To quell the desire of division which agitated the Franciscan order during the 13th cent., Celestine V. empowered *Petrus de Macerata*, and *Petrus de Foro Sempronio*, with other Italian spirituals, to form a distinct society, called *Pauperes eremiti Domini Celestini*. But the other Franciscans having persecuted them, the society was dissolved by Bonif. VIII., 1302. Enraged by this persecution, these eremites, now called Fratricelli, went about exciting the people to fanatical measures. They affirmed that there had been no Pope since Celestine, carried the rule of poverty to its utmost extremity, and frequently uniting with the Beghards, declared that they had no sin, possessed the Holy Spirit, and needed neither penance nor the sacraments. Clem. V. endeavored to reunite them with the other Franciscans, but the spirituals refused, and the animosity increased. In 1314, a party of Fratricelli drove the Franciscans from the monasteries of Béziers and Narbonne. John XXII. prohibited (1317) their manner of life, and commanded the Inquisition to suppress them. They had spread in Italy, Sicily, S. France, and later in Germany. They denounced the Romish C. with ever growing bitterness, appealing mainly to the postill of Peter Olivius. Those of their brethren whom the Inquisition punished they considered martyrs (See the bull of John XXII., Jan. 23, 1318, in Raynaldus, an. 1318, Nr. 45; and the *Culpæ Aequinorum*, in the *Lib. sentent. inquisit. Tolosanæ*, appended to LIMBORCH's *Hist. inquis.*). The number of these victims daily increased; some were burned, others imprisoned for life. In 1321, and the succeeding years, they were most violently persecuted in Italy, where they called themselves *fratricella della opinione*. After 1350 they disappear, especially as the spirituals, who remained true to the Church, but would not be reconciled with the order, were tolerated, and at length formally recognized by the Council of Constance.—Later writers, as *Prætorius* (*Elench. hæret.*, 186), and even Bayle, accuse the F. of scandalous customs and vices. Contemporaneous accounts say nothing of these. C. SCHMIDT.*

Frederick II., ruling Landgrave of Hesse-Cassel from 1760–85, was born on the 14th of Aug., 1720; noted for his apostacy, Feb. 1749, — Manism. He was enticed to this, by his con-

with the court of Bavaria, by the pomp of

the Rom. worship, and by his expectations of the crown of Poland. He was carefully educated under the court teacher (the renowned General Von Donop), and the philosopher Peter De Crousaz, from whom he imbibed predilections for French literature. As hereditary prince, he distinguished himself in the Austrian war of the succession. As imperial General-Field-marshal, he promoted, in 1744, the freeing of the Bavarian hereditary dominions, and accomplished, at the head of a Hessian army, in the service of his father-in-law, George II., various warlike exploits in Scotland. Soon after his return from England, accompanied by his father, Landgrave William VIII., he visited the Elector of Cologne, Clement Augustus of Bavaria. Here he abjured the Reformed faith. For five years he concealed this transition from his father, who was a zealous adherent of that faith. Meanwhile he performed various diplomatic services for his father, in Paris, Brussels, and London; and only in September, 1754, did the old Landgrave learn his son's apostacy. To avert the dangers of attempts at reaction, and to secure the religious confession of the country, the Landgrave caused a so-called Act of Assurance to be passed. Frederick himself confirmed this in 1754, whereupon it was adopted into the Constitution of the Hessian States, and sworn to by all the Hessian Boards, and was guaranteed by the *corpus evangelicum* of Ratisbon, by the kings of Great Britain, Prussia, Denmark, Sweden, and the States-General. In vain did Pope Benedict, the Elector of Cologne, the Bishops of Augsburg, the Courts of Vienna and Paris, attempt to destroy this Act of Assurance, and to draw the Hessian hereditary prince and his future dominions into their plans of reaction.—In consequence of his change of faith, his pious consort, Mary, Princess of England, separated from Frederick. Her marriage had been expressly designed to promote the Protestant religion. She retired, with her three sons, to Hainault, where she died in 1773. The same year he concluded a second marriage with Philippine, the beautiful daughter of the Margrave Frederick William of Brandenburg. On this occasion, Frederick the Great made the Landgrave promise by oath, neither to turn his new consort from the Evangelical religion, nor to have his children educated in any other. This marriage remained childless. Frederick fulfilled his various promises. The Constitution of the Church, which, as Frederick assumed the government, had been placed under the executive control of a special ministry of State, remained undisturbed. No preference was shown in any way for the Romish Church. In mixed marriages the sons went with the father, and the daughters with the mother. The private worship of the Landgrave was confined to the court chapel, and enlarged concessions were made to the Lutherans. The Landgrave zealously encouraged learning. Under the direction of his genial minister, Von Schlieffen, much was done for education. The Carolinum in Cassel, the Universities of Marburg and Rinteln, were much improved by erecting new professorships, enlarging endowments, and calling distinguished teachers. His preference for French culture,

however, led Frederick sometimes into unwise appointments. He showed an especial fondness for the fine arts. The museum and picture gallery were filled with the choicest treasures. The castles of Cassel, Wilhelmsthal and Weisenstein, were beautified. But the means for all this, he obtained by hiring 22,000 of his subjects to the English service, in the war against the United States of North America, for whom, from 1776 to 1784, he received over 21 millions. In view of this he relinquished to his subjects the half of their war contributions and other extraordinary taxes, and paid the debts of his dominions.

KLÜPFEL.—*Derr.*

Frederick III., called the Wise, Elector of Saxony, from 1486—1525, born in Torgau on the 17th of January, 1463, is, on account of his relations to Luther and the Reformation, an important character in church history. After the death of his father, the Elector Ernest, he assumed the government of the Dukedom of Saxony and its electoral dignity; and, in connection with his brother John, his subsequent successor, and surnamed the Constant, he governed the other Ernestinian possessions. He is represented as a sensible, considerate prince, and enjoyed, on account of his political sagacity and his integrity, great respect among the princes of the Empire, and with the Emperor Maximilian I., who, on removing to Italy, in 1496, assigned to him the imperial vicegerency. In affairs of the empire he belonged to the party which, led by the Elector Berthold, of Mayence, urged the reformation of the imperial constitution; and when, in 1500, the form of government recommended by this party, gained the ascendancy, the Emperor placed him at its head. One of his most important acts, was the founding of the University of Wittenberg. He spoke of it as his daughter, and spared neither care nor expense, to gain for it distinguished teachers. Calling Luther and Melancthon to it, he unconsciously became the creator of the Reformation University. He had no thought of a Reformation in the Church. Though favoring the humanities, for the sake of his University, he had taken no party position in this respect. He was still a good Catholic; and when already an Elector, he made, in 1493, a pilgrimage to Palestine, became in Jerusalem a Knight of the Holy Sepulchre, and collected 5000 relics for his Cathedral at Wittenberg. In earlier years, also, he was ambitious to obtain the papal gift of honor, the Golden Rose. This he obtained, but only when for him it was valueless. The first presentiment of Luther's significance, it is said, came to him in a dream (See d'Aubigné's Hist. Refor., Vol. I., p. 265, Amer. Tract Society edition). During the night of All-Saints, 1517, just as Luther had nailed up his theses, the Elector is said to have seen, in a dream, a monk writing some theses on the Castle in Wittenberg, with letters so distinct, that they could be read in Schweinitz. His pen grew so long, as to reach to Rome, and disturb the tiara of the Pope. Frederick, about extending his arm to arrest it, awoke. Luther earnestly attacked the Romish Church system; Frederick remained calm, neither opposing nor encouraging him. At the Diet of Augsburg, 1518, which Maxi-

milian had called to secure the imperial succession to his grandson, Frederick, for the first time, requested the mediation of the popish legate, Cajetan, and his friendly treatment of Luther. The renewed demand to send Luther to answer at Rome, or at least to dismiss him from his situation at Wittenberg, caused Frederick, for a time, to waver. Concern that his University should not lose one of its most important teachers, and Luther's bold self-defence, prevailed with him. Luther, he said, had as yet not been convicted of heresy, and he positively refused to dismiss him. The Elector's favor became now of the utmost importance to Luther. By the death of Maximilian I., the Elector became vicegerent of the empire. It was even thought he might become Emperor. In the contest between the grandson of Maximilian, King Charles of Spain, and King Francis of France, it would have been quite possible to unite a majority upon the Elector of Saxony. This would have been of the utmost significance, not only for the Reformation, but also for the whole national future of Germany. Frederick had too little ambition to contend for the imperial dignity. He understood too well the almost insurmountable difficulty of keeping the powerful States of the empire in subjection. Duke Philip of Solms, his attendant, being consulted, feared his master would not be able sufficiently to exercise the primitive power. This being also Frederick's own opinion, he had it publicly proclaimed by his servant. Besides, Frederick, generally very discreet, and already nearly sixty years of age, had no desire to assume such a burden in the evening of his life. Instead of permitting his own election, he cast the decision for King Charles of Spain. Here also ended the vicegerency. True, the Emperor appointed him regent of the imperial government, which, according to the wishes of the States-Reform party, was to be instituted during the absence of the Emperor; but the imperial commissioners did not institute this government, and hence did not deliver the diploma which constituted Frederick III. regent. As Elector, however, he continually protected Luther. When Eck, in the fall of 1519, brought with him from Rome, and endeavored to have enforced in Saxony, the papal bull against Luther, Frederick positively refused to assist in this, and repeated his demand, that Luther should be tried, in some safe place, and before pious and learned judges. He also permitted Luther, unpunished, solemnly and publicly to burn the papal bull. His most important act, however, for Luther, was, that he had him arrested on his way from the Diet of Worms, and taken, for safe keeping, to the Wartburg (See d'Aubigné as above, Vol. II., p. 276). Not courageous enough indeed, to declare himself openly for him, and openly to oppose and disobey the decision, he secretly instructed the governor of this castle, and another knight, thus to secure Luther against persecution. Disturbances having broken out in Wittenberg, Luther notified the Elector of his purpose openly to return. The latter entreated him not to come, as he could not protect him. Luther replied: "I come under a much higher protection, and

have no intention whatever to seek protection from your Grace, yea, I think to protect your Electoral Grace more than you can protect me."

The movement in Wittenberg had already reached a point, where the carefully calculating disposition of the Elector, and his timidity to resort to active measures, proved unavailing. He had hitherto protected Luther, not from active espousal of his cause, but rather to prevent a rupture, and for the purpose of conforming matters to a course of peaceful development.

His protection of Luther, says Ranke (*Deutsche Gesch.*, Band 2, S. 22, dritte Aufl.), resulted, at first, from a regard to political interest; afterwards it became a duty required by justice; but above all, he shared the implicit reverence for the Holy Scriptures, which Luther caused to prevail. All else, he found, however ingenious it might sound, could be contradicted; the word of God alone was holy, majestic, and the truth itself. It filled him with deep reverential awe. This also restrained him, both from an active participation in Luther's cause, and from any decided opposition to the innovations in Wittenberg; however unwelcome to him these were, he ventured not to condemn them.

The cruelties of the peasant war affected him most painfully; but he lived not to see its end. He died on the 5th of May, 1525, in his Castle of Lochau, aged 63 years, after having a few hours previously, by receiving the holy communion in both kinds, confessed himself a disciple of the new doctrine. Having never been married, he left no posterity of equal rank, and only two natural sons.

KLÜPFEL.—Derr.

Freedom, Moral. — Our conception of this subject is of the first importance to Christian doctrine and morals. Upon it depend all right ideas of man and his development, the providence of God and his government of the world, nature, and the design of the creation; no question lies so near the heart of theology and philosophy. For this reason a complete theory of human freedom can only be given in the connection of an entire system. Here we must limit ourselves to a brief glance at the chief points.

By the freedom of the human will may be understood, first of all, the ability which it has to produce effects, of itself, by the activity of its inherent powers. Of this ability, which fatalists and determinists are wont to style freedom, we do not here treat. That man, in this sense, is a self-moving creature is beyond dispute, but this cannot be truly called freedom; for such an ability may be granted, and yet everything like real freedom be denied to him, by asserting that his acts are a necessary result, natural fruits of original powers and instincts working reciprocally with influences from without. Man would then differ from the animal only in degree, not in kind — merely in the higher tendency of his instincts and the clearness of the consciousness which directs them in their play; he would be just as little the creator of his own acts; his freedom would not be *moral*. — Opposed to this lowest conception stands the ethico-religious idea of freedom; the deliverance of the human will from the determining influence of lower, sensual instincts; the agreement of that will with the moral law. In this emphatic sense the words

of Christ, in John 8 : 32, 36, and of Paul, in 2 Cor. 3 : 17, are used, where true freedom is strongly contrasted with the bondage of the moral will under sin. Of such freedom actually in possession it is not our design here to speak, but only of that which is *formal*, the *freedom of choice*. Is man really the master of his own actions? Is his will in action delivered from an absolute law that determines it, be it from without (God or nature), or from within (his own instincts or ideas), if not wholly at least in part? It is certainly an important question: How far does this ability of choice extend, if indeed it can ever be ascribed to him? Can the realization of the highest moral problem, in a word, freedom in the second, emphatic sense, be attained through the power lying in this freedom of choice? Or what aid for the solution of that problem can the freedom of choice in man give?

That man now is actually free in the last-named sense of the word, is a simple revelation of his own consciousness, an intuitive fact. By the recognition of myself as a person, as an Ego, I place myself over against the body and the whole sphere of nature, and claim thereby a supernatural existence, or perform at least a supernatural act. The Ego is the formal *causa sui*; to deny it the power of self-determination, is to deny it just that by which alone it is what it is. Individuality (the Ego) reflected upon itself (self-conscious) proves, by this very reflection upon itself, its power to tear itself loose from determining influences; so that to it this freedom could be shown as rather supplementary than superfluous; a thing already accomplished by the act.

Yet it may be said, grant that man, by the fact of his personality makes good his claim to freedom, i. e., the capacity of a self-determination independent of natural causality, or at least not to be explained by it—is not this Ego, which is by no means a pure activity, but interwoven in manifold ways with the external world, most of all through the body, determined by impulses arising from this very connection? Though the theoretical Ego may even rest upon an act of freedom, is also the practical Ego in its working, *causa sui*? To give a plain proof of it we need point only to asceticism which is possible to man alone, and especially to suicide. The latter never occurs in the animal world, and by its very contrariety to nature furnishes a most striking proof of the formal freedom of man, by virtue of which he can take a negative position against the basis of his own personality. But a more thorough answer is given to the question by the simple intuitive works of our own spirits. We find: amid a multitude of possible acts, amid the motives and incitements to perform one or more of them, the Ego can fall back upon itself; it takes counsel, weighs the reasons for and against, and at length decides for this or that purely from its own consciousness. Before acting, it was entirely certain, that it had the power to perform all or at least some of them (two are enough to prove the freedom of choice); it had indeed reasons, motives, but these by no means wrought with the necessity of causes; the decision was occasioned by a motive, but

not at all produced by it, for to each particular motive the Ego could give at least either a positive or a negative answer. When a decision is made, the act is performed with a sympathy (pathos), which may indeed give it the appearance of being constrained; but the man could, if he would, control this sympathy—he could bestow it on another act as well as this, and even if it cost him self-denial, the possibility of such a victory over self is the strongest proof of freedom. But the consciousness of a free causality of the will appears still more plainly in its relation to the moral law. Here there is no compulsion, only a command, which may be met by obedience or by disobedience. If the Ego choose the latter, *then it bewails it* not as misfortune, but *accuses itself* of guilt; it must feel penitence, i. e., it sees itself compelled to acknowledge freedom of choice (which perhaps it would willingly reason away on philosophic grounds), and confess that among the possible modes of acting it could have chosen a different one. Likewise, in our judgment of others, fortune and misfortune are carefully distinguished from merit and guilt, praise and blame being only awarded to the latter.

That the *consciousness* of freedom of choice is an essential element of personality, is proven by all these facts, and so strong are they, that any system which comes into conflict with them, whether it be on philosophical or religious grounds, must fall to pieces. Freedom of choice, as we will soon see, has indeed a limited sphere; a conception of the human will, as absolutely independent and indeterminate, would be certainly untrue. On the other hand, a system, which assigns to freedom of choice no sphere of action, and regards man as blindly subject, like other creatures in nature, to the operation of laws that cannot be resisted, is no true picture of the world as it is. Such a system, be it religious or philosophical, may in apathetic times, among decayed nationalities, prevail for a time, but sound human consciousness will continually battle against it with the watchword: Make room for freedom! Such a system will also find itself involved in greater difficulties than those which it strives to avoid. If it be believed, for example, that the omnipotence and omniscience of God, and especially the entire dependence of man upon him, leave no room for human freedom, how can we, if everything that happens on earth is thus rolled back upon him, defend the divine goodness and holiness? Whether it is easier to suppose, that God, because he wishes our freedom, limits his omnipotence and omniscience (for it must even come to this), or that the history of our race, with all its manifold wickedness, sin and cruelty is the work of a holy God? He who cannot endure in thought the dualism of a Divine will (which is the source of law) and a free human will, must be driven almost by necessity to that which is more intolerable—a twofold government of the world, divine and devilish, in perpetual conflict with each other. Or, if any one, not on God's account, but for the sake of his opinion concerning the unalterable necessity of nature, denies the free causality of the will, how can he possibly explain the existence of self-consciousness

and all those undeniable facts of moral consciousness, which have altogether the same realness and certainty in the sphere of intuition, as in the external world, the fact, that the stone, deprived of its support, falls to the ground? Just as an advocate of the corpuscular theory of light, by reflection upon the phenomena of interference and polarization, must find himself constrained to accept the theory of undulation, so also duty, i. e., an inward obligation, requires the advocate of natural causality to modify his views in such a way that these facts may find room. And yet by the admission of human caprice we do not seriously endanger the certainly indispensable idea of a system of natural necessity; for caprice, especially in its power over nature, has its fixed limits—"care is taken that trees do not grow to heaven." Titanic enterprises are impossible to man; the will which deals with the laws of nature according to its own pleasure, exists only in the world of romance; freedom of will has bounds which it cannot pass over (see Art. on *Miracles*).

To enter into details cannot be here done; for the problem of freedom, as before said, can only be solved in the connection of an entire system. But we may briefly remark, that a solution of the most important questions arising from this subject is given by the system of the Holy Scriptures, which, though they have so little of a formal, scientific character, and leave so much unanswered, cannot but impress the most frivolous unbelief and the greatest assumption of absolute knowledge with a sense of their wonderful grandeur, their beautiful harmony, and a comprehensiveness which overlooks nothing of essential moment, neither sacrificing the idea of nature and of God for the sake of freedom, nor the latter for the sake of the former, but standing in full harmony with the facts of moral and religious consciousness. God the creator of the world, and in it of the free creatures, who, though bound to nature, are yet above it—wholly dependent on God as to their being, but in their acts under his law, a law of liberty; this freedom left to itself, now more, now less—frequently awakened, guided, *educated*, by direct spiritual means or by divine influences exercised through nature as a medium; history, an interweaving of divine and human activities (Gen. 50 : 19); the distinction of two grand ages, that of the present, where freedom of choice has the widest scope and its greatest abnormalities are suffered, where God has not yet fully revealed his power, where the Lord has "taken a far journey" (see Mark 13 : 34); and that of the future, the time of the harvest, when the pure results of the development of human freedom will appear, and they who have sought and used their freedom in subjection to God, will be transferred also to a sphere of loftier activity (Rom. 8 : 21-23; Rev. 21; Matt. 25)—these are the main features of the biblical view of human freedom and its development.

Having now proven from his immediate self-consciousness, the actual existence of freedom of choice in man, and shown that its acknowledgment neither conflicts with the idea of nature nor of God, because the Scripture unites human liberty with the strictest notions of the

divine government of the world, it only remains for us to determine more accurately its sphere of operation, and to answer the question, How far man's moral perfection can be regarded as its work?

It has already been observed that human freedom is only relative. It is so, because it has fixed limits on all sides. It has its limits on the side of God and his government of the world: his laws it can indeed transgress, but is soon made to feel that such a course is destructive to itself. It has, moreover, its limit on the side of nature, over whose laws it can exercise a vast control, yet not so vast as to suspend their operation. Upon nature man can only work through his body. Finally, the freedom of man has its limit in his individuality and character, which are in a great measure what they are, by virtue of his nationality, circumstances, age, education. So long as he occupies a very low stage of intellectual and moral culture, his acts, his whole course of life is certainly little else than a product of all these factors. But as soon as he attains to self-consciousness and his will reflects upon itself, the determining power of these influences is broken, and he is able to bring various reactionary influences to bear against them; especially, if he becomes conscious of the moral law, and endeavors to bring his life and conduct into conformity with its divine precepts. The difficulty of conquest and the measure of success will be, it is true, just in proportion as external and sensual impulses have acquired strength by habit and use; but to deny the ability of the will thus to act is the same thing as to deny its freedom, and declare all the phenomena of conscience, such as remorse, approval, and the like, a mere sham. Even "natural men," like the heathen, distinguish between those who are conscientious and those who are not, between the righteous and the wicked, the virtuous and the vicious. To deny it, therefore, is nothing less than to close the eyes against a palpable fact.

Far different is the answer to the question, whether the actual, complete fulfilment of the moral law, the realization of the ideal of human life, is possible in this way; whether freedom in this emphatic sense of the word can be attained by the exertion of that which is merely formal. Experience replies with a decided negative. Nowhere does it appear that any one ever became actually good and holy, by the mere use of his natural freedom of choice. Every one finds rather within himself radical evil, indifference, resistance to the pure dictates of conscience (which, however, have certainly the priority) and a preponderance of sensual impulses, to decide in favor of which the will has a previous inclination (original sin); every one has to accuse himself of increasing this evil inheritance by the action of his free will. Only a good man can perform that which is truly good; but to make himself such a good man no one has ever yet succeeded by the mere exercise of free will. Only "in God" can that which is truly good be achieved. Even if we grant a partial fulfilment of the law (morality) to be attainable by free will, the right relation of man to God through his participation of the divine life,

is something which far transcends his power. Because now the Scriptures always keep in view this highest conception of the good, deny that man has a freedom, which can accomplish that which is truly good (John 3:6; Rom. 5:1; Gal. 5:17; 2 Cor. 3:5); the relation of those within the circle of divine grace to those without is that of freedmen to bondmen (John 8:36; Gal. 4). The act, from which the possibility of performing a good work first arises, is not itself productive, but an act of pure, unconditional surrender, a trustful acceptance of the divine grace offered by God in Christ—in one word, *faith*. Freedom could indeed produce of itself a relative good; yet even this, compared with what is good in the highest, divine sense, is again no good; man ought thus to acknowledge, that he does not become righteous by the works of his own unaided freedom, but only when this is raised into an entirely new sphere. If now, in conclusion, it be asked, whether the act of surrender itself be a matter of free choice, or if it be produced by an irresistible working of divine grace, the latter is to be positively denied, and the former as decisively affirmed. According to the undoubted fundamental view of the Scriptures, this act of faith toward God is only solicited by him, not produced. Man can of himself accept or reject the grace offered to him. The Apostle Paul, who sometimes may appear to favor the other view, had he intended to discriminate the *formal* act of accepting or rejecting grace, would no doubt have recognized the freedom of choice. But looking chiefly at the objective blessings of divine grace, he denied that man had anything to do with their production, and that so strongly, in order to cut off all ground for boasting, that it would almost seem as if he regarded the formal acceptance on the part of man as itself a work of God. But if we, in harmony with the teachings of Scripture elsewhere, ascribe this acceptance to moral freedom of choice, which by this act contributes a most valuable share toward the attainment of the moral ideal, we do not say too much, nor leave any room for boasting; for if a rich man offers a bag of jewels to a beggar, how absurd would it be for the latter, forgetting the giver, to boast of his non-refusal—the merely formal act—as that work to which he owed his wealth!

The more important works on this subject are: The famous treatise of *Schelling*, Ueber die menschliche Freiheit, Philos. Schrift. I. G. F. Bockshammer, Die Fr. des menschl. Willens: Stuttg., 1821. *Romang*, Ueber Willensfreiheit u. Determinismus: Bern., 1835. *Signart*, Das Problem von d. Fr. u. Unfr. des menschl. Willens, Tüb. Zeitschr. für Th., 1839, 3. *Herbart*, zur Lehre v. d. Fr. d. m. Willens: Gött., 1836. *Frauenstädt*, Die Fr. des Menschen, &c.: Berlin, 1838. *E. Zeller*, Ueber d. Fr. des m. Willens, das Böse u. die mor. Weltord. in seinen Th. Jahrb., 1846, 3; 1847, 1, 2. *J. Müller*, Die christl. Lehre v. der Sünde. *Rothe's Theol. Ethik*. *Schliephake*, die Grundlagen d. sittl. Lebens: Wiesbaden, 1855. JONATHAN EDWARDS, "Inquiry on the Freedom of the Will;" and DAY's Examination of Edwards' work.

H. PARET.—Porter.

French Catholic Church.—This portion of the Roman Catholic Church has an individuality, and presents a peculiar phase of the Catholic principle; the harder to characterize, because embracing all the peculiarities which an exuberant nationality could add to an already luxuriant Church. It is to be considered by itself in regard to its organization; the exercise of its powers; its relation to the whole Church and to the State; its doctrine, discipline, and cultus; its spirit and tendencies; its works; and its general influence.

1. In the organization of the Church, the clergy and spiritual orders have a less prominent and overshadowing position, than in the Rom. Catholic Church elsewhere; though even in that Church in general, it is wrong to suppose the clergy identical with the Church. The French Church has 15 archbishoprics; 69 bishoprics; 1,393 parishes; 29,532 *succursales*; 7,190 vicarships supported by the State; besides the *congrégations* and *communautés des femmes*.

Of the clergy there are two classes: the superior and the subordinate. The higher clergy are six cardinals, viz., the archbbs. of Lyons, Bourges, Besançon, Rheims, Bordeaux, and Tours; one belonging by birth to the middle nobility, all the others to the citizen rank; 15 archbishops, each at the head of an ecclesiastical province; and 69 bishops, who, as the proper and sole governors of their dioceses, and communicating directly with the temporal powers, and with the supreme authorities of the Church, are rather co-ordinate with the archbishops, than subordinate to them. The bishop is assisted by vicars-general and secretaries (in number according to the size and demands of the diocese), a corps of officials, and a chapter of canons (to which, at one time, the election of the bishop was entrusted). The subordinate clergy, placed over single parishes, are *Curés*, *Desservants*, and *Vicaires*; with *Pro-curés* in some dioceses, and *Aumôniers des Lycées, collèges, écoles normales*, and of hospitals, prisons, army and navy, each of which has its *aumônier en chef*. Also chaplains of the male and female congregations. In all, some 39,000 persons, exclusive of professors and students.

All the officers of the diocese receive their place and title directly or indirectly from the supreme head, and are subject to removal by him. Yet between the bishop and the lowest priest there is only the difference of rank, not of class, as between clergy and laity.

The religious societies, or spiritual orders, form a sort of transition from the laity to the clergy—nothing more; though some of them, through their clerical members, have at least an equal share with the clergy in the internal government of the Church. They fall into three principal classes: (1.) The proper *Ordres religieux*, whose members live in close houses (cloisters), under a perpetual vow of consecration. Of these, the order of the Jesuits is unquestionably the mightiest support of the Church. Not fully restored to its early strength and position since its *final* suppression, yet certainly restored in regular form, active in many ways, and actually in possession of many insti-

tutions of education and discipline (*Collèges, Missions, Retraites, Noviciats*). Next are the remnants of the Benedictines, devoted, as of old, to Church history, liturgy, and literature; but behind the age with their lumbering ways of communicating thought, and not likely to spread, or even hold their own. The Dominicans, under Lacordaire, through a better perception of the wants of the age in France, and by devotion to eloquent preaching, have risen in public esteem. The *Oratoriens*, and the Trappists have likewise grown in importance by pious and timely labors. The Carthusians and Capuchins are less popular and influential. (2.) The Lazarists (*prêtres de la mission*, not to be confounded with the *chevaliers de S. Lazare*), and the *Prêtres des missions étrangères*, show how much acceptance those societies enjoy, without the form of a monastic order, living in common, the more effectively to meet the wants of the age and the enlightened wishes of the Church. The latter is the most skilful foreign missionary society of the French Church. The *congrégations* and *communautés*, both male and female, are innumerable; few devoted to a purely contemplative life—this is at this day an exception even in the morality of the Church. Most are devoted to education and labors of love in hospitals, prisons, &c. (3.) Brotherhoods (*confréries*), whose members do not leave the lay ranks nor their temporal calling; and *sociétés* for particular purposes, all attached to the Church, committed to its views, its wishes, and its work.

That the laity thus, notwithstanding the sharp distinction made between them and the clergy by ordination, are still, through the various associations, in which they serve the Church and her spirit, engaged in one and the same work, and form one and the same whole, with the clergy, is very noticeable; for it is owing to this very fact, that, in spite of the sharply drawn boundary line of the Church herself, the administration of all her functions is so easy.

2. In the executive field, the great peculiarity of the French Catholic Church especially appears: that, agreeably to its organization as above described, it has no one national head, no primate, no patriarch, even nominal; each bishop has the direct charge of all the affairs of his diocese. Special titles among them are mere honorary designations, indicating no special authority. The archbishop is but a sort of *primus inter pares* among his bishops, never invading the internal control of their dioceses. The bishop is supreme in his diocese, subject only to the universal laws of the Church, and the will of the common supreme head at Rome. Here is the largest play for personal freedom, yet every security against caprice. With the unchangeable laws and the changing primacy, the unbroken tradition, the sense of the great public, the spirit of the Church, unite to discourage innovation. Every bishop, too, is counselled and restrained by his subordinates, whom he watches and directs. The monarchical unity of the whole resides in the relation of all to the one head at Rome. This virtual aristocracy of diocesan bishops, leads not rarely to differences

of views and regulations among them in matters not determined; sometimes going so far, that the supreme power must interfere.

3. But here we come to another main point: the relation of the French Church to its centre, the Church of Rome, and to the State. This, though more clearly defined and more firmly established than in any other national Church, has been still subject to constant changes, according as the Church has needed most the spiritual or temporal power, and as either of these two powers has more or less needed, or been able to serve, the other. The bishops of France have kept at the head of their privileges these two maxims: (1.) The supremacy of the pope over the bishops is confined to spiritual things; in temporal affairs they owe allegiance to the temporal rulers. (2.) In doctrine the pope's decrees are *irreformable*, only when they have received universal consent through a general council. To these add the purely political proposition, that kings and princes, according to the ordinance of God, are subject in temporal matters to no spiritual power. These principles, however, were never acknowledged by Rome, were condemned by Innocent XI., and have never been practised with universal sympathy by the French Church itself; revived, for example, particularly by Napoleon I., as a law impressed by public instruction upon the mind of the nation; but in other circumstances so far set aside, that Gallicanism at last remained as unwelcome to the bosom of the clergy as its older opponent ultra-montanism, and far more foreign to it. This change is due to the experience of the French Church, that the self-control, which she largely enjoys, is supported better by a close connection with the universal Church and its unchangeable government, than by attachment to the State and its changeful forms. Yet, with all its deference to Rome, the French episcopate by no means holds that inveterate ultra-montanism, which would but satisfy the claims of the Roman See. The bishops are not apostolic vicars by the grace of the pope, but successors of the apostles by the grace of God. The papal bulls are not binding till accepted by the episcopate. And in the older bishops a vigorous Gallicanism still survives, but finds little sympathy in the nation at large. — The posture of the episcopate towards the State has followed the same course in its posture towards the Roman See. At first sight the State seems everywhere supreme, virtually appointing the bishops, supporting them, building their churches, appointing their priests, watching them and their ministrations, protecting them, promoting them from office to office, and authorizing their synods. But the control is only apparent. The clergy are first consulted about every nomination. The State can make bishops of priests, but not priests of laymen. In such ways its authority in externals is materially modified; and in the more internal affairs of the Church, in doctrine, discipline, and worship, civil interference could be withstood by the smallest priest.

We speak of the French Church and its episcopate as more free and independent now, than formerly, simply because both share in that

progress of the age, which, placing all under a common law, allows to every one his natural definite sphere. That this independence is only a larger freedom of motion in a better and legally determined sphere, is already evident, and appears further from the manner in which doctrine, worship, and discipline, are treated in the French Church.

4. The doctrine is, of course, that of the whole Church, but presented in her own way, in conformity with the national mind and the taste of the age, in connection with the truths, which an incontestable progress in all departments of human study unfolds. In academic instruction we discern two tendencies, an ancient and a modern. The ancient is that love for metaphysical speculation, which produced the great scholasticism; philosophy and theology having remained united and interchangeable ever since their union was completed by Thomas Aquinas. The modern tendency is an altogether special endeavor to harmonize the truths of biblical doctrine with those of general physics, cosmology, and geology, or to keep them in harmony with the latest advances of these sciences. The old philosophical school is also characterized rather by opposition to non-churchly, independent speculation and rationalistic metaphysics, than by effort to win and reconcile them. Yet both these tendencies in the French Church are held subject to the Catholic maxim of the unchangeableness of Christian doctrine, on the principle, that "the rays of philosophy on religion, and of religion on philosophy, present to us every day in new points of view, things which still do not really change, but are in their essence unchangeable." Within the limits of an honest subjection to this maxim, the law of progress freely asserts its right, and the French Church labors to keep pace in her forms and representations of the received doctrine with the high advances of the age, gathering the contributions also of the active mind of other countries.

Each bishop as a rule trains his own clergy; each diocese has a higher, and one or more lower seminaries. In the higher seminaries which are conducted by a superior under the supervision of the bishop, the students are everywhere instructed in the Scriptures, dogmatics, ethics, and canon law; according to circumstances in Hebrew, philosophy, physics, liturgy, church history, &c. In the provinces bordering on Germany, they have exegesis and pastoral theology. The higher academical studies are provided for in the theological faculties which are outwardly under the ministry of public instruction, but inwardly under the direction of the bishop of the diocese. These faculties, however, except that of the Sorbonne in Paris, are not in much repute, nor at all superior to the seminaries in their science or modes of instruction. The *Ecole ecclésiastique des hautes études*, is the institution, which really, with clear insight, pays true regard to the spirit of the age. Its organization in reality does homage to the scientific supremacy of the laity. The school, divided into two classes between clergy and laity, each under its own director, has for its teachers ten laymen, who have all received in the University the diploma of doctor or licen-

iate in the sciences or in letters. The school has eminent ability, and promises much for the future.

The homiletic and popular form is properly the radiant point of public instruction in the French Church. Nature has richly endowed the nation with the gift of eloquence, and with a special delight in it. Ministers everywhere aim especially to perfect the power of pulpit discourse, and find abundant stimulus not only in the stated feasts, but also in extraordinary occasions. The preaching missionaries, whose business it is to address themselves to the indifferent, the erring, the hostile, the illuminists, rationalists, atheists, materialists, to reclaim them, find themselves compelled to gain access by the attraction of their words, and the earnestness of their teaching. The free, persuasive conference, is a favorite form for the popular inculcation of the doctrines of the church.

Catechetical instruction, which has heretofore not been so systematically attended to in France as in the Catholic Church of Germany, bears everywhere the stamp of definitive statement and unchangeableness of doctrine. — With all its assertions of the great privilege of freedom in still doubtful points, which have caused the French Church to appear often in the Roman Index, that Church still keeps the already settled doctrines as its own, and various circumstances show, that the Index has a greater power now than formerly in France.

The same inclination towards Rome appears in the discipline and worship of the French Church. Of old it has had its own liturgy in almost every diocese. So has every diocese its own usages, feasts, saints; agreeing in the main, differing in particulars. These differences have become very unpleasant to some now living members of the clergy, and determined them to the unconditional adoption of the Roman liturgy. The question is especially with the Breviary and the Missal. The matter is thus of great importance for the Roman See. Yet not on this account, nor from any presumptive inclination to submission, but for the sake of unity, from a desire for a better choice, and in consequence of great aversion to the changes made in the Breviary and Missal, particularly those of 1744, the Roman came to be adopted in one diocese after another. These changes made the liturgy to be set aside comparatively a new one; and when Pius V., in two bulls in the name of the Council of Trent, commands that his Breviary and Missal be introduced into all the dioceses, unless another has been in use at least two centuries, the bishops are thus very strongly authorized to refer the agreeable change, as it had already been decreed by the two French Synods of Toulouse, 1590, and of Narbonne, 1609. In the diocese of Evreux, through a most remarkable pastoral letter of its bishop, of Jan. 5th, 1854, the adoption of the Roman Breviary and Missal has been followed by the adoption also of the ritual, the ceremonial, and the hymns of the Roman Church; still to the no small grief of Gallicanism over this ultra-montane revolution. — The worship of the French Church is distinguished also, according to the national taste, in the cities particularly, by profuse and elegant

ornamentation of churches, chapels, altars, and by splendid music; sometimes to such an extent as to incur censure from the more strict and severe; though such censure is only the exception.

The discipline is still more free than the worship. It is a fundamental maxim here, that all which belongs to discipline is quite beyond the province of faith, and so can change according to time and place. The French Church, therefore, has been able to adopt in general the decrees of the Council of Trent without the canons relating to discipline. Yet since it is another maxim, that the Church cannot exist without some disciplinary laws, the French Church has had her own, though in a certain agreement with the whole Church. These laws have suffered in stormy seasons, and in philosophic periods; and the diocesan synods, by which the episcopate has sought to restore and complete them, are among the most influential phenomena of our time. Aiming only at restoration and development, not touching at all the great questions of doctrine, church, pope, and emperor or king, their quiet deliberations are as little to be compared with the debates of the Councils of the 15th century, as with a church-diet of evangelical Germany. Perhaps nowhere else is the peaceful spirit of the present French Church, striving only after harmony with every power of the age, better expressed.

5. It is really at present the main tendency and spirit of this church to secure to itself on a more extended scale than ever its desired power over the mind in the way of conviction; not without fixed means, according to unchangeable doctrine and settled rules; but without outward force, by the luminous presentation of what is in its view the only truth. Toleration is a favorite word, though every founder of dissent is still very rigidly dealt with. Next to the German, the French Church is unquestionably more tolerant than any other. Yet her principles allow not a word of toleration in the Protestant sense, which concedes eternal salvation to Christians of another confession. She has abandoned inquisition and persecution, and fallen into better views of freedom of conscience. But spiritual weapons and warfare, scientific and literary polemics, and the zealous spirit of proselytism, she by no means renounces. And the Protestant Church, or single doctrines, institutions, events, teachers, members of it, she makes the first object of her exertions, to enlighten all respecting the truth, which she exclusively possesses. With this view, besides producing from her own bosom, she freely avails herself, by translation, of all such productions abroad as suit her polemic purposes; and the spirit, which would suppose the purest motives in all the converts of the Church, and charge even the most censurable upon the converts of her opponents, — the spirit of bigotry, of blindness to history, and of prejudice against all movements outside of the Catholic Church, even in many cultivated and learned persons, — has not perceptibly declined in the French Church since the days of Bossuet.

6. The missionary and benevolent operations of the French Church, are inseparable from its

institutions; the name *œuvres*, works, is applied alike to both. Respecting these we cannot here go into detail; suffice it to indicate the character of the French Church in this respect by a very general enumeration. In labors of Christian love, in caring for the poor, sick, widows, orphans, and all who need material help, few national Churches show so much, under so many, so beautiful, and so inviting forms. Here is one of the bright sides of the French societies and orders. Nor are these abundant labors, it must be confessed, entirely wanting in evangelical spirit. Yet of course the idea of sanctification by good works plays its part, and these charitable operations engage not only the great majority of the spiritual orders and religious unions, but also the great majority of the laity of all classes, either personally or through offerings of every kind.—Almost as numerous are the institutions, and as highly esteemed the works, of charity for spiritual purposes, for the improvement of convicts, the restoration of penitents, the reclaiming of wanderers, the protection of the destitute of every sex and age; institutions exhibiting not only the right spirit, but also admirable skill and winning deportment.

Her missionary labors among non-Christian people, both abroad and at home, are perhaps the greatest honor to the French Church. Of this the *Lettres édifiantes* are a lasting monument. A considerable list of associations is employed almost exclusively in preparing those called to this work; at the head of which stands the *Congrégation des Prêtres de la Mission*, the society of the Lazarists, with seven directors under a general superior, a seminary at Paris with five professors, stations at Constantinople and Salonica, a college at Bebek on the Bosphorus, two posts in Greece, a house and a college in Smyrna, five stations in Syria, one in Persia, three apostolic vicarships and a bishopric in China; settlements in Abyssinia and Egypt, in the latter country a college; with still more important and numerous institutions in America, particularly in the United States, where, to its forty apostles belonging to all nations in Europe, it has gained five and twenty students; and in Brazil, where it possesses three main institutions, a hospital, a seminary, and a mission. Next to this stands the *Séminaire des Missions étrangères*. Then the *Congrégation du sacré cœur et de l'adoration perpétuelle*; the *Congrégation du Saint-Esprit et du Saint-cœur de Marie*; which was united in 1848 with the recently-founded *Congrégation du Saint-cœur de Marie*, with stations in the two Guineas, in Senegambia on the Senegal, with two bishops and an apostolic prefect, and other distant connections. The *Société des prêtres de la miséricorde*, founded in 1834, and affiliated to the Propaganda in Rome, prepares under the direction of the central house in the capital city, in a noviciate at Orleans, and in its institutions at Bordeaux, New York, and St. Augustine in Florida, clerical laborers for missions at home and abroad; besides teachers for Latin schools, and preachers or directors for those extraordinary spiritual exercises so much thought of in the French Church.—We should also remark, that female

societies are often attached to these missionary operations in various ways.

But of all the works and institutions of the French Church, those are the most popular and the most important, which have proceeded, if not from an entirely new spirit, at least from a spirit very much renewed, and which are best adapted to the wants of the time, and most promote the influence of the church: the educational. Though the clergy has from the first claimed the education of the young, and even the imperial university was founded with a view to have its members a congregation in celibacy; yet the demands of the spirit of the age have separated between the university and the clergy, though many clergymen are called even to the higher places in the government and instruction. But the clergy have aimed with diligence, skill and success, to provide in their own institutions, under a government of their own, a small clerical university; and just now, since the law of March 15th, 1850, which opened the doors of the national institution most widely to them, a whole series of *collèges Catholiques*, and *maisons d'éducation dirigées par des ecclésiastiques*, have arisen. A brilliant beginning unquestionably for a remarkable counter-reform against the whole system of purely state education.—Then the Archbishop of Paris, with his clergy, has founded a special normal school, for the education of teachers, which gives great promise. Though the higher faculty studies must be left to the State, yet the Church, through such societies as that of *St. Vincent de Paul*, brings the religious element to bear effectively upon them. The public common schools, also, outwardly under the care of the State, and admirably appointed, are internally for the most part under the direction of the clergy. All are subject directly or indirectly to the heads of the diocese, though enjoying considerable freedom in their own sphere. The number also of institutions, and of female laborers for female youth is equally large; most of the female associations being employed in the tuition of the young of all classes.

In all these institutions and labors of charity, no other part of the Catholic Church is richer than the French; and these are unquestionably the simple and splendid means which have placed her, after revolutionary dissolution and momentary suppression, already not only upon her former footing, but upon even much higher ground.

7. As to the general position of the French Church, we may briefly say, that it is everywhere represented in all the circumstances and relations of the French people. It stands as *Chapitre impérial* at the grave of past dynasties, as *grande-aumônerie* in the palace of the present. In the senate its cardinals take the first place. In army and navy it alone is called to the official chaplaincy; the protestant clergy being merely allowed voluntary service. In all public state ceremonies it alone officiates. It sits in all the councils of public instruction, and controls the religious education of the nation. In literature and science, and even in the daily journalism, it has a leading part. All the political sheets

belong to it, and among the great journals, an anti-Catholic one has never been able to sustain itself longer than a couple of months. In a word, though the Catholic Church is not identical with the French, yet is the French nation, though not in its laws, at least in its manners and customs, Catholic. In the eye of the law all worships are alike; but a real equality of the clergy of different confessions, or an actual equality of the different churches, is not to be thought of. Not that the French nation is Catholic in the old Spanish or Italian sense, or even in the old French. The progress of active thought for the last three centuries has liberated the spirit of investigation there, and introduced a certain Protestant element, in opposition to obligatory faith. Yet the Reformation in its non-political aspect, that is, evangelical Protestantism, is so little acceptable to the hearts of the people, that the most inveterate prejudices and the most honest aversion still exist against it, and the active posture of the clergy against it only agrees with and carries out this feeling; not only their posture against all philosophy, science, and politics, which do not proceed from the Church, but also against all theology independent of her. Though the influence of the Church here, in producing uniformity and fixedness of faith, falls far below her ideal,—many of her members conforming merely outwardly and for policy, not from conviction,—still in her principles and works the Church maintains her standard. And not only all religious training and education, but even the direction of the inner, nay, the inmost life, has either remained or been restored to her; and in fact is in many respects more largely and firmly in her hand now, than, for example, in the century last past. This great fact, induced in part by political circumstances, goes further than any other to explain the grand enterprises and the whole working of the Church.—Her influence upon the progress of philosophy, science, and literature, with all her protestations of the tenderest regard, is at bottom only that of resistance, in so far as the movement threatens the religious element. Her former exclusive influence on the fine arts is almost gone; and the same must be said of her influence on politics, and the shaping and administration of the State. She has always played an important part, indeed, in French politics, but never a leading and formative one. She has been present everywhere as an important spiritual or moral element in material shape and social form; but it cannot be said, that she has made any considerable impression upon the principles of the constitution, the maxims of the government, the course of the administration, or still less upon relations and affairs abroad, some itself not excepted. Here, where Catholicism reigns in the inward and the outward life of the people, in art, literature, custom, and law, and even tinges strongly the French Protestantism, it could not be less perceptible, as a formal power, than it is.

[Abbé *Ferdinand Fr. Châtel*, born 1795 in *Taunat en Bourbonnais*, of poor parents, attempted to start a new French Catholic Church, after the Revolution of 1830. Châtel had at-

tracted public attention as priest, by his preaching, and especially by exciting articles in the *Réformateur* and *Echo de la Religion et du siècle*. After 1830 he gathered several dissatisfied clergymen around him, and through them a small company which held meetings in various places. Soon he held public worship at different points in Paris and its vicinity, and even in distant towns. His adherents elected him *évêque-primat*. As long as Châtel and his friends merely advocated ecclesiastical reforms, the people listened to them, and the government tolerated the movement. But when he allowed himself to be chosen *évêque-primat*, and avowed as his faith "*la loi naturelle, toute la loi naturelle, rien que la loi naturelle*," public opinion turned against the new Church. In 1842, the police stopped their public worship, and Châtel obtained an office under the king. Thus all traces of the movement soon disappeared.]

MATTER.—*Yeomans*.

French Confession (*confessio gallicana*) was composed in the French language in 1559, confirmed by the first national Synod of Paris, and presented to King Henry II (see Art. *French Reformation*), but soon found occasion to be presented to King Charles IX. at the Synod of Poissy (1561), in presence of the temporal and spiritual dignitaries of the realm (see Art. *Poissy, Conference of*). It was afterwards ratified by the national Synod of Rochelle, in 1571; hence, it is often, in France, called the *Confession de la Rochelle*, and some have been led to suppose, that the confession current under this name was a different one from that composed in 1559, and ratified in Poissy in 1561. In La Rochelle it was subscribed not only by the clergy and elders present, but also by Joanna, Queen of Navarre; Henry, prince of Navarre; Henry Bourbon, Prince Condé, Louis, Count of Nassau, Admiral Coligny, and several other persons of rank. The French text is given in Beza's *histoire ecclésiastique*, Tom. II., 173, sq., and in the *confessions de foi des églises réformées*: Montpellier, 1825. A Latin version was published in Geneva in 1566, found in the *Corpus et Syntagma* and other collections. A German translation appeared so early as 1562, in Heidelberg.

The general Calvinistic spirit of the document has given rise to the false impression, that Calvin was its author. On the strict biblical principle, it not only rejects all traditions and tenets contrary to the Word of God, but enumerates all the several canonical books of the Old and New Testament. It propounds the doctrine of predestination and the kindred anthropological points, but without supralapsarianism. On the sacraments, particularly the Lord's Supper, it is most strictly Calvinistic. And the prominence which Calvin, and with him the French Reformed Church, gave to church government and discipline, appears in the articles on those subjects. The Confession takes pains to counteract the impression, that the Reformed Church taught insubordination towards the temporal power. It even claims for the civil authority power to punish breakers of the commandments of the second table, that is, heretics. It has long since lost all force.

HERZOG.—*Yeomans*.

French Lutheran Church, from Louis XIV. to the Revolution.—(See RÖHRICH, Mittheil. aus d. Gesch. d. ev. K. d. Elsaszes: Strasb., 1855). Before 1648 there was no Lutheran Church in France. The first French reformers were doubtless influenced by Luther's writings, and for a time the adherents of the evang. doctrines were called Lutherans. But Calvin's influence soon predominated, and the name Lutheran was dropped.—By the peace of Westphalia Elsass was ceded to France. In several territories of Elsass the Augsburg Confession had been adopted. These included the imperial cities of Colmar, Münster, Weissenburg, and Landau, in which a pure or mixed Lutheranism had been established. The peace of W. had guaranteed religious liberty; this was further confirmed, 1678, by the peace of Nymwegen. Each retained the confession adopted by it in the normal year 1624. In 1681 Strasburg was ceded to France under similar guaranties; and in 1796 Montbéliard separated from Würtemberg and joined France, on the same conditions. These were the constituent parts of the Lutheran C. in France, and the territorial diversity of its origin may still be seen in the various liturgies, hymn books, and catechisms found in different sections, as well as in its divers forms of church organization.—Louis XIV. and his successors formally maintained the guaranties, but sought by every means to further the Romish interests in those districts. To this end various ordinances against proselytism, mixed marriages, &c., were issued. It is said that 64 churches were thus regained for the Romish Church.

DR. KIENLEN.*

French Reformation, the, to the first General Synod, A. D. 1559.—The reformatory movement, originated by Luther, found many special points of connection in France. Certainly nowhere had history so plowed up the ground of Catholic tradition, so richly sowed it with partly anti-Romish and partly genuine evangelical seed, and so abundantly enriched it with the blood of confessors. In the South-east this seed had already sprouted in the little Church of the Waldenses (see the Art.), and in the South among the Cathari (see the Art.). The contests for Gallican liberties, if they never attained a permanent victory, did very much darken the nimbus of the Popes by their continual repetition, whilst the University and Parliament of Paris, greatly weakened the papal authority in the wide circles of its influence. Among the active agents of this reformatory movement in France we must not overlook the *satirists* and *humorists*. The satire of that time had not yet been banished from language and literature by a central academy devoted to the court, and even cynicism had not yet been killed by ambiguities and erotic ornaments. Most prominent among others of the laborers of this class is *Francis Rabelais*, who, although at one time a Franciscan and then priest at Meudon, near Paris, labored as a reformer in so far as he, like Luther and Calvin, called the Sorbonists only *sophists*, and honored their leader in their quarrels with humanists, *Dr. Natalis Beda*, on account of his gluttony, with the authorship of *De optimitate triparum*, which learned trea-

tise he professed to have found in the library of St. Victor, in Paris, under the title: *Pantofla decretorum, Decretum universitatis Parisiensis super gorgiasitate muliercularum ad placitum*, and *L'apparition de sainte Gertrude à une nonnain de Poissy estant en mal d'enfant*. In addition, around the reformatory germ were lying layers of the most different spirits at the court, in Parliament, among the clergy and nobility, who promised to advance the Reformation by decided approval or by negation of what had been transmitted, by religious and moral earnestness, by sympathy for the confessors, by scientific and intellectual endeavors, by ridicule of priests and monks, in short, in the most manifold ways. We must mention here, first of all King Francis I., "the restorer and father of the sciences." Next to the King is his sister, "the tenth muse and fourth grace," *Margaret of Valois*, or of *Angouleme*, or of *Orleans*, wife, first of the Duke of Alençon, then of the King of Navarre. The greatest promoter of the French Reformation was *Renata*, daughter of Louis XII. and Duchess of Ferrara, who protected the Reformers, and communicated the evangelical spirit to her daughter, the heroine *Johanna d'Albret*, the mother of Henry IV. Among the men whom she gathered around her and protected in her little sovereignty of Bearne, the first place belongs to *Jacob Lefèvre* (*Jacobus Faber*), called after his birth-place, near Boulogne, von *Etaples* (*Stapulensis*), because, without being a Reformer, he let shine an evangelical light before Luther and Zwingli. It is certain, that he taught the doctrine of justification by faith in Christ, without the deeds of the law, before Luther, and at the time when the German Reformer had not yet decided in favor of the real presence of Christ in the eucharist, he held the local presence and the doctrine of ubiquity (see the Art. *Faber Stapulensis*).

All these and many similar hopes of a complete territorial reformation of France remained unfulfilled, and we must look to other and more direct causes for the origin of the movement.

The first of these is the power of Roman Catholicism, which comprehended and penetrated every civil and social relation. Although we find the same existing in other Catholic countries and States, yet it exerted a mightier influence upon this susceptible and lively nation. Ever since the baptism of Chlodwig, France was regarded as the oldest Catholic kingdom—this transaction being glorified by a miracle (see the Art. *Chlodwig*); its rulers being regarded not only as the "most Christian kings" and "the eldest sons of the Church," but were placed by Gregory the Great as far above all other kings, as these latter were above other men. "*Quanto ceteros homines regia dignitas antecedit, tanto ceterarum gentium regna regni vestri profecto culmen excellit*" (*Gregorii M. Opera, studio Ord. S. Benedicti, T. II., Paris, 1705; Epist. 6, lib. VI.*). Pepin and Charles the Great are called "the noblest and most glorious sons" of the bride of Solomon's Song, her "*spirituales compatries*," etc. (*Muratori, Rer. Ital. Script., T. III., P. 2, p. 94–123*). To this must be added the traditions concerning the banner of the Oriflamme, which an angel gave to a hermit at St. Germain,

and the gift of healing the scrofula which was given by God to Chlodwig and his successors. These traditions exercised a mighty influence upon the minds of the people.

Moreover, there were circumstances which, because in France they opposed the papal system more than anywhere else, promised to promote the Reformation, but notwithstanding hindered it, and so far as they weakened it, they strengthened the national religion and Church; whilst in Germany the want of political unity aided the Reformation. Under almost sovereign princes the Reformation could, in the former country, establish itself upon the broad and firm foundation of the possession of the soil by the secularization of the ecclesiastical possessions, which was impossible to the crown vassals of the latter, at least it would have been very difficult for Francis I., after the conclusion of the Concordat with Leo X., to attempt so radical a measure.

The French Reformation experienced similar treatment from the University of Paris, and specially its theological faculty, or the Sorbonne; which made itself so distinguished as the protectress of the liberties of the Gallican Church, and as the opponent of hierarchical usurpation, and even in the year following the publication of Luther's 95 theses, published a decree against the indulgence-nuisance.

A similar position in opposition to the Reformation was taken by the Parliament of Paris, which also considered itself called to protect the rights of the crown and the liberties of the nation against the usurpations of the hierarchy, and thus obtained a respect which would have been lost by the introduction of the Reformation. By holding fast to its corporate rights and honor, the Parliament indirectly injured the Reformation, in that it led the people to rise as one man against the Concordat, so that the King, provoked by this opposition, could be more easily persuaded by the Romish court, to oppose the new and therefore *illegal* and unconstitutional agitations of freedom. Therefore it was not difficult for the papal nuncio to persuade the King, that "a new religion introduced among a people only caused a change of the ruler" (Brantome). — Another influence, hostile to the Reformation, was connected with this, and came from the directly opposite quarter, namely, the general and just aversion to the Concordat, which was even shared by the clergy.

But finally the *moral claims* of the "new religion" were by no means adapted to gain an entire nation, especially a court, whose ornament and noblest, purest, and most Christian character was Margaret of Navarre, in whose graceful novels, the conceptions of earthly and heavenly love are mixed together, and who, in her old age, when she had realized the earnestness of life and experienced godly sorrow, wrote: "We pass our time with mummeries and farces" (*Genin, Lettres de Marguerite*, p. 1). The French Protestants, who apprehended the Reformation principle of faith as a principle moral renovation, became for this reason the *rebuking conscience* of their Catholic countrymen, were *hated* as such, and, as Davila (*Lib. . . Istor. delle guerre civili di Francia*) declares,

were the *materia peccans* in the bowels of France, which must be expelled by the shedding of blood!

Thus, therefore, we see, that a territorial and Church-reform was not possible for the people and kingdom of France, but only such a Reformation as proceeding from the free moral change of the individual and resting upon internal power, should open a way *without*, or even *against* external might.

As the French and Swiss Protestants were called "Lutherans" by their enemies previous to the division which originated in the controversy about the sacrament, so there is truth in designating the French Reformation in its beginnings as "Lutheran" (which has been objected to) inasmuch as it was Luther who fanned the latent flame of reform, so that it spread itself over the land and people. But he could not preserve this flame in its purity. Many circumstances united to prevent this. Although Luther apprehended the universality of Christianity and the idea of the true Catholic Church, as no other Reformer scarcely did, still his nature was too German to exert the same influence upon the French which a prominent *Romanic* character could. To this must be added his aversion to the French as a people, and the language in which he wrote his works, which could only be carried to France in weak translations.

Thus then, the French Reformation depended upon itself until Calvin took hold of it, but it was not entirely forsaken. If God gave the German Reformation a pyramidal form, he also so controlled events in France long before the Reformation, that it had to search for its centre of gravity *down among the broad foundations of the totality of believers*. Thus we find at first and before Calvin became prominent, a difference existing between these Reformations *made by history*, the one possessing a democratic the other a monarchic character, and both equally legitimate, because they were produced by the God of history.

The fire of persecution, however, exerted such a purifying influence upon the democratic character of the French Reformation, that even its impure elements, as the Libertines and Anabaptists, did not run to the communistic and demagogical excesses of the German peasants and Anabaptists, but preserved a more speculative character. Similar causes, such as the methodical French spirit, connected with a natural tact for organization, prevented the usual party tricks and excesses at the elections for ecclesiastical officers. Thus in many places small congregations were organized, which assembled periodically in secret places; such an one even existed at Paris under the protection of the Queen of Navarre, and was served by Roussel. For the ecclesiastical office of teaching, notwithstanding the rejection of the priestly character, was from the first so highly honored, that wherever it was possible, the Catholic priests who accepted the Reformation were placed over the little congregations, and only in cases where there was neither such nor any other kind of called teacher, was a layman appointed as *servant* (ministre) of the congregation by its free

choice. In extraordinary cases, however, there were exceptions to this, which, in the later constitution of the Church, were even acknowledged (see *Art. Court*). Generally, the French-Reformed Church in this respect approached nearer to the Apostolic and primitive Church. This enabled it to preserve its life amidst the many extraordinary vicissitudes through which it passed, and by running into a radicalism which denied the office of teaching, exposed it to mortal jeopardy.

On the other hand, at Meaux a circle of evangelical men gathered around Bishop Briçonnet, which, without being schismatic, sought to labor in a reformatory way by doctrine and example within the diocese of this Bishop, and by his authority. The first place among these men belongs to *Lefèvre*; the others are, *Gerhard Roussel* (called Gerardus Ruffus, also le Roux and Ruffi), *Francis Vatable* (Vatablus), *Martial Mazurier*, *Josse Clichthou* (Jodocus Clichtoveus), *Michael von Arande* (Arundel), and *William Farel* (see *Articles*). Being soon suspected of heresy, these men succumbed partly to their own fears, as especially Briçonnet, and partly to actual persecution. *Lefèvre* and *Roussel* fled from the latter to Strasburg, and, under the protection of the Queen of Navarre soon returned to France, where they took a middle position between the old and new Church. *Farel*, however, who was not the man for such a position, returned to his native Dauphiny, where, wandering in the forests, he as a missionary opened a wide door for the Reformation. *Martial Mazurier*, who, in a fit of carnal zeal, cast down and broke a stigmatized image of St. Francis of Assisi, was led through fear of the stake to recant, and being liberated from prison, he not only taught and preached against his previous convictions, but also influenced a young man and hopeful pupil of *Lefèvre*, *Jacob Pavannes* (also *Pauvant*, *Ponent*, etc.), who had been imprisoned with him, to recant; finally even appeared as accuser against his own brother. Meanwhile in this same city of Meaux, a greater and wider effect was produced by the teaching and example of these men than they designed or wished. *John Le Clerc*, a wool-dresser, was led to a saving knowledge of the truth partly by the evangelical sermons of Briçonnet, and partly by reading the Bible (translated by *Lefèvre*) and evangelical tracts, which were scattered abroad at this time already by faithful and fearless "basket-carriers" (*porte-paniers*). Connected with his knowledge was a fierce zeal against the Popish doctrines and practices, which was so inflamed by the abuses which he saw in the Church, and by the persecutions of which it was guilty, that he applied many passages of Scripture against idolatry to the Roman Catholic Church, and placed Popery and heathenism, worship of images and idolatry in the same category. This zeal did not allow him to be contented with going from house to house in order to confirm his converted brethren, but drove him to an open assault on the papacy. He nailed a treatise on the door of the cathedral of Meaux in which he denounced the papal indulgences, and called the Pope anti-Christ (1523). He was soon after discovered as the perpetrator,

was arrested and condemned to be whipped for three days with rods, and on the third day to be branded on the forehead. This penalty was inflicted. This branding perhaps disclosed to Pavannes the wrong which he had inflicted on his own conscience by his apostacy. It gave him no rest "until he had confessed, by word and writings, the pure Christian faith, especially the doctrine of the Lord's Supper. In the following year (1525) he was burned at Paris."—(*Act. Martyr*, 1560, fol. 52, b. *das grosse Martyrbuch*. By Dr. P. Crocium: Bremen, 1682, p. 181, etc.).

Meaux has justly been called the cradle of the French Reformation. For here it was that, under *Lefèvre*, evangelical knowledge was united in a focus, and where, also, after the persecution, an evangelical congregation was collected by *John Le Clerc*, and where *Peter Le Clerc*, another wool-dresser, and perhaps the brother of the former, served the congregation, and, with thirteen of his brethren, was burned in 1546 (*Act. Martyr*).—But Meaux was not only the cradle of the French Reformation, the movements there present us a faithful and almost perfect image of this Reformation, which, according to *Göbel* (*Die religiöse Eigenthümlichkeit der luth. u. der reform. Kirche*, 1837, p. 78), and *Merlé d'Aubigné* (*Le Luthéranisme et la Réforme*, 1844, p. 34), is more a *renewal* than an *improvement* of the Church, so that in our limited space but little remains to be said about it. A faith which overcame tortures and death, an evangelical spirit and knowledge upon the standpoint of the Old Testament, which regarded Roman Catholics as the heathen nations, whose extermination the Lord has commanded, and put Roman Catholic images on a level with idols, are the unmistakeable features of the cause, which Calvin found existing, and further delineated with but little modification. For, to confine ourselves to the last feature, if he did regard painting and sculpture as gifts of God (*Inst. Lib. I. C. 11., § 12*), and also strongly disapproved of wild iconoclasm; it is clearly evident from his interpretation of the second commandment, that he desired the removal of images from the Churches. Just as little is it to be denied, that the line of separation between the commanded removal of images from the places of divine worship, and the forbidden destruction of the same is very fine and difficult to be seen by the mass; especially when they can regard it as a *bloodless* reaction against *bloody* cruelties. Thus in a representation made to the King during the first religious war, their spokesmen said, among other things: "Idolatry and the erection of idols, Sire, is an abomination. . . . The defence of the same (at the religious conference at Poissy), could stand as little against the arguments of our preachers, as the image of Dagon could stand before the ark of the Almighty God. . . . May it please you to investigate the matter more closely and consider, that, if it (the destruction of images) did not take place at your command, it was still good and holy in itself, and that nothing is so abominable as idolatry, and nothing more acceptable to God than its extermination and destruction" (*Remonstrance au Roy, sur le fait des Idoles abba-*

tues et déjettées hors des Temples, en quelques Villes de ce Royaume. Mem. de Condé, T. III., pp. 355-364). Finally, Beza, in 1561, wrote to the Queen of Navarre, after censuring the violent destruction of images, which, as it seemed to him, had no foundation in the word of God: "Nevertheless, because the matter, in and of itself, takes place according to the will of God, who condemns idolators and idolatry; and it appears, that a secret decree of God is the foundation of so general a matter, which perhaps by this means would shame the great by the small, I therefore satisfy myself by censuring in general what deserves censure, and by moderating such violent zeal, so far as I am able." We think we perceive the truth of the matter here, from the historical point of view at least, which shows, that the rage against images promoted the Reformation in many places and hastened the result; indeed, that here and there it never would have come to pass without it.

If, however, the final judgment concerning this subject is perhaps difficult and doubtful, and different opinions may exist about it, nothing but the most unjust party zeal can deny the honor of *martyrdom* to the French Reformed Church, and especially, until the conspiracy of Ambroise (1560), of a *pure* martyrdom in all its martyrs, and in the Church from whose bosom they came. That the French Reformation was compelled to take almost every step in its own blood, that the number of the martyrs was uncommonly large, and their heroic faith extraordinary—is especially proven by the most unsuspected *Roman Catholic* testimony. *Jacob Severt*, doctor of the Sorbonne, wrote and published at Lyons, 1622, an anti-martyrology, under the authority of the Pope, and the revision of seven cardinals, in which, it is true, he colors the facts related by Crespin with the dark colors of his party; but not only does not contradict a single one of them, but even adds some to their number, which escaped Crespin (consult also *Histoire de la naissance et progrès de l'Hérésie*, by *Florimund de Ræmond*).

The element, which the reformatory impulse proceeding from Luther and Germany brought with it to France, and therefore can be called a Lutheran or German element, seems soon to have yielded to the nationally and locally nearer and stronger Swiss element. At least, the local presence in the Lord's Supper taught by Lefèvre soon gave place to the Zwinglian symbolical view. Notwithstanding these foreign influences, the French element remained the stronger and more prominent, and from it proceeded the remarkable church constitution and discipline, which the Reformed Church comprehends under the expression, *Discipline ecclésiastique*. It is, however, not to be denied that this discipline and the whole reformatory movement in France would soon have disappeared if Calvin had not given it a permanent character. He animated and strengthened the movement during his brief residence in France, bound its wild tendrils to the staff of dogmatic knowledge by his celebrated Institutes; and, when it was near sinking under external pressure and internal weakness, from Geneva he directed, protected, and strengthened it, and as often as it was driven

out of France, gave it there an asylum, from which it could return home refreshed, purified and strengthened. Especially did he prepare there a place of culture for his countrymen (see Art. Calvin), whose importance St. Francis of Sales, Bishop of Geneva, expressed in the words: "Science is the eighth sacrament of the ecclesiastical hierarchy for a priest. . . . Our unfortunate Geneva has overreached us with it." (*Œuvres de saint François de Sales*. Edition du Panthéon. T. II., p. 604). To the French Reformed, and especially to their preachers, belongs the honor of embodying Calvin's ideas of Church government and discipline, and his dogmatic views, in a common confession of faith. This took place in May, 1559 (See *de Thou, Hist. Lib. XXII.*, *Ebrard, Das Synodalleben der ref. Kirche in Frankreich*. Reform. K.-z., No. 2, 1853), when the first *National and General Synod* was opened under the presidency of *Rev. Francis Morel*, and *M. de Collonges* (also *Coulonges*), and when the *confession of faith* in 40 articles, and the *church constitution (discipline ecclésiastique)*, in 40 general articles (*Matières Générales*), followed by other articles concerning special cases (*Faits spéciaux*) were reconciled and united.

The confession of faith and church constitution breathe a moral strictness, which is offensive to modern feeling, especially that of the higher and educated classes, but which becomes a *martyr church*; at the same time also do they exhibit a stern rejection of everything Roman Catholic. Both documents bear the stamp of Calvin, and proceeded also certainly in great part from his inspiration, if, from internal and external evidences, it is to be assumed, that they were not directly written by him, but much rather are to be attributed to *Anton de Chandieu*, who already in 1557 was known as a preacher in Paris (known also as an apologetic writer and author of *Octonaires sur la vanité du monde*, under the Hebrew names *Sadeel* and *Zamariel*).

More important for our subject is the pre-eminence which *was given* to the French Church constitution by the providence of God. For, notwithstanding the radical separation of Church and State, of spiritual and temporal government, the church constitution was still in Geneva the woof and warp of the civil organism, and Church and State acted and reacted on each other.—The French Church constitution originally rested, as already remarked, upon the broadest democratic foundation of the totality of believers, from which foundation, as from the roots of a tree, the sap rose through the veins of consistories, colloquial and provincial synods, up to the National and General Synod. The danger connected with the ochlocratic principle and element, was neutralized by the *indirect* mode of election, which followed the first election of elders and deacons, always held directly by the congregation and pastor; according to which, the consistory, composed of preachers, elders and deacons, could complete itself by its own election or co-optation, without going back to the people. Thus the original ochlocratic, or rather democratic principle and element passed over to the aristocratic or oligarchic, whose dan-

gers were neutralized by the veto held by the people. But a more powerful neutralization was exercised over the organs of the Church by the threatening *sword of persecution*. Therefore the French Reformed loved their church constitution as the apple of their eye, and resisted the attempts made by eminent men, as the philosopher Ramus, and the preacher Morel, to introduce an entirely ochlocratic constitution with direct elections by the people. In the existing constitution there was a continual reciprocal action, a constant relation of the head to the members, and of these to that, as the Apostles made it the condition of an ecclesiastical organization; whilst, as the Church was scattered over all France, it refreshed it, through many channels, with the water of life, and gave it the character, yet remaining, of a *missionary Church*. And as finally, in the course of events, a commissary of the King represented the State in the National Synod, and directed the Church in civil matters, both were placed in their true and pure relations to each other.

V. POLENZ.—Beck.

French-Reformed Church.—(For its previous history, see Art. *French Reformation*).—*First Period*, embracing the transition of the French-Reformed Church to a "State within a State," (from the conspiracy of Amboise to the Edict of Nantes, 1560–1598). In the reign of Henry II. (1547–1559), the French-Reformed had so vastly increased, and their spirit and well-adapted church organization had given them so much internal strength, that it was difficult any longer to regard and treat them as the adherents of an *illegal* religion. They themselves made every effort to secure legal toleration or recognition. And they were the more strongly tempted to aim at becoming the State religion, as no other religion since the time of Constantine the Great, had attained to this position, and as they regarded the Romish faith as false, and near its end. This view was still further strengthened by the fact, that, in the spirit of the Old Testament, they regarded it as the duty of the State government to root out the false, and to establish the true religion; the more so, as it was in entire accordance with the spirit of the age, filled with sanguine hopes, to demand, that the civil power should give it that status, and should declare the Rom. religion illegal. This tendency was increased by the fact, that Princes of the Royal family, as the King of Navarre and his brother, the Prince of Condé, and numbers of the nobility, among others the three brothers Chatillon, and Admiral Coligny, attached themselves to the Reformation. In this manner, a powerful political element connected itself with the French-Ref. Church. We must not forget, also, the unprecedented inhumanity and faithlessness of the State government, which reached its acme in the celebrated massacre on St. Bartholomew's night in 1572. It is not to be wondered at, therefore, that the *Huguenots* (as the French-Reformed were now called¹), also seized upon

the weapons of speech and the press, in which they were as superior to the opponents, as the latter were in the weapons of the flesh; and that, almost always beaten in the field of battle, they entered upon the arena of dangerous political speculation. We find, besides, that in the 16th century (a period of general political disenthralment and fermentation), ideas the most dangerous to the State, agitated the Roman Catholics, and such of them, too, as were influenced neither by the Reformation nor by the hierarchico-democratic ideas of the Reformation,—we refer to Catholics among the magistrates, and the educated classes generally. We find these ideas, for instance, running riot in the work of *Stephan de la Boétie* (councillor of Parliament), called by the wise and loyal *de Thou*, "a divine spirit:" *De la servitude volontaire ou le Contr'un*—a work that has become celebrated through Montaigne. How then was it to be expected that the crushed and persecuted Calvinists should keep themselves quite free from such extremes? Thus sprang up, not to mention less celebrated pamphlets, works like Hotman's *Franco Gallia*; Lanquet's, a very intimate friend of Melanchthon, *Vindicia contra Tyrannos*, and an anonymous *Le Politique*; from which, notwithstanding their other differences, a so-called Huguenotic civil right was deduced. As compared with the history of Calvinism in England, Scotland, and the Netherlands, they cast great suspicion upon the Reformed Doctrine and Church, and seem to justify the charge of a political Calvinism in the 16th and 17th centuries.

In any event, however, the degrading charge, that the French Reformation opened its way by means of the weapons of flesh, is contradicted by its history; for only after it had accomplished this Reformation by its *internal* force, and after it had fully developed itself in doctrine and organization, did its adherents lay hold of such weapons. Our regret that such was the case is mitigated by the judgment expressed by a Lutheran theologian (BENGL, *Gnomon*, N. T., Act. VIII., 36), "That the kingdom of God adapts itself to all circumstances, without doing violence to them; that, like the air, it yields to all bodies, and yet *penetrates* them all;" this penetrating, however, scarcely ever coming so clearly to light, as in the Fr. Ref. C. which was rather *driven* from the right path, than a *wanderer*.

Upon the death of Henry II. (1559), his son, as Francis II., ascended the throne. A child in years and intellect, called by Beza a worthless boy (*miserabilis puer*), he allowed himself to be entirely ruled by the uncles of his wife, Mary of Scotland, Duke Francis of Guise, and his brother, the Cardinal of Lorraine. Their political position, the relation of their niece to Queen Elizabeth, that of Scotland and France to England, the high clerical position of the Cardinal, the towering ambition of the two brothers,—all influenced them to look upon the Reformed as their opponents, and made them most cruel persecutors. In these circumstances

¹ Among the various derivations of this term, which arose first about the time of the conspiracy of Amboise, the most correct, historically and etymologically, seems

to me to be that of Soldan, who derives it from Aignos, Aynos, Aynossen—Eidgenossen (See his *History of Protestantism in France*, 1855, Vol. I., Appendix II.).

It was natural that the Reformed should seek the protection of their nobles, and that the latter, excluded from their rightful positions by the arrogant Guises, should, from political reasons, afford them that protection. Thus arose the celebrated *conspiracy of Amboise*, not fully understood, even to the present day, as to its participants and all its ramifications. In this, even many dissatisfied Rom. Catholics took part; but the French Calvinists were its soul. Its object was to break the power of the arrogant Guises. Betrayed by a Calvinist, immense numbers were executed in the presence of the king, and the lords and ladies of the court, as an after-dinner diversion. Calvin and Beza had some knowledge indeed of the undertaking, but condemned it earnestly and advised against it. The King of Navarre was deeply involved in it, but most of all, the Prince of Condé. The unexpectedly speedy death of the King saved the Prince from certain, as it did his brother from probable death, at the hands of the executioner, not from assassination, and rescued the Calvinists from entire extinction by placing the two parties on a more equal footing. This state of things was sought to be maintained by the Queen-mother, the notorious Catherine de Medicis, not only from the natural proclivity of her character, but from the desire of securing the empire for her minor son. The Huguenots were thus enabled again, not only to breathe freely, but even to entertain good hopes of at least securing toleration. And inasmuch as all persecuting edicts had proven fruitless, the administration party (under *Hospital*, see Art.), becoming gradually more moderate, after many abortive legal attempts, at last placed their whole reliance upon the promulgation of the edict, which, without putting in jeopardy the State religion, granted toleration to the new religion, and protection to its adherents. For these were now so numerous, that their extirpation appeared impossible without plunging France into all the horrors of a civil war. But the more the Huguenots increased in strength, and in political influence, the more did the Guises feel the necessity of concentrating and enlarging the specific Rom. Cath. party. It was an easy task for them to detach the aged constable of Montmorency from the Bourbons and the Chatillons, and to bring him over to their party, and thus form the so-called Triumvirate. They were soon further strengthened by the addition of the King of Navarre, whose moral sense, never very strong, had been blunted by his infidelity to his excellent wife, Joanna d'Albret, and his intrigue with one of the Queen-mother's maids of honor, so that he fell an easy victim to the cunning and intrigues of the Cardinal. Francis Baldwin, the latitudinarian apostate, who gave the Prince Cassander's (see Art.) work, and the Spanish legate, who held out to him the hope of recovering Upper Navarre, at last brought him to a total apostacy.

In order, also, to widen the breach between the Calvinists and Lutherans, the Cardinal designed partiality for the Augsburg Confession, and favored the celebrated Colloquium of Poissy (see Art.). Although the anticipations of the Calvinists, regarding the effect of that colloquy,

were not realized, it exerted an important influence for their cause. It afforded them the first opportunity of publicly testifying their faith, of demonstrating their moral superiority, and of correcting many unfavorable prejudices. They took occasion also to expose the ignorance of their opponents, and made them the laughing-stock even of their own party. The Church and the Sacraments were the main points discussed. The former was intended to embarrass the Reformed, in view of the newness of their Church, and the defective call of their clergy. The latter, with reference to which the Cardinal laid before his opponents for subscription an article taken from a Lutheran Confession, was designed to place them in the dilemma, either to complete the schism between the Lutheran Germans and themselves, as incurable Sacramentarians, by rejecting the bodily presence, or by accepting it, to cast a brand of burning into the midst of their own Church. It is well known that the former object was in part at least attained, inasmuch as the repeated warning sent by Calvin to Poissy, not to allow themselves to be burdened with the Augsburg Confession, to which he had himself subscribed, so laid him open to the assaults of the Lutherans, that his explanation that he had subscribed said confession (*i. e.*, the *variata*), in the sense of its author (Melancthon), and not in the sense of its later expositors, could not screen him from their condemnation.

It is to be regretted that Calvin allowed his indignation at the Cardinal's perfidy, to betray him into harsh expressions against the Augsb. Confession. A better spirit, however, prevailed with some of the members, and even with the Cardinal, so far, that for the purpose of making an effort toward union in the doctrine of the Supper, it was agreed to hold a Colloquium, composed of five members from each party. It was proposed, with a good intention, on the part of the Rom. Caths., to assent to the bodily presence in *any appropriate terms* (*en quelques bons termes*, according to Beza's history¹). This had already been done in a formula, approved by Montluc, Bishop of Valence (but half a Calvinist), and Claude d'Espence; and on the Reformed side, by Beza and des Gallars. After some difficulties with respect to the mode of receiving the body of Christ *truly and substantially* (*vere et substantialiter*), a formula was at last agreed upon, in which the bodily presence was by no means admitted; but the substance, on which the Calvinists insisted, and with it also the real presence according to Calvin's view, was vindicated against Martyr and the Zurichers. The public rejoicing of the Queen-mother and

¹ Deserving of further investigation, is the denial by Soldan of a fact asserted by all historians and biographers (and lately by Baum in his valuable work, *Theodore Beza*), that the Cardinals had called five German theologians to the Colloquium, in order to bring them into a contest with the Reformed. One of the strongest arguments of Soldan is, that if the Cardinal had had this in view, he would either have called the German theologians earlier (it is well known they came too late), or else would have delayed the Sacramental controversy, which the Calvinists were extremely anxious to postpone until their arrival (See *Hist. of Prot. in France*, Vol. I., pp. 531, &c.).

the Cardinal, with respect to the agreement, was not, and could not be, of long duration; for the fanatical populace, even in a less agitated period, would scarcely have allowed an ecumenical Council to have thus obscured the doctrine of transubstantiation. At this time, when so near the impending bloody contest, its adoption was entirely impossible; and it was therefore natural, and indeed wise, on the part of the Sorbonne, to anticipate the excitement that would necessarily arise upon its promulgation, by declaring it unsatisfactory, delusive and heretical. Its Catholic compilers and supporters could not, of course, escape suspicion, and the Queen-mother and the Cardinal could only cleanse themselves from the stains of heresy by the blood of the Huguenots. In the meantime, so wide-spread became the influence flowing from this Conference, that Beza was forced to declare, that he dreaded the impetuous zeal of his adherents more than the persecutions of his opponents. The religious meetings of the Huguenots could not only be no longer hindered, but took place in masses of thousands. In many places the Reformed took possession of the Cath. churches by force, in others this was unnecessary, as the churches were found deserted, and in some cases their Catholic fellow-citizens allowed them a joint use.

Under these circumstances appeared the celebrated *edict of January* (1562), so much the more remarkable and important, as it was the first act which secured to the Reformed public recognition and religious freedom, and as it was issued immediately upon the reception of the most exciting intelligence concerning their violent proceedings in Guyenne, and after an almost insolent remonstrance from the Spanish legate. This edict had been discussed in an extraordinary session of the Council of State, and had been carried more especially by the influence of a speech made by the excellent Chancellor, in which, in answer to the question, "whether the religious assemblages of the Huguenots were to be tolerated or forbidden, he had maintained, that there might be many citizens who were not Christians, and that he could still live at peace with those not having the same form of religion." This edict commanded *those of the new religion* to restore all the temples, church buildings, furniture and other property, wrested by them from the Catholics; all incomes withheld from the clergy, etc.; forbade them all religious meetings, and the building of their own temples in the cities; and allowed them these assemblages only outside of the cities, and that only for the time being "until God would bestow upon them his grace, and lead them back to the one fold, and until the decision of a General Council," etc. Although this edict secured but little to the Calvinists, and that *provisionally*, and indeed forced them to give up in many places what they already possessed, yet it was received by them, especially by Beza, with great joy. On the part of the Catholics it produced dissatisfaction and even resistance. Many Parliaments (as for instance that of Paris), made the strongest remonstrances against it, and could only be forced to register it after repeated royal commands (*Lettres de jussion*), and then only

with saving clauses and conditions. The Paris Parliament especially insisted that the toleration of the two religions was incompatible with the territorial divisions and arrangements of the Church, and propounded the serious question, How a Bishop, as a shepherd of souls, could raise his voice against the wolves, and warn his flock against them, and at the same time permit them without hindrance to go out of the cities to hear the preachers, and thus yield greater obedience to the commands of the King than to those of God? The Duke of Guise took no part in such questions of principle, but expressed his views, and those of the Catholic majority, briefly and summarily, in the declaration; that he would cut the edict in pieces with the edge of his sword.

The Duke of Guise, called upon by his friends, by the leaders of the specific Cath. party in Paris, and by his brother the Cardinal (after the Conference at Zabern), to rescue the Church, suddenly made his appearance, with a numerous armed retinue, on Sunday, March 1st, 1562, in the city of Vassy in Champagne, at the moment the Ref. congregation there had assembled for worship. A collision was natural and inevitable; and the sad massacre of Vassy took place. It is not necessary to suppose that this massacre was premeditated by Guise. Yet it was natural that it should be so regarded by the Huguenots, and that the report of the event, as it ran swiftly over France, should set on fire the materials everywhere ready for conflagration. Neither the craft of the Queen-mother, nor the wise moderation of the Chancellor, could now prevent a conflict. The universal cry of the Reformed, *Israel to your tents!* precipitated them into a terrible religious and civil war, in which the Queen-mother and her son, for a time vacillating, and sometimes even leaning to the side of the Calvinists, and seeking their aid against the triumvirate, was finally forced irresistibly into the party of the latter. Occasionally the war was sought to be stayed by the so-called edicts of pacification, to which the Calvinists always agreed, even after repeated experiences of perfidy, with almost child-like confidence, demanding no other guarantee than the word of the King. We must ascribe this, on the one hand, partly to inconsiderateness and exhaustion, partly also to their Christian and loyal disposition; and on the other hand, to the mighty force of French national unity. To the latter alone can we ascribe it, that, at the conclusion of the first war by the peace of Amboise (1563), the Calvinists, with a bravery and self-devotion praised even by their Catholic fellow-citizens, aided in driving out of France the English who had been summoned to their aid. The Catholics also acknowledged, that amidst all the horrors of war, the Calvinistic troops maintained a degree of piety and discipline, exceeded only in the Puritan armies of the following century. Admiral Coligny, was like a rock, on which the waves of disorder broke themselves; and those Reformed ministers, who suffered death, not alone on the field of battle, but on the scaffold, may be regarded as the leaven that vivified the Huguenotic armies. Convinced of the justice (FAYUS, in *vit. Beza*, p. 47, calls it *bellum sacrum*)

f the war, opposing by the power of their eloquence and example, a noble party in their own ranks who were not actuated by such earnest motives, they bore the chief burden of the perilous enterprise.

If we direct our attention, for a moment, to the internal history of the Huguenots, we perceive that as early already as the peace of Amboise, two distinct tendencies are apparent among their ministers. The one class desired to preserve peace; the other, equally averse to war, yet regarded it as their only means of religious freedom, and therefore insisted, that it should be prosecuted with decision and vigor. These two tendencies did not issue in distinct parties for some time. The former was represented by the Prince of Condé and the nobles, the latter by the Admiral and the ministers generally. As the political element crept more and more into the general cause, it gradually produced an unhappy split into distinct parties, specially as the Huguenots no longer had Coligny to guide and aid them. These parties called each other "Politicians" and "Conservationalists." To the former belonged Henry of Navarre, afterwards King Henry IV., and to the latter the Prince of Condé (in knightly character equal to his father, in morality far superior), who was assassinated in prison after the defeat of Jarnac (1569). The former called themselves the "*Faiseurs*," the latter the "*Dieux*." The former, in their most favorable aspects, presented a wise moderation, the latter, a self-sacrificing zeal; the darker shades of the picture betray in the former, selfish intrigues in the latter, a spirit of contention and turbulence.

The peace of St. Germain en Laye (1570) put an end, for the time being, to the third religious war. It granted the Huguenots, besides certain concessions over and above the January edict, the cities La Rochelle, Montauban, Cognac, and La Charité, as pledges of good faith (so often violated), or as "cities of security." This is, in many respects, important. For we see here the commencement of the abnormal position into which the French-Reformed Church fell, in reference to the State, as a "State within a State," and that the same came not from her, nor from her doctrine, but that she was driven into this position by the force of circumstances flowing from the intolerance and faithlessness of the Catholics, and from the principle of the State that there could be but one religion. As it was the duty of "his most Christian Majesty, and eldest son of the Church" after taking the oath of coronation, not only to exclude them from the State, but to extirpate them, the Huguenots had no other resource than to seek, according to circumstances, to establish within this hostile State another and an independent one.

Although the massacre of St. Bartholomew's night (1572) which, according to Perefixe, Archbishop of Paris (*Histoire du Roy Henri le Grand*) was "*that horrible deed which has never had, and, if God permit, will never have its parallel*," was not, according to the latest historical investigations, the result of a long diabolic premeditation; it is yet proven, by equally

authentic accounts, that its seeds were deeply imbedded in the fanaticism of the Catholic clergy, and that the abominable deed was the subject of conversation, before its consummation, at Catholic courts and other places, and in truth even among the Huguenots themselves.¹ The plan of a total extermination of the Protestant Huguenots throughout France, of which the massacre at Paris was to be the commencement, failed. It led, however, to the fourth religious and civil war, and to the formation of the new party of "*Politicians*," under the auspices of the youngest brother of the King, the Duke of Alençon (afterwards of Anjou), and the sons of the Constable of Montmorency. The connection of the Huguenots with this party led naturally to great changes in the religious principle of the Calvinists. Another more permanent and more destructive result of the massacre was this, that the loss of so many Huguenotic nobles by murder, flight, intimidation, and apostacy, from the general cause, transferred the contest from this time on, more into the hands of the citizens of cities and villages. Here their writings found ready access, and the recollections of the mediæval freedom of their cities aroused them to truly republican aspirations.

In the meantime (after a new and speedily violated peace) there arose a far more dangerous enemy to the King in the celebrated "*Holy League*," whose object was the defence and preservation of the Catholic religion. Henry III., for the purpose of controlling this League, took refuge in the doubtful resource of placing himself at its head. To convince the League of his Catholic sentiments, in the first meeting of the States, at Blois, he revoked all edicts favorable to the Reformed, and decreed that henceforward the Catholic religion alone should be recognized. The consequence was a new (the ninth) war, which was brought to a close by the edict of Poitiers (1577). In this the Reformed were secured in the concessions granted them at the peace of St. Germain. It went *beyond* the former, in that it granted them *nine* cities of security for six years, their own cemeteries; and that they should have Councils (the so-called

¹ This is placed beyond all doubt by diplomatic despatches printed in *Groen van Prinster's "Archives ou Correspondence inédite de la Maison d'Orange Nassau,"* T. IV., p. 13, etc., in which the massacre of St. Bartholomew's night is portrayed by the French diplomats in despatches to the Roman and Spanish courts, where they expected an approval of the act, as an "*acte prémédité*;" but in those to the Emperor, where approbation was not expected, as an "*acte non prémédité*." The Emperor openly declared, that about the time of the marriage festival of the King of Navarre, he had been written to from Rome: "*que à ceste heure que tous les oyseaux estoient en la cage, on les pouvoit prendre tous ensemble, et qu'il en avoit qui le désiroient*." And he said to the French ambassador: "*que quand on veut faire une chose, on ne demeure jamais à faute de trouver couleur et prétexte*." With reference to the massacre we refer to *Wachler* (Leipzig, 1826), and *Soldan* (Histor. Taschenb., 1854). The work of the latter has received the well-merited honor of a translation into the French. *Capefigue* represents the massacre as exclusively the result of a bigoted public opinion, long nourished and long repressed, but at last violently bursting out. The number of those who fell a sacrifice is variously given from 20,000 to 100,000.

"*Chambres mi-parties*") in the Parliaments of Bordeaux, Grenoble, Aix, and Toulouse, each composed of eight Catholic and eight Reformed counsellors, with one Catholic and one Reformed President. This edict also disavowed the massacre of St. Bartholomew's night.—The troubles caused by the movements of the Duke of Anjou in the Netherlands, spread also over France, while the Holy League fanned the hatred of the fanatical populace, and the King in every manner rendered himself more and more despicable. After the Duke's death, as the King was without issue, and the King of Navarre was next in succession, the danger thus threatening the Cath. religion, was seized upon as a new means of exciting animosity against the Huguenots and the unfortunate King, and the latter was compelled, in fulfilment of a disgraceful compact with the League (Nemours, 1585), to revoke the peace of Poitiers (which he was so proud to call *his* peace) and all the concessions that had been made the Reformed. After this edict (called also the July, or Union-edict), of which d'Aubigné says, that it brought thrice as many Huguenots to the mass as the massacre on St. Bartholomew's night, and which kindled a new and bloody war (called the war of the "*three Henrys*"), there was scarcely any necessity that the King should, for the purpose of exterminating the Reformed, and with them the last vestige of the Reformation in France, promulgate the *Union-edict of Chartres*, wrung from him by the insolent Guise after the terrors of the barricades and his flight from Paris. In this edict Henry pledged himself upon oath not to lay down arms until the last heretic had been extirpated from his kingdom. He imposed the same duty upon his subjects, and, at the same time, commanded them never to recognise as their King one not belonging to the Catholic, Apostolic, and Roman religion. This oath was followed, in the second convocation of the States at Blois—in which this Union-edict was solemnly sworn to by its members, and made a fundamental law of the State—by a formal act of reconciliation with the Duke (Dec. 4, 1588), sworn to by the King "on the holy mystery of the altar." Immediately succeeding this transaction Henry caused the assassination of the Duke on the 23d of the same month, and on the 24th, that of his brother the Cardinal of Guise!

This double murder, followed by a conditional papal excommunication, so exasperated the Holy League and through it the great majority of the Cath. population, against Henry III. that he found himself compelled to seek the aid of the very Huguenots whose extermination he had so solemnly sworn to accomplish but a short time before. "It was now," remarks *Ranke* (*Hist. France*, Vol. I., p. 467), "of inestimable value, that there was yet in France a power, unsubdued by this universal movement, namely, the *army of the King of Navarre*." To all the enemies of the French-Reformed this incontestible fact can be held up, that it was *due to them alone* that the French monarchy was maintained, and saved from falling a prey either to a partition among powerful nobles, or the Spanish empire.

On the death of Henry III. (murdered by a fanatic monk named Jacob Clement, 1595),

Henry of Navarre (Henry IV.) was indeed recognised as King by most of the nobles then at the court; but he found himself in so difficult a situation, that only by his heroic courage, the splendor of his victories, and his noble disposition, was he enabled to maintain himself. Besides an open war with the powerful League, to which new strength was constantly flowing from the inexhaustible fountain of the popular bigotry, from Spanish subsidies, and from disturbances stirred up in Paris by the fanatical papal legate, Henry was plunged into another and perhaps a more difficult contest with his own internally distracted party. It was fortunate for him that in the League there was also a division at the same time, and that oligarchical municipal and indeed wild democratical movements existed there together under the form of Catholic unity.

The Huguenots, fully cured of their chimerical hopes of a complete reformation of France, by the religious wars and the revived strength of the Catholic Church, soon recognised their new situation, and were filled with the greatest anxiety, when Henry found himself compelled to abjure his religion in order to secure his crown. Those among them who had political insight, saw well enough that as King of France he would have to take a more elevated position, his circle of vision would have to be enlarged, and his party relations to them would have to be merged in those that would embrace the Catholic elements of the kingdom also, and that this would almost necessarily issue in an abjuration. This view is reflected, in its most favorable aspects, in the remark of the Duke of Sully: "Although a Calvinist I was yet firmly convinced, and compelled the most learned of the Reformed ministers to acknowledge, that God may be honored no less in the Catholic Church than in the Protestant." But the darker shades of the picture are exhibited to us in Huguenots, who, from the doctrine advocated by Calvinistic ministers and theologians, that salvation is also to be attained in the Catholic Church, and from the Catholic dogma that there is no salvation out of the Catholic Church, drew the conclusion: that one should unconditionally prefer that which is *universally* acknowledged, to that which is only in *part* recognised as certain, and in *part* disputed. "And this," says d'Aubigné, in his Confession of Lord de Sancy, "was the breach that made the King and many others ready to surrender." He expresses this still more strongly in the words ascribed to this apostate. "The King apostatized to save a State (*état*), and I did it to save my State." The abjuration took place in the most solemn manner on the 25th of July, 1593, in the church of St. Denis.

The events connected with the edict of Nantes (1598) and the difficulties which it encountered from all sides, are too manifold to be here portrayed, and belong properly to political history. They are fully and most accurately described by *Ranke* in his *Hist. of France*, Vol. II., p. 42, etc. We will, therefore, content ourselves with giving a brief description of the main contents of the edict itself.—It contains 92 articles, followed by 56 special or secret articles (*articles particuliers*), and two "*Brevets*," as explana-

tions, &c. They grant to all subjects of the 'so-called Reformed religion' (*Religion prétendue Réformée*) freedom of conscience. But freedom of worship is circumscribed by many conditions, based partly upon the previous edicts of pacification, and partly upon the then existing circumstances. This latter condition shows how power took the lead of right, since even the new law was compelled to accommodate itself to it, as the right was again allowed in those cases where there was power to maintain it. Thus religious worship was allowed the Reformed in those places where they possessed it in 1596 and 1597, i. e., in those places where they were the most powerful; whereas in those places where the Holy League was predominant, they did not obtain this liberty. Whatever disadvantage might have occurred to the Catholic religion from these grants of rights to the Reformed, was fully neutralized, however, by the circumstances, that the former was acknowledged as everywhere *established*, and the latter as *only tolerated* in certain localities. As in the earlier edicts, especially that of Amboise, so in this there was granted to the nobles having high jurisdiction, the right of public worship, to the remaining nobles only that of family-worship, and to those Reformed living amid a prevailing Catholic population there was granted in every judicial district (*Bailliage, Senechaussée et Gouvernement tenant lieu de Bailliage*), a locality or village where they might worship. For judicial investigations of disputes between the adherents of the two religions, and for the interpretation of the edict, there was established for the districts of the Parliaments of Paris, Normandy, and Brittany, a joint "Chamber of the Edict" (*Chambre de l'Edict*), composed mainly of Catholic members; in the Parliaments of Grenoble, Bordeaux, &c., the before-mentioned so-called "half and half chambers" (*Chambre mi-partie*); composed of Presidents and members equally from the two Confessions. By the acknowledgment of the Catholic religion as the ruling and established one, it was of course made the duty of the Reformed to observe the Catholic holidays by cessation from labor, to contribute the tenth to the support of the Catholic clergy, &c. In consideration of the last-mentioned obligation, it was ordered, that there should be contributed for the support of the Reformed ministers, and other necessary Church expenses, the sum of 135,000 francs per annum, from the State treasury. In those places where the royal officers or Commissioners could not designate any suitable places of burial, the Calvinists should, *for the time being*, be allowed the joint use of the Catholic cemeteries. They were declared eligible to all court, state, and civil offices, allowed to establish high-schools, and gymnasia, as well as to enjoy the use of the public schools. The most important, however, of the concessions made the Reformed, were the numerous, so-called, cities of security, for eight years. As they already were in possession of them in fact, and would hardly have been willing to surrender them after the abjuration of the King, this concession proves more than any other, how precarious and dangerous was their situation and that of the State.

This condition of things, however, proves that as the edict accomplished all that was possible (a solution for which streams of blood had been shed in vain), it could be neither a complete nor a permanent one, and that the adoption of the edict as "*an eternal and irresistible*" law of the State, was at best an *Idolum Fori*. How was it possible that a law should be eternal and irresistible, which not only did not repeal an older and incompatible law, recognised by the great majority of the nation and sealed by their blood, but which in its third Art. formally recognises the "Catholic, Apostolic, and Roman religion" as the established religion of the realm? To notice only the Art. relating to the burial of Protestants in Catholic cemeteries — the cause of so many disputes for centuries — how could it be expected that this Art. could endure after so many interdicts with reference to "burying heretics in consecrated ground?"

Second Period. — The French-Reformed Ch. as a "State within a State." (From the Edict of Nantes to the "Grace-Edict of Nismes," 1598–1629).

Although the abjuration of Henry IV. robbed the Reformed of their nominal protector, and the King gave them many grounds of mistrust and rightful complaint, they yet became conscious, very soon after his murder by Ravallac (1610), that they had lost their real protector and their best friend. This murder not only swept them into the stream of feverish intrigues on the part of the nobles, but made them a prey to their own perversity, according to which, with the usual French impetuosity, their nobles again took up the plan suppressed in his time by Henry, of a Huguenotic free and confederate State (under a *foreign* protectorate too!) — an idea the more chimerical, as the Reformed nobles were divided in their interests, and between them and the Consistorialists there was not such a union as would justify so great an undertaking. The breach was widened by such men as Sully and Duplessis, the former skilfully representing the political, the latter the religious principle. The Reformed, now fully organized as a "Huguenotic League," at first exhibited great moderation, and successfully withstood solicitations to a revolt organized by the active Catholic Prince of Condé against the Queen-mother. But when the youthful King, Louis XIII., by force of arms, had restored the mass in the province of Bearn, and initiated a formal counter-reformation (1620), there was enkindled *another religious and civil war*. In the meantime Cardinal Richelieu took the helm of State, with a determination to re-establish an unlimited monarchy, in place of the proud and obstinate aristocracy, and upon the ruins of the Calvinistic confederacy. In consequence of this, the concessions made to the Calvinists in the peace of Montpellier (1622) were not fulfilled, and the Huguenots were incited to another war, more just than the preceding, and one promising a more successful issue, by reason of a *League* made with England. This war was more especially undertaken to maintain and defend the city of Rochelle, a bulwark of Calvinism, the centre especially of democratic and municipal Calvinism, and because of its historical deve-

lopment and intimate commercial union with the enfranchised Netherlands, the focus of confederate-republican ideas and hopes. The league with England (which country had in the Duke of Buckingham a weak and unfortunate rival of Richelieu) only accelerated the fall of the proud city; inasmuch as the English fleet, instead of rendering them assistance, departed again after having been furnished by the citizens with provisions, and in consequence gave the city so much the earlier a prey to the most terrible want, and many of its inhabitants, indeed, to absolute death by famine. This terrible famine alone caused the capitulation of Rochelle (1628). JOHN GUITON, Mayor of the city, who may be regarded as the last representative of republican Calvinism, addressed the Cardinal upon his entrance into the fated city, now inhabited only by scarcely-living skeletons, with these words: "It is better to surrender Rochelle to a King who knows how to take it, than to a monarch who was not able to render it support." Richelieu took these words in good part, and the defenders of a city whose reduction had taken a whole year, at an expense of more than 40 millions livres, were on the whole treated with kindness and even respect. After an unnatural and ineffectual league with Spain by the Duke of Rohan, he also was compelled in the succeeding year (1629) to yield. In this year the Edict of Nismes was promulgated, in which the French Protestants were again confirmed in the church and civil rights conceded by the Edict of Nantes, but by which they lost all political independence.

Third Period. — There was comparative rest under Richelieu and Mazarin (1629–1661).

Richelieu was opposed to all religious freedom, and especially to Calvinism, and had he lived in the time of the Reformation, he would undoubtedly have carried out against Prot. the formula "*Principiis obsta*," employed by him against the Jansenists. But that time was now past, and he was soon too deeply involved in greater undertakings and difficulties. Nor was it in accordance with his character to employ low chicanery against a minority, respectable indeed in numbers, but rendered powerless by him. He indeed entertained the thought of reuniting the Reformed with the Cath. religion, and perhaps of elevating himself to the position of Patriarch of France, and thus concentrating the power of the Church and the State in his own hands; and he adopted the principle of conferring high offices in the State, court and army on the Calvinists only in extraordinary cases; but the former thought and the latter principle were made subordinate to his main object of elevating the monarchical principle above all subordinate and secondary forces, and the French monarchy above all foreign States. In this spirit he made use of the warlike-genius and active Calvinism of the Duke of Rohan in the war with Spain. In a like spirit he selected the Reformed Count of Bethune to succeed the French ambassador at the Papal court, for the purpose of announcing categorically to the Pope the invasion of Valtellina by the French troops. Under Richelieu, therefore, the Reformed were able to enjoy a quiet and, indeed, contented

existence—even under the shadow of his iron rule, which, on the whole, bore more heavily on the nobles than on *them*, from whom the higher nobility continued more and more to withdraw themselves. Their ministers and theologians had now leisure more thoroughly to unfold their doctrines and to disseminate them in popular and learned works. In this way, and by the force of their correct lives they won over Catholics and wrought conversions that were at least far more sincere than those of the nobles to the other side, under the influence of the Count and the Cardinal minister. What the Reformed theologians accomplished under such unfavorable circumstances is worthy of all acknowledgment. Their schools in Saumur and Montauban, by reason of their excellent Professors and high standard of morality attracted many Germans of noble families, in preference to the German Universities, and it requires no extensive historical investigation to discover that they were the channel through which Calvinism flowed over into Brandenburg and Prussia.

More favorable still was the position of the Calvinists under Cardinal Mazarine (successor to Richelieu), who was more ready to recognize their quiet civil virtues, and gave proof of this by conferring offices (especially in the department of finance) upon some of them. We see this from his well-known remark: "I have no reason to disquiet myself with respect to this small party; if it does feed upon tares, it, at least, does not do so to excess." Nay, they won the respect even of the court itself, when, in the war of the Fronde, they not only withstood the most pressing overtures from the Prince of Condé (known as the great Condé), but actually took up arms against him, and thus aided to sustain the tottering throne, during the minority of Louis XIV. Their assistance in sustaining the monarchy, on this occasion, although not so signal as in the days of the Holy League, was of scarcely less value in reality. For the watchful Cromwell had actually sent emissaries into Southern France, to sound the disposition of its Protestant inhabitants, but upon receiving information of their faithfulness, had wisely refrained from mixing in the dangerous contest.

Fourth Period. — Chicanery against the Reformed. Persecutions and petty oppressions, until the total destruction of their ecclesiastical and civil existence by the revocation of the Edict of Nantes under Louis XIV. (1661–1685).

Louis XIV., spoilt by a miserable education, though with a natural instinct for greatness and genuine tact, sought to bring his religious standpoint into unison with the political greatness, which he strove to establish for the welfare of his kingdom, torn and distracted at the commencement of his reign by numerous factions. Of this we have authentic evidence in the memoirs composed for the instruction of his son the Dauphin. In these he declares, that, with pain, he always looked upon the large number of his subjects of the supposed Reformed religion, as an evil, and that he had accordingly taken measures against them, which he could not regard as wrong, because under the blessing of God they had been accompanied with many conversions. His plan consisted in this, that

he by no means intended to persecute them, nor to compel (*presser*) them by any new measures of force, but that he was rather inclined to secure to them what they had received from their predecessors; but that he would not yield them anything *beyond* the same, and would limit, what was conceded them, within the narrowest limits that justice and expediency would allow. Therefore he had ordered commissioners to carry out the Edict of Nantes, and had formed the resolution, and had strictly observed it, to grant the Protestants no favors depending upon himself alone; and this rather from good-will, than from ill-will towards them, in order to bring them from time to time, to consider, voluntarily and without passion, whether they could in justice to themselves, rob themselves of the advantages in which they might participate with all his other subjects. At the same time he had determined to urge the bishops to labor as much as possible for their conversion, and to abate the offences that sometimes repelled them from the Catholics, and also to make advances to *those* Calvinists who manifested a teachable spirit, even by rewards, etc.

From all this we see clearly, that it was the object of the King to win back the Reformed to the Cath. Church; not to revoke the Edict of Nantes, but to render it *unnecessary*. To accomplish this he did not wish to employ direct force and persecution, but indirect means. These consisted of investigations (by commissioners) into the title-deeds (based upon the Edict of Nantes), of the Reformed Churches (which investigations almost necessarily led to chicanery); and in the withdrawal and granting of acts of grace.

These are, properly speaking, the foundation of the system of conversion, which, had it not been for a mass of circumstances beyond the intention and even the knowledge of the King, would never have taken such a form as to lead to the formal revocation of the Edict of Nantes. We can cite only a few of these circumstances.

The investigations above mentioned took at once the character of a most petty and hateful chicanery. The commissioners, impelled by the clergy and their own wishes, and the approbation of the court, readily found the rights of many churches to be defective, and decreed, in some cases after long and tiresome litigation, the closing and sometimes the demolition of the temples. The influence of the court also affected many Calvinists, and brought back the stray sheep to the fold of their proper shepherds, for such the local bishops and priests, according to the territorial system of the Edict of Nantes itself, always regarded themselves *de jure*. And what the influence of the court could not accomplish, was effected by numberless vexations, to which the Calvinists were daily subjected. The Intendants, under the same influence of the court, had nothing more opportune to do, than to send lists of the new converts to the court, which naturally secured to them many substantial tokens of regard, as encouragements in the pious and holy work. The bishops were even less idle—in pious exhortations, controversial sermons, church visitations in their dioceses (of

which the Calvinists were also members), pastoral letters, popular and learned works, etc. The great Arnauld wrote his work: *De la perpétuité de la Foi*; Bossuet his: *Exposition de la doctrine de l'Eglise Catholique*; Nicole his: *Prejugés légitimes contre les Calvinistes*, &c. The King's Council and the Parliaments kept pace with the clergy and the commissioners in their zeal for conversions, and poured forth a stream of *arrêts*, declarations, edicts, charters, ordinances, and *lettres de cachet*. The work of conversion was even carried forward by means of dragoons and money. The former method was superintended by Louvois Rath, Minister of War, who found it quite natural to relieve the obedient Catholics by quartering the dragoons at the expense of the Calvinists. The King also thought this quite natural, and had no knowledge of the secret order of his minister, to let loose the reins of the soldiery, and to permit them, horses and men, to live at discretion upon the Calvinistic population. The latter were indeed spared their *lives*, according to the loudly professed principle, *Ecclesia abhorret a sanguine*; but they were worried by the healthy tortures of hunger and thirst, beatings, daily and nightly rolling of drums, &c., until their hard hearts were softened, and they were made willing to sign a formula of faith, from which their large-hearted convertors (*convertisseurs*), sometimes were willing to take its dogmatic edge (see Art. *Calas*). The money conversions were reduced to a regular system by the academician Pellisson (himself formerly a Calvinist), who stood at the head of the administration of the fund of conversion, formed from the economists or incomes of vacant livings. "This golden eloquence," the pious courtiers exclaimed, "was not so learned, but far more convincing than that of Bossuet." Conversions by dragoons, and the commerce in souls, as the Calvinists termed it, found defenders among the learned and unlearned. As love demands that the erring "should be saved from eternal pain by the help of healthy tortures," so duty required "that the pathway to truth should be strewn with flowers." The Saviour himself had fed his hungry hearers with bread and fishes; the father had embraced and rewarded the prodigal son on his return, etc. They relied upon the authority of Augustine. A work appeared, entitled, *Conformité de la conduite de l'Eglise de France, pour ramener les Protestants, avec celle de l'Eglise d'Afrique, pour ramener les Donatistes à l'Eglise Catholique*. The whole of France was gradually drawn into this system of conversion as into a whirlpool, to keep aloof from which was difficult, and in the case of officers unwise. The Coun. of State and the Parliaments also partook of the general madness of the hour; so that they issued the most wilful and irrational orders; as, for instance, that all temples, in which Catholics had attended the Reformed worship, should be pulled down; that the ministers should change every three years; that children of seven years of age should be capable of choosing the Cath. religion, and that they should be encouraged in these divine impulses by a formal reception into the Church;

that the backs of the seats in the Reformed Churches should be taken down, etc. The most splendid reports of the success of the work reached Louis XIV., and became to him so many sources of intoxicating praise, which, with the arguments of Jesuitical court theologians, externalized and perverted in him the internal influences of the Holy Spirit, after a life full of sin and adultery. The proofs of this are contained in a historical State document which Rulhière composed at the request of the minister Breteuil, in 1788, entitled, *Eclaircissements historiques sur les causes de la révocation de l'Edit de Nantes et sur l'état des Protestants*. With truly terrific truth wrote the Duke of St. Simon, himself a Cath. and no friend of Calvinism, in view of an intimate and personal knowledge of this perversion, "The King wished to become pious, and as he had no knowledge of religion, he sought and found peace in doing penance upon the backs of the Huguenots and Jansenists" (*Mém. T. XIV., p. 77*).

Although abjuration of the religion of their fathers seemed to become daily more and more prevalent among the Reformed, it was yet far from being so universal as was stated in these reports, and as it was the interest of the clergy to make the King believe, in order to bring him to the fatal step. In order, therefore, to open his eyes with respect to their numerical strength and their zeal for their religion, and to keep him back from further persecutions, the Calvinists, in some provinces, namely in Poitou and Lower Languedoc, resolved to assemble themselves for public worship on the same day and at the same hour, at the ruins of their temples. This demonstration, not ill-contrived, was spoiled by a lack of proper concert and order, and its result was to cast still further suspicion upon the Reformed as disturbers of the peace.

But Louis still hesitated to put the final stroke of destruction upon the work of his grandfather, the greatest and best of the French Kings. This indecision was shared by his Council, especially with reference to the carrying out of the undertaking that had long since been determined upon. Grave difficulties were in the way. They knew not what to do with the Reformed ministers, who, by their moral lives, and their theological and practical education, formed a very respectable body. To condemn them to a life-long imprisonment was difficult, in consequence of their great number, and the danger of having in the midst of France such a material for constant excitement. To banish them, and thus scatter them through the various Protestant lands, to whose public opinion it was necessary to have regard from political motives, was a grave step. Finally, the latter alternative was determined upon, and carried out with great severity and many petty vexations.

The Edict of Revocation was at last drawn up, and after the dying Chancellor Letellier, father of the minister of war, had affixed the seal of State to the document, he exclaimed, in the words of Simeon: "*Lord, now lettest thou thy servant depart in peace, for mine eyes have seen thy salvation.*" "He justly recognizes," says the Jesuit d'Avrigny, from whom we quote

this, "this last act of his as the most fortunate and most splendid of his whole life."

Clouds of incense flowed from all sides towards Versailles, to the "author of this great work," the "new Constantine the Great," the "most perfect and most august of all Kings," who, "although his great deeds have long since carried his name to the extreme ends of the earth, and will make him renowned to the latest generation, has by this last act elevated it to the heavens, and has won for himself a fame that shall endure beyond the destruction of the world." But not only was this great work speedily followed by destruction at the hands of an unknown youth (see *Art. Court*), but history has elsewhere recorded quite a contrary judgment. For it soon became plain, that what was regarded by the ruling Church at least as *materia peccans* in the body of France, to be expelled even by the shedding of blood, was in truth a healthy counterpoise. "So long as our religion stood upon a secure footing in France, and our *Claudes, Daillés, and Drélincourts*, could make themselves heard," wrote a French Calvinist, a half century later, in defending the freedom of religion against the Bishop of Agen, "what brilliant spirits the Catholics had to oppose to them? But since they have no longer such powerful opponents, can we not affirm that the Gallic Church has seen its glory passing away? Where now are the *Bourdalouses, Marsillons, Fléchiers, Mascarons, Bossuets, Arnaulds*, and so many others, who conferred honor upon it? In a century so enlightened, in which all other departments are perfecting themselves, the study of theology is almost abandoned, the pulpits are miserably filled, and whatever lights there be, must be sought for in a despised party." The final judgment of history is clearly this, that after France had cast forth and excluded from itself the salt contained in Calvinism, it fell through its Catholic sons, Voltaire, Diderot, d'Alembert, Helvetius, and Lamettrie, into that state of moral and religious putrefaction, which allowed its philosophical century to reach a very unphilosophical end. With reference to the period from 1700 to 1789, we refer to the *Articles Brousson, Camisardes, Calas, Court, and French Lutheran and Reformed Church in the 19th century*. This period (1700-1789), is appropriately divided into two portions, of which the one (1700-1715, which we may call the fifth period), is the age of fanaticism; the other (1715-1789, which may be regarded as our sixth period), is the age of the regeneration of the Churches in the wilderness, until they were, in religious and civil respects, placed on an equal footing with the Catholic Church by the National Assembly.

Sources.—These are so numerous, that besides those already mentioned, we can name but a few. Chief among them is the work ascribed to Beza, *Histoire ecclésiastique des églises réformées du royaume de France* (properly speaking, more a chronicle of the several decrees of the Parliaments, than a history). In German works this history is so poor, that if we would merely mention the before-quoted work of Soldan, we would by no means give it the position

it deserves in historical literature, by reason of its thorough study of the sources, its critical investigations, and its style. As it extends only to the death of Charles IX., we must refer to *Hist. des Protestants de France, depuis l'origine de la Réformation, jusqu'au temps présent*, par G. D. Félice: Paris, 1850; of the second edition (Paris, 1851), an excellent translation (by Pabst, Leipsic, 1855), has appeared. *Der bedruckte Palm-Baum Christlicher Wahrheit: Cologne on the Spree, 1687*, is antiquated, but still valuable. Important information with respect to the history and present condition of the French-Ref. Church, we find in *Christianity in France*, by Reuchlin: Hamburg, 1837; and *The Prot. Church of France*, edited by Gieseler, 2 vols., Leips. 1848. It is to be regretted that Germany and the Huguenots, by Berthold, 1st vol. Bremen, 1848, was not continued. Berthold has compiled of many monographs in the *Hist. Taschenbuch*, which cast much light on this as yet little known portion of history. *Hist. des Réfugiés Prot. de France*, par Weiss: Paris, 1853, is distinguished for thoroughness, critical investigations, and a very laborious study of sources extending to almost all lands whither the French Ref. emigrated. Popular and edifying is the work, *The Power of Faith, or Memorabilia from the lives of the earlier heroes of the Protestant Church, especially that of France*, by Wenz, with an introduction by Dr. Sack: Bonn, 1834. Finally, we must mention the *Bulletin de la Société de l'Histoire du Protestantisme Français*; and *La France Protestante*, par M. M. Haag (embracing in alphabetical order the lives of distinguished French Protestants), as an encouraging sign of the activity now existing in France in the study of the sources, and the interest that prevails in this hitherto neglected part of its history.

V. POLENZ.—J. H. Good.

French Reformed and Lutheran Church in the 19th cent.—(See MÄDER, a Ref. clergyman of Strasburg, d. prot. K. Frankr. von 1787–1846, published by Gieseler, 2 vols.: Leipzig, 1848, a valuable work; de FÉLICE, Prof. in Montauban, *hist. des Prot. (réformés) de France*: Paris, 1850, impartial but too concise. VINCENT, *vues sur les Prot. en France*, 2 vols.: Nîmes, 1829. BOST *Memoires, &c.*, 2 vols.: Paris, 1854, valuable for its accounts of the origin of the division).

I. External relations and constitution.—After the National Assembly, Aug. 21, 1789, affirmed the equal rights of all citizens, and on Dec. 10, 1790, excepted the property of the Protestant Church of Elsass and the possessions in Montbéliard, referred to in the preceding article, from the sale of national property, a season of sore trial fell upon all the religious societies. Public worship was stopped in the evangelical Churches also, churches were used for profane purposes, the sacred vessels were melted up, clergymen were required to abjure their faith, and, if they refused, imprisoned. In the year III. (1795), it was enacted that no one should be hindered in practising his religious convictions, no one compelled to support public worship, and that the Republic would not pay for its support.

Anarchy prevailed; each congregation was sovereign; peace and order were not restored until the decree of April 7, 1802 (18. *Germinal* X. — When Napoleon opened negotiations with the Pope for the arrangement of the affairs of the Rom. Cath. Church, it was first intended to meddle with the Evan. Confessions no further than to extend over them the protection of the State. But Providence had ordered otherwise. By Napoleon's direction the clergy of both (Ref. and Luth.) Confessions were paid out of the State treasury, and to the Evan. Churches themselves a new constitution was granted (*de Félice*, p. 572). Its main features are the following: the lowest judicatory for both Churches is the *consistory*; each consistory to have charge of 6000 souls, whether these belonged to one or more congregations. It was composed of the minister of the parish, and 6–12 laymen. The laymen were, in the first instance, chosen from 25 of the wealthiest married persons. A biennial election was thereafter held, of persons (the wealthiest again), nominated by the consistory and 12 other laymen, whom it associated with itself for this purpose. The oldest minister presided. From this point the government of the two Churches differed. In the Ref. Church the consistories are under a provincial synod. Five consistorial districts form one synodical district. The synod is constituted of one minister, and one elder from each congregation, the elder chosen each time by his consistory. The synod elects its own president. It can be held only by permission of the government, continue in session not more than six days, and transact only such business as has been previously fixed upon in the presence of the Prefect, or his delegate. — In the Luth. Church the consistories are under an assembly of *inspectors*, who appoint a clerical inspector for life, with two lay adjuncts, and these have the right of visitation. This assembly of inspectors, again, is subject to the *General Consistory*, a sort of central synod. The General Consistory is composed of a lay-president and two clerical inspectors appointed for life, by the government, and of one lay-deputy chosen for life by each *Inspection*. — As there were six *Inspections*, the Gen. Cons. was composed of nine members, including two clergymen. This Cons. was subject to the same rules as the Synods. During the interval between the sessions of these bodies, the affairs of the Church were managed by a Directory, consisting of the President, the oldest of the two Inspectors, two lay-members appointed by the assembly, and a government commissary appointed by the chief magistrate. — Two Luth. and one Ref. seminaries were to be established for the training of ministers. There was, however, but one Luth. seminary opened, that at Strasburg. The Ref. institution was first located at Geneva. Afterwards another was opened at Montauban; and when France lost Geneva, that at Montauban stood alone. A Ref. chair, however, was founded in Strasburg. — In each congregation the minister was elected by the consistory.

This law, we see, to a certain degree retained, for the Ref. Church, the early Calvinistic, Presbyterian, and Synodal system, and formed the

government of the Luth. Church by amalgamating the Presbyterial, Episcopal, and Consistorial (in the German Luth. sense of the term) elements.—The defects of this organization are obvious. In neither Church were the rights of the single congregations duly secured. In the Ref. Church, besides, the key-stone of its organization, the National Synod, was wanting. The qualification for eligibility is especially objectionable. In the Luth. Church one is surprised at the small number composing the higher courts, their appointment for life, the inequality in the clerical and secular elements, and the interference of the government in the appointments. The limitations imposed upon the assemblies also seem unjust; and the vagueness of the law, and its failure to define the duties of each office, led to endless diversities of opinion.—At first this law was thought highly advantageous. But its defects soon became manifest. Besides its inherent defects others appeared. The Ref. Provincial Assemblies never met; and it was disputed whether the Luth. Assemblies of Inspectors were really consulting bodies, or mere election machines. But the want of Presbyterial Councils was so deeply felt, that, despite the violence of the law, such were soon organized; in the Ref. Church under the name of *consistoires sectionnaires*, in the Lutheran, *conseils presbytéraux*. The manner of election varied. In larger Ref. congregations deacons were also chosen. In 1854 the Luth. congregation in Colmar imitated this example. The congregations, likewise, desired to have a voice in the choice of pastors; but instead of succeeding in this, the elective prerogative of the consistories was restricted, after 1806, so that their choice was limited to one of four candidates proposed by the Director. Under the Emperor and the Restoration no improvement of the law could be hoped for; the former was too despotic, the latter too unfavorable to Protestantism. But from 1830 the opposition to it made itself felt in the Chambers. In 1831 the Luth. Directory appointed a commission of ministers and laymen to draft a new law. This was submitted to the consistories, and then was laid before the Gen. Cons. (1833), which rejected its leading items. In 1838 the Gen. Cons. again met, and drew up a series of resolutions relating to the presbyterial councillors and the duties of the several boards. The government, however, did not decide upon them, and thus the dissatisfaction increased. — At length in 1840 the government felt compelled to satisfy the demands made, and began with the Ref. Church. The Minister of religious affairs, *Teste*, had an ordinance drafted for the completion of the organic law. In this way, it was hoped, the inconvenience of a discussion in the Chambers on a new law might be avoided. The draft invested the presbyterial councillors with full rights, defined the prerogatives of the several boards, but again said nothing of a National Synod. On this account, already, the new provisions were unacceptable. But when, by amendments made in the Council of State, the Church was made more dependent on the State, a general outcry was raised against the law. In 1844 it was the

turn of the Luth. Church; but after several conferences between *Teste* and the Inspectors, matters remained as before.

Meanwhile a party arose which proposed radical measures for the cure of all these evils. The *Evan. Society of France* (see below), had established several independent Churches, and allowed them to continue in this form. Through the influence of the distinguished *Vinet*, this casual independence of the State was defended as a fundamental Gospel principle. This view was also advocated by an excellent periodical, *Le Semeur*; but it found favor only in the Ref. Church. — Under these circumstances the revolution of 1848 broke out, and all were intent on securing their own wishes. This was the case with both the Evan. Churches and the dissenters. The Churches desired an amendment of the organic law, and that the independence of the Church, in its relation to the State, should be secured. The dissenters wished to break up the hated union of the Church and State.—As early as Feb. 24, placards were put up at the corners of all the streets, in which the separation of Church and State was decreed to be the wish of the people, although these never troubled themselves about this theological question. Some Rom. Catholics, also, joined in this demand. But the movement failed. — Then the Lutheran Church made an attempt. Its Directory had become unpopular. On the 9th of March, the work of revolution commenced. Two directors had died; the remaining three were compelled to resign. The municipal board hastily called a tumultuous assembly which granted the Church a previously prepared provisional directorial commission. Notwithstanding its objectionable features, it was received. This commission issued a circular in which it proclaimed the right of general suffrage, and that of each Church to choose its own pastor. Then, having obtained ministerial permission, it called an assembly of delegates from the different consistories, one clergyman to two laymen, to meet in Strasburg in September, to consult upon a law to be then presented. It deserves credit for having thus turned things into an orderly channel. — Meanwhile pastoral conferences, partly composed of laymen also, were held, and pamphlets were printed in anticipation of the new constitution. Almost the universal opinion favored the preservation of the connection between Church and State. Many even expressed a desire for a union with the Ref. Church.—In the Ref. Church, the democratic tendencies of which were often complained of, matters proceeded in an honorable and orderly manner. No violent measures were adopted. It also talked of union. In May, an unofficial preparatory Synod met, at the invitation of the Paris Consistory, to devise means for holding a National Synod. This latter met at the same time with the Strasburg delegate assembly, and also issued a draft of a law.—Both drafts proposed, first of all, the proper organization of the congregations and their Presbyterial Councils, and upon the basis of universal suffrage, with due limitations; the number of members of the Council to be proportioned to the population. —

The consistories were to be chosen from the Presbyterial Councils, and to elect their own president. The Luth. draft, besides, proposed an enlarged Gen. Cons. and Directory, subject to renewal, and to be appointed by the Church alone; only the president of the Directory should be appointed by the government. The Inspectors were retained, but were not to be appointed for life. Thus an approximation was made to the pure synodal form, and the liberty of the Church was preserved in its connection with the State.—The Ref. draft restored the National Synod without a permanent committee.—The Luth. pastors were to be appointed by the local consistories and the half of the Presbyterial Council of each congregation; the Ref. were to be nominated by the presbytery, and appointed by the consistory. Both parties approached nearer each other than in the law of Germinal 18, and both assemblies expressed the hope of a future union, though the Lutheran coldly.

Louis Napoleon now became President of the Republic, and his government forthwith sought to remove all traces of the revolution. So, also, in the Luth. Church. At the close of 1850 he appointed, according to the law of 1802, three members of a new directory, and convened a Gen. Cons. in order to have the directory filled, and to deliberate upon the project of a delegate assembly. But before any results were reached, the *coup d'état* of Dec. 2, 1851, occurred. For four months, Napoleon exercised dictatorial powers, and on March 26, a few days before the dictatorship expired, he astonished the nation by issuing a "*décret portant réorganisation des églises Protestantes*," which completed and confirmed the *Germinal* law, in every article not expressly abolished. This decree gave the two Churches a constitution wholly different from their respective drafts.—The Presbyterial Councils, elected by general suffrage, were allowed to both Churches; the consistories are chosen from the Councils, and elect their own (clerical) presidents, who are confirmed by the government.—Then 1) over the Ref. Church is set a "*conseil central*," the members of which were to be appointed the first time by the chief magistrate; of subsequent appointments nothing was said. Pastors were to be elected as arranged in the September law. 2) In the Luth. Church, inspectors are appointed for life by the government; they all belong to the General Consistory, now the Upper Cons., the president of which, and one more member, are appointed by the government. The Church elects two lay deputies to each *Inspection*, and a deputy of the seminary, who serve for life. The old Directory remains, with the exclusive right of appointing pastors.—This scheme called loud complaints from both Churches; but it is still in force. Time will prove its defects or merits.—Soon after the decree of March 26, a new division was made of the consistories of both Churches, and of the *Inspections* of the Luth. Church, and their number increased. This arrangement is very advantageous, especially to the Reformed Church. Now there is a consistory for each *department*, whether there be Protestants in it or not. But dissenters from the Ref. and Luth. Churches are excluded from privileges granted to these.

The *charte* of 1814 (Art. 6), occasioned much annoyance to Protestants, by making the Rom. Cath. the State religion. But the July revolution struck out the clause concerning the State religion, and simply declared that Rom. Catholics were in the majority. The Republican Constitution of 1848, and the Imperial one of 1852, say nothing about this. But much more perilous to Religious freedom, are Arts. 291, 292, 294, of the penal code of Napoleon. These forbid the regular meeting of every *association* of more than 20 persons, for *religious*, political, literary, or any other purpose, unless by special permission from the authorities. The question arose, whether congregations for worship were *associations*, &c. Under Louis Philip, the matter was not decided. Under the Republic, the articles were declared not to apply to meetings for public worship. But on March 25, 1852, the day before the "*décret portant réorganisation*," &c., another decree appeared which referred those articles to all *réunions publiques*. Many Ref. consistories have protested against this, but without effect.

The relations between Protestants and Rom. Catholics in France, have been unhappily hostile. Sometimes the animosity has shown itself in open violence; as in Nismes in 1815, when the Protestants had to bar their churches, and Gen. Laycorde was shot down (Nov. 12), in the defence of one (See LAUZE DE PÉRET, *causes et précis des troubles, etc., dans le dépt. du Gard, etc., en 1815, 1816*). For the most part, however, the weapons of controversy were the tongue and the pen. By these the interior of France is kept in constant agitation.—In some instances union churches and literary institutions have occasioned strife (See ILLOEN's *Ztschr. &c.*, 1843, II. 3. *Notice sur les fondations administrées par le séminaire Prot. de Strasbourg*; Strasb., 1854; and, on the other side, *Revendication par la ville de Strasb., &c.*: Strasb. 1855).

II. *Inner life*.—After the revolution the Protestants of France fell into a deep slumber. Religious truth exerted but little influence. The forms of worship were maintained, but all was cold and dead. About 35 years ago, however, the churches were revived. The first instruments of this happy change were persons who had imbibed the spirit of true piety from the Moravians in Germany. But subsequently Methodists (both Wesleyan and Whitefield), went over from England, and contributed chiefly to the work of revival. Although some fanatical disorders attended their movements, the result, in the main, has been decidedly good (See in favor of the Methodist influence: VINCENT, *l. c.* II., 265–290; against it: DAVERN (*Ch. Coquerel?*) *lettres Méthodistes*: Paris, 1833; MME. DE GASPARDIN, *Quelque défauts des Chrétiens d'aujourd'hui*, 2 ed.: Paris, 1855.—Opposed to this order of things are the *Rationalists*. Those clergy who favor Methodism (especially the Reformed), are supra-naturalistic; and they designate their system *l'orthodoxie moderne*, and *christianisme expérimental* (see works with these titles of ATHAN. COQUEREL). Rationalism found more favor, for a time, in the Luth. Church, in which, also, rigid Lutheranism has recently been revived, with *Horning* (senior), of Strasb.,

at its head. This latter movement has but few adherents, but they boldly assail the Reformed Church and the Union.—In regard to this entire revival, it is to be lamented that it at once became associated with Dissenters. Meetings were established, at which all the ordinances of religion were administered; then congregations were organized. Often uneducated men, not ordained, took charge of these. The "Evan. Society," founded in 1833, operated, according to its charter, with, without, and against the consistories, among Catholics and Protestants. Then arose the question of the separation of the Church from the State. In the next place it is to be regretted that the spirit of intolerant exclusion was indulged. In 1842 the "*Soc. d. intérêts généraux du Prot. français*" was founded, from which all non-Methodists were excluded. This excited violent opposition. After the Revolution of 1848, the society was dissolved.—The Synod of 1848 led to a final rupture. At the commencement of its session, Fred. Monod, of Paris, withdrew from it, because of its refusal to adopt a doctrinal basis. Sustained by Count Agénor de Gasparin, who was prominent at the founding of the "*Soc. d. intérêts généraux*," and followed by a few other clergymen, Monod founded a chapel, and set about establishing the "*Union d. églises évangel. de France*." If the name "Free Church," claimed by the other party, involves a charge of servility against the State Church, the term "*évangeliques*" contains an insinuation of a departure from the Gospel, on the part of the "Free Church." This Union was organized at a General Synod in August, 1849, which prepared a confession of faith, and a discipline. Thus the most of the single dissenting congregations were united. Henceforth the "Evan. Soc. of France," labored in the interest of the Dissenters, and the pecuniary means for carrying forward its work were first obtained from England and Scotland, which countries Monod visited on a collecting tour.

In the operations of the free religious societies, existing within the evangelical Churches, Lutherans, Reformed, and Dissenters participate.—The Bible societies of Strasburg (1816), and Paris (1818), were started with the revival, and through the influence of the Brit. and For. Soc. A few years after the founding of the "*Soc. Bibl. Prot. de Paris*," the "*française de étrangère*" separated from it because it would not labor among Catholics. All three societies have numerous auxiliaries, and the Brit. Soc. has, besides, its direct agents. The "Evan. Soc. of France," has already been named. Subsequently clergymen and laymen of the National Church, founded societies in Nîmes, Bordeaux, Strasb., &c., for the evangelization of scattered Protestants. These (that of Strasb. excepted), unite in the "Prot. Central Soc." in Paris. This soc. has an ally in the "Soc. to encourage primary instruction among the Protestants of France." A want often felt, has been met by the institutions of Deaconesses in Paris and Strasb.; the parties of Coquerel and Fr. Monod have united in opposition to these (See *Mme. DE GASPARIN, les corporations MONASTIQUES au sein du Prot.*, 2 vols. 8vo.: Paris, 1855). The

"Agricultural Colony at St. Foix," for youthful culprits, founded by the decayed "Soc. of the general interests of Protestants," is an important institution. There are also institutions for friendless children; and a Soc. at Paris aims at establishing Sunday schools in all parts of the country. Besides these there is a "*Soc. des traités relig.*" at Paris, and a "*Soc. pour l'impression des livres religieux*," in Toulouse. There are other societies in Paris, Lyons, Marseilles, &c., which operate among the Germans in those large cities, and one in Strasb. for Algiers. Thus every branch of Home Missions has been provided for.—Neither are the heathen or Israelites forgotten. The happy results of the labors of the Paris Missionary Soc. in South Africa, are generally known; and the "Soc. of the Friends of Israel," has led many to embrace Christianity. These societies are all sustained by voluntary contributions, collections, sales, lotteries, &c. To secure more general aid the "*Soc. du sou Prot.*" (members paying at least 5 centimes (1 sou), weekly), was founded. It divides its funds annually among the various societies; but as an appropriation is also made to the "*Soc. évan. de France*," many opponents of the Dissenters have withdrawn their names. In several places independent son societies exist, which distribute their income at pleasure among the National Church institutions.¹—To these must be added the funds for the relief of the widows of clergymen, and for disabled ministers; and the "*Soc. de l'histoire du Prot. français*," in Paris, which publishes an annual bulletin.

The voluntary "Clerical Conferences" have been exerting a most happy influence in all parts of France. There are two such in Paris, a general one, and one of the clergy of the State Churches. They have served to bring the various parties together, and to assuage jealousies. Questions affecting the interests of the Church are freely discussed, and with happy results. The Strasb. Conf. has published a Catechism, a general Prayer-book, a Hymn and note-book, which are being substituted for the many different books of devotion in use; unity is thus promoted. This Conf. exerts great influence. It and that of Paris, hold their annual meetings simultaneously with the anniversaries of the several societies. The anniversary week in Paris occurs in May, that of Strasb. in June, and that of Basel, which is visited by many persons from Elsass, in July.—Of the many religious periodicals published, we will name merely the leading organs of each party or system. The "*Archives du Christian. au 19^{me} siècle*," ed. by Rev. Fr. Monod. This was formerly the organ of Dissent, but it now adve-

¹ The sums collected in 1853, were:—

For the three Bible Soc.	137,987 francs
For the Prot. Central Soc.:	
The Strasb. Evang. Soc., and.....	111,470 "
The Soc. for Primary Instruc.....	
For the Evang. Soc. of France.....	150,202 "
For the Religious Tract and Book Soc.,	104,136 "
For the two Deaconness Institut.....	94,877 "
For the Miss. Societies.....	88,974 "
The sou Prot.....	12,222 "

ates the union of the Evang. Churches. It violently opposes the State Churches, Romanism, and latitudinarianism. The "*Espérance*," ed. by Rev. Grandpierre (who left the Dissenters for the National Church), represents the orthodox tendency of the Nat. Church; its opposition to Rationalism is moderate. "*Le Lien*," ed. by Athan. Coquerel (the son), the organ of the Rationalists, is more moderate now than formerly, strictly national, but in favor of the largest religious liberty.—The "*journal d. missions évang.*," is an interesting paper. The "*petits écrits pour le temps*," ed. by Rev. Puaux, is apologetical, and harshly polemical. The "*la voix nouvelle*," ed. by Rev. Boucher, was started in the last days of the July regime, as a Prot. political paper; but many thought it too radical, and it was stopped. There was a German Prot. Church and school paper for Elsass. In 1848 it perished, and now the only German periodicals published are the "*Missionsfreund*" of Rev. Kuntz, and the "*Archiv d. Strasb. Pastoralconf.*"—Until recently theol. science was in a sad condition in France. Various attempts to establish theol. journals failed. VINCENT's "*mélanges de morale, de religion et de critique sacrée*;" the "*essais et fragmens de théologie*," ed. by the faculty of Strasb.; the "*revue de théologie*" of the faculty of Montauban, lasted but a short time. The "*revue de théologie et de philosophie chrétienne*" of COLANI, lic. of theol. in Strasb., started in 1850, seems to be sustained; Edm. Scherer, formerly Prof. in the independent theol. school at Geneva, but whose views were changed through the influence of Schleiermacher, Neander, and Vinet, is a prominent contributor to Colani's review.—A number of valuable works in the history of French Protestantism, and Church History in general, have appeared, as well as translations of German works, during late years (see Theol. Stud. u. Krit., 1844, H. 2. "Beiträge d. theol. Gesellsch. v. Strasb.," vol. 1, 1855). Recently the "*revue chrétienne*" was started by Edm. de Pressensé, a Dissenter preacher in Paris, of the latitudinarian school; it is designed for the clergy and laity.—The theol. institution at Strasburg has from the first been pervaded by German learning, which it spread among the clergy of Elsass; its tendency is rationalistic, but of late it has taken a more positive character. In the faculty of Montauban orthodoxy preponderates, but it has not contributed much to science. Several attempts have been made to remove the institution of Montauban to Paris, or to start a third one here; but Montauban and Strasburg both opposed the project, and it was dropped. It is proposed, however, to enlarge the Strasb. instit. by adding a seminary for preachers, like that at Wittenberg. The term seminary as now used in Strasb. denotes a scientific institution connected with the faculty, and which has a residence or boarding-house for students belonging to it.

The worship of the French Church is exceedingly simple: first a hymn is sung, having reference to the sermon, then prayer, then the sermon, another prayer, singing, and the benediction. In the Reformed Church the ten com-

mandments, Matt. 22 : 37–40, the Apostles' creed, and sometimes a portion of Scripture, are also used; Marol's versification of David's Psalms is used in singing. In the Luth. Church the old and four new series of Gospels are preached upon in the morning. In the Ref. Church free texts are used. The Upper Consistory of the Luth. Church has prepared a new liturgy with responses.—The Prot. Church of France has always had distinguished pulpit orators, both in French and German.

DR. KIENLEN.*

Freylinghausen, John Anastasius, one of the principal leaders of the Pietistic movement in its early stage, labored, in connection with Spener and Francke, for the revival of practical piety in the Protestant churches of Germany, and occupies at the same time a prominent rank among the sacred poets and hymnologists. He was born Dec. 2, 1670, at Gandersheim, near Wolfenbüttel, received from his mother a strictly pious, though legalistic education, studied theology at Jena, 1689, became acquainted with Augustus Hermann Francke, the founder of the famous Orphan House at Halle, accompanied him to Halle, assisted him in his labors, married his only daughter, Anastasia, and succeeded him, in 1727, as director of his benevolent institutions. He died, twelve years afterwards, Feb. 12, 1739, a pious and peaceful death, and was buried at the side of his intimate friend.—He combined the activity of an academic teacher, pastor, and superintendent of the benevolent institutions at Halle, and exerted a very salutary influence upon the rising generation. His theological works, of which the "*Fundamental Theology*" (Grundlegung der Theologie, 1703) deserves to be mentioned, are not distinguished for any vigor or depth of thought, but for their piety and practical tendency in opposition to the dry and cold scholasticism which then prevailed in the German Universities. His most valuable and lasting productions are his hymns, above forty in number, pregnant with Scripture truth and fervent love to the Saviour. Some of them have passed into common use and found a place in every good German hymn-book, as "Wer ist wohl wie du, Jesu, süsse Ruh;" "Jesus ist kommen, Grund ewiger Freuden;" "Mein Herz, gieb dich zufrieden," etc. (see translations of his hymns in Miss Cath. Winkworth's *Lyra Germanica*, first and second series). Freylinghausen published also one of the best German hymn-books, in two vols., Halle, 1704, and 1713 (and often since) under the title: "Geistreiches Gesangbuch, den Kern alter und neuer Lieder, wie auch die Noten der unbekannten Melodeyen enthaltend." The historical significance of this collection consists in its pietistic spirit, and the introduction of the element of subjective devotion, as a supplement to the older, more objective and churchly hymns of the 16th and 17th centuries.

Literature: FREYLINGHAUSEN'S Ehrengedächtniss: Halle, 1740. Francke's Stiftungen, a Journal ed. by Schulze, Knapp, and Niemeyer, Vol. 2, 1794. H. DÖRING, Die gelehrten Theologen Deutschlands, I., 439, sq. WETZEL, Lebensbeschreibungen der berühmtesten Liederdichter.

IV., 145. Also the larger hymnological works sub Freylinghausen, especially Koch, *Geschichte des Kirchenlieds*, p. 235 (1st ed.).

PALMER. — *Dr. Schaff.*

Fridolin, St. — The biography of St. F., by Walter, a monk in Sädingen, is unreliable. It is even uncertain whether he lived under Chlodwig I. or II.; the former died in 511, the latter did not become ruler of the entire Frankish empire until 656. St. F. was of noble Celtic origin. It is said he fled from the praises his sermons in the British isles called forth, to Gallia. He then devoted himself to a revival of the veneration of St. Hilary, seeking to found monasteries in his honor in different places. On an island in the Rhine, between Schaffhausen and Basel, he founded a church dedicated to St. H., and the Sädingen nunnery, where he died Nov. 6, which is observed as his anniversary at that church. — (See RETTBERG, *K.-gesch. Deutschl.* II., 30, &c. HEFELE, *Gesch. d. Einführung d. Chr. im Südwestl. Deutschl.*, &c.: Tüb., 1837, p. 243, &c. BLUMHARDT, *Versuch einer allg. Missions-gesch.*, &c.: Basel, 1832, II., 2, p. 382).

REUCHLIN.*

Friesland, or the country of the Frisons, comprises, in its extended sense, the entire coast of Northwestern Germany. Originally, however, the name was applied only to the country lying between the mouth of the Weser and the Schelde. It is divided by lake Flevum or Fly (since the breaking of the dykes called Zuider-Zee), into East and West Friesland. The former embraces the province of F. and Gröningen, now under the realm of Holland; and East F. proper, which, in 1815, was ceded to the kingdom of Hanover. History also mentions North F., which embraced the islands of Helgoland, Föhr, and Sylt. — Friesland deserves a place in this work in regard to the *introduction of Christianity and the Reformation*. The first missionary who visited (626) F. was B. Amandus (see Art.), followed (641) by Eligius, afterwards B. of Noyon; neither of whom met with expected success. In the winter of 677–78, Wilfried, Archb. of York, having been shipwrecked upon the shores of F., was kindly received by Aldegild, the King, and allowed to preach Christianity. The fruits of his labors were blighted by the persecuting spirit of Radbod, successor of A. But these reverses were only calculated to kindle the zeal and devotion of the pious Anglo-Saxons, who never relinquished their purpose of Christianizing Friesland. Egbert (see Art.) solemnly vowed to devote himself to the preaching of the gospel on the continent. Prevented by shipwreck from entering the field, he afterwards dispatched several pious monks. The first was Wigbert, who met with a favorable reception from the King, and preached for the space of two years, but without effecting much; whereupon he returned to Ireland. The next missionary was Willibrord, the proper founder of the church in Friesland, accompanied by eleven fellow-laborers; previously, however, Wulfram, the Bishop of Neustria, is said to have preached there, and to have almost succeeded in persuading Radbod to receive baptism. — When Willibrord arrived in

F. the country was, in part, subdued by the Franks (689), and to this portion of F. his labors were chiefly confined: for, where Radbod's power had full sway, no good results could be expected. In 714, when the conflict between the Franks and the Frieslanders was renewed, Willibrord was forced to retire even from those districts which the former had conquered, and sought shelter in the monastery of Epternach. After the death of R. he resumed his missionary labors, and continued in the prosecution of his great work until his death (Nov. 6, 730). The beginning of his success may be dated from the year 696, when he returned from a visit to Rome with plenary power to act as missionary, and distinguished by Pope Sergius with episcopal honors. According to Bede, Pepin assigned to him the bishopric of Utrecht, which city he also selected as the place of his future residence. At the time of W.'s death, only the southern part of Friesland, the vicinity of the mouth of the Schelde, the Zealand isles, and the country as far as Fly was secured to Christianity. His successor in office, Abbot Gregor, and assistant of Boniface, succeeded in converting the inhabitants of the district between the Fly and the Lauwers. He also founded and conducted a school which produced a number of German bishops and teachers. — As his assistants we may mention Lebuin and Willihad: the former the builder of the churches¹ in Wulpen and Deventer, the latter subsequent B. of Bremen. Liudger, a native of F., and pupil of the school founded by Gregor, also rendered effective service to Willihad in his labors. After seven years uninterrupted toil an insurrection took place, which, however, was speedily suppressed, and the work of Christianizing F. soon completed. In 785 Liudger obtained episcopal authority over the five districts lying between the Lauwers and the Ems, which he retained when subsequently called to the diocese of Münster. — The conversion of the Frieslanders was now considered as completed, although traces of heathenism were plainly visible as late as the middle ages.

The *Reformation* was introduced (1524–35) in F. by Edzard I. and his son Enno. Edzard formed an acquaintance with Luther's writings as early as 1519, and after comparing the same carefully with what his opponents had written, he decided in L.'s favor. Henry Brun and John Stevens were the first preachers of "the new doctrine," but the principal Reformer of F. was Jörgen (*Magister Aportanus*), a former pupil of the school of the *Fratres comm. vitæ*, at Zwollen, who had been called by the Count to the school at Aurich as teacher, where he became a disci-

¹ During the conversion of the Frieslanders the following ecclesiastical establishments arose: —

1. In Utrecht, the churches of St. Salvator and St. Martin, the latter of which a cathedral.
2. Five churches (Flardinghe, Kirkwerke, Velsenburgh, Heilegelo, and Pethem), which were presented to the Abbey of Epternach.
3. Gertruidenburg, on the South side of the Maas.
4. Elft, on the Bethue, near the division of the Rhine and Waal.
5. Another church edifice at Wichmund, near Zutphen, on the Yssel.

ple of the Saxon Reformer. Under the auspices of the Count he commenced preaching at Emden; and when excluded from the pulpits by the opposing clergy, he preached in the open fields. Being forcibly led by his adherents into the cathedral of Emden, an officer was sent there with a guard in order to prevent either party from committing violence. Seeing the movement increasing, and receiving no support from the civil authorities, the Romish clergy withdrew from the contest, but were permitted to continue their mode of worship unmolested. After Edzard's death (1528), the work of Reformation was prosecuted by more forcible means. E.'s successor (Enno) commenced to abolish the monasteries, and to deprive the churches of their treasures. In the meantime differences arose among the Reformers themselves in regard to the doctrine of the sacraments, which caused great perplexity to the Count and his counselors. The matter was referred to Bugenhagen, of Hamburg, for decision, who, not knowing whether he should visit F. in person or send a deputation, finally determined (1529) to send Pelt and Tilemann. The difficulties in F. were further increased by Anabaptist exiles, among whom was Carlstadt. Many of the Frieslanders had already been led by them to neglect baptism. The Lord's Supper was administered in a disorderly manner. The Sabbath and festival days were disregarded, and marriages were contracted without the sanction of the Church. This was the state of affairs in F. when the deputation arrived; and yet without the least effort to reconcile contending parties, they expected the people to adopt the fixed Lutheran view on all mooted points, and that without any modification whatever. The people at Emden and Aurich listened quietly to their preaching, until Tilemann, in his fourth sermon, boldly upheld the Lutheran view on the Lord's Supper. The audience became infuriated, T. was pulled down from the pulpit, and with great difficulty the public officers succeeded in locking him up in the sacristy, in order to protect him against open violence. The Count, considering any decisive measures at this juncture as premature, anxiously awaited the completion of the new ritual, which the ministry of Bremen were to compose for East F., on the basis of the united forms of concord, as adopted by the convocation at Marburg. This ritual was submitted Dec. 12th, 1529, and its general introduction ordered by the Count. After a stated period all Anabaptists were compelled to leave the country. On the 15th of Jan., 1530, the Count convoked the evangelical clergy at Emden, to hear the new church service read, and to pledge its willing adoption. This pledge they all gave, begging the Count henceforth not to encumber them with the subject of corporeal presence, but to permit God and his Word to govern them in such matters. In regard to the doctrine of the sacrament the Count himself was, as yet, undecided; at first he seemed to favor Luther's view, but subsequently adopted that of the Reformed, yet granting to each party perfect liberty.

This state of comparative peace was soon interrupted. One of his chiefs, Balthasar, de-

clared war against the Count. Victorious at the beginning, Enno was overpowered after the forces of the Catholic Carl, Duke of Geldern, had joined B.'s army, and had to submit to a disadvantageous treaty. Carl insisted on the re-establishment of the old Church order, but contented himself, finally, with the introduction of the Augsburg Conf. and the Saxon ritual. In compliance with the treaty, Enno issued a decree that all "sacramentarian preachers" should leave the country; whilst, on the contrary, two Luth. ministers were called from Lüneburg, to establish Lutheranism — the doctrine of the corporeal presence, with the use of candles at communion, and the white surplice. The effort met with great opposition. Many of the clergy remonstrated against it; and others, who persistingly refused to submit, were deposed, and their places supplied by Luth. ministers. In spite of all these efforts and the closest surveillance of a board of visitors, expressly created for this purpose, the Reformed system continued to prevail, and after the death of the Catholic Duke Carl (1538) supplanted entirely that of Lutheranism. Enno died a few years later. Countess Anna, who had now in the name of the minor heir, Edgard II., to assume the reins of government, appointed John a Lasco, a Polish nobleman and distinguished theologian, general-superintendent of the Church of F. Lasco introduced the Calvinistic institution of elders, appointed, during the summer season, a weekly clerical meeting (the *cætus* of Ems), and established order in the churches in Friesland. When subsequently the *Interim* appeared, and its adoption was demanded also of F., the Countess became greatly embarrassed, especially on account of the absence of Lasco, her spiritual adviser, who had been called by Edward VI. to assist in organizing the Church of England. At the request of the government, Chancellor Westen drew up a modified form of the *Interim*, according to which existing doctrines were to remain unchanged, but the use of the surplice at the Lord's Supper and vespers to be restored. These changes, although greatly modified, caused general dissatisfaction. Many churches where their pastors refused to observe the *Interim* were closed. Meanwhile Lasco returned from England, not less dissatisfied with the *Interim* than the rest. Count John, brother of the deceased Enno, who assisted the Countess in managing the affairs of the government, tried in vain to enforce the new formulary, it had to be laid aside. Lasco resumed the duties of his previous office, and gathered around him a large number of German, English, and French refugees, so that the church at Emden, received the honorary title, "Home of the oppressed and banished people of God." Ere long the old difficulties between the Lutherans and the Reformed were revived. At the instigation of the Catholic Mary of England, and the Lutheran King of Denmark, the Countess dismissed Lasco, but the proposed plan to call Melancthon as general-superintendent, was never executed; and the Reformed system and church-order, as introduced by Lasco, again prevailed. Disputes between the Lutherans and Reformed, as well

as unsuccessful attempts at union, subsequently occurred, but no general movement of any importance.—(See T. D. WIARDA, *Ostfr. Gesch.* 9. Bde.: Aurich, 1791–98, especially Bd., 1–3. C. A. CORNELIUS, *Der Antheil Ostfr. an d. Reform.* his z. Jahr., 1535: Münster, 1852. RETTBERG, *K.-gesch. Deutschl.*, 2 Bde.: Göttingen, 1848. CLEMENT, *Lebens- u. Leidensgesch. d. Friesen.*: Kiel., 1845) KLÜPFEL. — *Gehr.*

Fructuosus, B. of Tarragona, and martyr.—Of his earlier doings we have no account. His martyrdom occurred in 259 under Valerian and Gallienus. Jan. 21 is his anniversary. The deacons, Augurius and Eulogius, were imprisoned with F. All three stood firm before Æmilianus, the president of the court; they were then led to the amphitheatre, ascended the pyre praying, and it is said that their spirits were seen ascending out of the flames to heaven. (See AUGUSTINE, *serm.* 273 *de diversis*, and the 6th Hymn of Prudent., in the book *περὶ στυφάνων*. BOLL., *ad* 21, Jan.). DR. PRESSEL.*

Fructuosus, Archb. of Braga, was of royal descent, but early inclined to a contemplative retirement. After passing through the clerical school of the B. of Palencia, he sold his property and devoted the proceeds to the poor, and to the founding of monasteries. About 647 he had founded seven. But instead of presiding over them, he retired into the most desert places, where his disciples of the monastery at Complutum, in Lusitania, sought and found him, and compelled him to take charge of their monastery. The monastery then became so thronged that the King had to interfere, lest men would be wanting for the army. F. then prepared two rules for monks. The *first* contains 25 sections, in which their duties, manner of life, diet, and devotions, are most minutely prescribed. Everything, even the very motions of their bodies, were reduced to a mechanism. The penalties of violating these precepts were very severe; in some cases the offender was chained and imprisoned for six months. They were not allowed even to cut their nails, or pull out a thorn, without special permission from their superiors. In the *second*, *regula communis*, F. prescribes the conditions on which married persons, with their children, might safely live in monasteries.—All conversation with females was strictly prohibited.—F. was meditating a departure to the East, when he was elected B. of Duma, in Galicia; in 656 the Synod of Toledo elevated him to the Archb. of Braccara (Braga). He died in 675. To the last he labored to multiply monasteries and churches, sometimes working at them himself, by night.—(See MABILL., *Annal. Ord. S. Bened.*, I., 437. SCHRÖCKH, *K.-Gesch.* Bd. 20, p. 24–30. *Conc. Tol.* X., p. 984; *ap. Hard.* T. III.). DR. PRESSEL.*

Fry, Elizabeth, the third of twelve children of John Gurney and Cath. Bell, was born at Norwich, May 21, 1780. Her parents were "Friends." After the death of her pious mother in 1791, she passed through many temptations and trials, arising out of the political and religious agitations of the times. In her 17th year, then already a shining light in the society, she wrote in her diary: "I am in doubt of every-

thing. Unless a miracle be wrought on me, my talents will be devoured by moth and rust." Soon afterwards the counsel of a Friend of great religious experience helped her to solve the difficulty. She derived advantage also from intercourse with Friends in London, where, in 1799, after a long struggle, she embraced Quakerism from full inward conviction. Her marriage to Joseph Fry (1810) led her to reside in London. There she moved among Friends of the strictest sort. Now also she had abundant means for developing her talents. Until 1816 she confined herself chiefly to her family. She trained her eleven children to assist her in her labors at home and abroad. Her 25 grand-children were enlisted in like manner. Indeed her influence reached to every member of the family. Her distinguished brother, John Joseph Gurney, and her equally distinguished brother-in-law, Thomas F. Buxton, labored zealously for the emancipation of slaves. The kindness of Elizabeth showed itself in her childhood, in attempts to relieve the poor. At her father's residence, Plashet House, she established a school for girls, clothed and fed hundreds, and helped the wretched Irish who lived near by, and gypsies; to all she gave religious tracts, and such counsel as they needed. At the grave of her father, falling on her knees, that power of prayer first descended upon her, by which she afterwards moved so many hearts. Soon afterwards the Society of Friends acknowledged her as a divinely gifted witness of the truth. Called out in this way she gradually overcame her timidity, and was drawn into that sphere of public benevolent operations by which she accomplished so much good. She delivered addresses before large assemblies, her first at the Bible Soc. anniversary at Norwich, 1811. The Rev. Mr. Hughes, then of Norwich, says of her public addresses: "If the first feeling, on hearing her, is one of surprise, this is soon followed by a pious awe, and by the ardor of devotion."—A new chapter in her life opened with her visit to Newgate in 1816. The wretched condition of the 300 female convicts there, so affected her that she at once set to work for their improvement. For this purpose she formed a society of 12 women to visit those convicts, and she speedily saw the happiest results. The movement was started when, after Howard had been nearly forgotten, general attention was directed, in England, to prison-improvement. The Duke of Gloucester, Hoare, Buxton, and other men of influence, were at the head of the movement. Soon all eyes were turned to the efforts of the women at Newgate; the fruits of their labors proved their value. Inquiries came in from all quarters, from persons desirous of following the example. Mrs. Fry was invited to visit the interior of England, Scotland, and at last Ireland. Not only women and private persons, but men in civil stations, even Parliamentary committees, applied to her for her views on the subject of prison-reform. Thus she spent 21 years (to 1837) in this work. Wheresoever she came prisons were opened to her, committees of women were formed to visit prisoners, and improvements suggested by her faith, wisdom, and love were introduced.

—The chief thing with her was to apply the Word of God directly to the hearts of the prisoners. The happy effects of this means seemed to her to furnish the strongest proof of the truth of revelation. As the commingling of men and women in some prisons was a source of evil, she succeeded in having them kept separate, and for the women female overseers. Suitable employment was assigned to them, and prison schools were started. Above all the inmates were to be visited by committees of women appointed for the purpose.—In order to appreciate this movement the miserable condition of English prisons at the beginning of this century must be considered. At the same time the readiness with which Mrs. Fry's measures were seconded by the public authorities deserves mention. Female prison societies were started on all sides, even in France, Italy, Switzerland, Russia, Denmark, Holland, and Germany.

It was natural for those most interested in these operations, to look beyond their immediate sphere, to the prevention of crime, and the future welfare of discharged convicts. To this latter class Mrs. Fry early gave attention. Those sentenced for transportation also became objects of her tender concern. Like a mother and a sister of these unfortunate beings, she accompanied them to the transport-ships as early as 1818, and sought in every way to benefit them. Thus she was instrumental in directing the attention of the government to this matter also, and in 1834 Lord Melbourne ordered those then awaiting transportation to be assembled in Milbank, to be prepared for their voyage by proper instructions. Subsequently female overseers were sent along with the convicts; thus these bedlams were converted into Bethels. One result of Mrs. Fry's labors is seen in the fact that from 1818–1822 the number of relapsed convicts in Newgate had decreased 40 per cent.—But she by no means limited her sympathies to prisoners, but extended them to all classes; the poor herdsmen of Salisbury, the poor sailors at Cromer, servants, the suffering during years of scarcity, the inmates of almshouses, the insane, all shared her beneficent pity. She was particularly active also, in the circulation of the Bible and religious books, not only throughout England, but on the Continent. On the coasts of England there are about 500 stations of watchmen, located at the most dangerous points. These isolated people, and their families, were exposed to great bodily and spiritual perils. But no one cared for them, until they attracted Mrs. Fry's attention. By her efforts they were visited, and supplied, at her own expense, with good books. Thus the attention of the government was turned towards these neglected people.

Meanwhile correspondence with the continent had so greatly increased, that a special committee had to be appointed to answer them. It seemed desirable, therefore, that she should visit the continent, and personally explain her measures. Accordingly from 1837–43, she visited it five times, impelled by that ardor of charity which irresistibly inflamed all others with whom she came in contact. During these tours she untiringly prosecuted her great work of love.

Everywhere she was welcomed, and mostly received special invitations from the rulers of the different countries, before she reached them. From the palace of kings she went to the prisons, dispensing the same word of truth to all she met there, whether Protestants, Rom. Catholics, or of any other persuasion. She as firmly proclaimed the message of justification by faith in an assembly of nuns, or before the prelates of Belgium, as anywhere else. During her stay in Copenhagen, at the royal court, she succeeded in procuring the liberty of Baptist preachers who had been imprisoned there.—At Berlin, William IV. was most favorably impressed with her Christian spirit and zeal; and when he subsequently visited London, he accompanied her to Newgate, and there bowed with her in prayer before the Lord of lords.—She continued these labors until her 64th year, when sore bodily and mental afflictions overtook her. She died in 1845, aged 65 years. The blessings of thousands rested upon her. Her often repeated saying, "*Charity to the soul is the soul of charity*," here indicates the most prominent characteristic of her beneficent career, and furnished a proper aim to many of the recent benevolent movements of the Continent, especially in Germany. (See "*Memoirs of the life of Elizabeth Fry*," 2 vols. 2d ed.: London, 1848. "*Visit to female prisoners, &c.*," by M. WRENCH: London, 1852).

WICHERN.*

Fulbert of Chartres, one of the chief promoters of that revival of science, which in the course of the next hundred years developed scholasticism, was probably born in Italy, but received his education in the school of Gerbert at Rheims. About 990 he opened the school at Chartres, which soon acquired such distinction that it was frequented by pupils from distant countries. Fulbert's cotemporaries surnamed him Socrates, and his school produced such men as Berengar of Tours. In 1007 he was chosen B. of Chartres, and became the oracle of the bishops and abbots of France; but he still continued his school. His fame reached to the utmost limit of the Christian world; and when he began the rebuilding of the Cathedral of Chartres, the princes of the distant North and South aided him. He died April 11, 1029, and was canonized soon after. His works first appeared in Paris, 1585, 8vo., ed. *Papir. Masson*; then enlarged, but defective and corrupted:¹ Paris, 1608, 8vo. ed. *Charles Villiers*, and since

¹ *Shröckh*, K.-gesch., vol. 23, p. 506, has the following note. Among F.'s works there is a collection of passages from the Church Fathers upon the Lord's Supper, and among these, upon the words of Christ: "If ye eat not the flesh of the Son of man, &c.," this remark of Augustine: "here a crime seems to be enjoined; but it is a figure, which commands us to participate in the sufferings of our Lord; that is, to remember that his flesh was wounded and crucified for us."—Now lest the expression *figura ergo est* might prove prejudicial to the Romish dogma, the editor, a Paris Dr. of Divinity, added: *dicet hæreticus*. But finding afterwards that he had thus made St. Augustine a heretic, he placed these interpolated words among the *errata*, with the remark that the whole passage was mystical. Of course his ed. was suspected of containing other corruptions.

then in the *Bibl. max. patr.*, T. XVIII. They consist of 138 letters (some spurious), sermons, hymns, and some less important articles. The first letter is the most valuable. It is properly a treatise upon the Trinity, Baptism, and the Eucharist. It undoubtedly advocates transubstantiation, a doctrine defended by Gerbert already. Thus in *ep.* 2, p. 6, he says: *panis ab episcopo consecratus, et panis a presbytero sanctificatus in unum et idem corpus transfunditur, propter secretam unius operantis potentie virtutem*. His sermons exhibit an extraordinary veneration for Mary. That upon her ascension was long thought the production of St. Augustine, and parts of it were copied in the Roman breviary. The celebrated prayer: *Sancta Maria, succurre miseris, etc.*, is also attributed to F. — (See *Hist. liter. de la France*, T. VII., p. 265, &c).

HUNDESHAGEN.*

Fulcher (*Fulcard*) of *Chartres*, was chaplain to Baldwin, 2d King of Jerusalem, and wrote a valuable history of the Crusaders: *Gesta peregrinantium Francorum, cum armis Hierusalem pergentium*, reaching to 1127. See it in DUCHESNE, *hist. Franc.* T. IV., 816, &c.

HUNDESHAGEN.*

Fulda, the monastery of, was founded, c. 744, by Boniface (Winfried), and his pupil *Sturm*, a youth of a noble family in Noricum. Sturm having resolved to devote himself to a strictly ascetic life in some desert place, acquainted Boniface with his purpose, who the more readily approved of it, as he himself had thought of founding a monastery on the borders of France, in a place secure against the inroads of the Saxons. Accordingly B. sent Sturm and two companions to search out a spot in the forest of Buchonia. They selected the ground on which the tower and monastery of Hersfeld was afterwards reared, and there built a few huts. But B. disapproved of the place, as being too near the Saxons. After wandering a long time in the forest, Sturm at length found a spot in the district of Grabfeld, on the banks of the Fulda, which had many attractions. He quickly reported his success to B., who approved of the place, and at once applied to Duke Karlmann, to whom it belonged, for the grant of it. Karlmann cheerfully complied, and gave them full titles to the ground. In Jan. 744, Sturm and seven companions took solemn possession of the territory. Under B.'s direction they immediately began to build, and to cultivate the ground; in these labors they made rapid progress. Before adopting rules for the government of the monastery, some of the brethren were sent to examine the arrangements of other monasteries; Sturm, and two others, went to Italy, and visited Monto Cassino, then revived under Abbot Petronax. After his return he completed the internal arrangement of Fulda after the rule of St. Benedict, and became its abbot. Lullus, also a pupil of B., notified Pope Zachariah of the establishment of the monastery, who confirmed the institution; and by a deed of Nov. 4, 751, granted it exemption from episcopal jurisdiction. Popes Stephan and Pepin ratified this exemption in 754. Boniface (see Art.), maintained intimate relations with the monastery, and became its

patron. It now began to flourish. Before Sturm's death (779), the inmates numbered 400. Its prosperity increased under his successor *Baugulf*. By new grants of land, its territory, under Pepin and Charlemagne, included 15,000 hides (not less than 900,000 acres). The advantages of cultivating the soil spread through all the adjacent districts, and the literary culture of Fulda reached to the utmost parts of Germany. Its school became a nursery of theological learning; it bloomed most under *Rhabanus Maurus*, who presided over it for many years, and then became Abbot of Fulda. *Iraban*, born in Mayence, c. 776, was another of its distinguished teachers. There were 12 sub-instructors, called seniors. The branches taught were Grammar, Rhetoric, Dialectics, Arithmetic, Geometry, Nat. Phil. and Astronomy, Theology, and the German language. Others besides candidates for the Church, were taught there. It produced many noted scholars. There were so many applicants for admission, that only a small proportion could be received. Fulda also possessed a considerable library for that period, founded by Charlemagne. Rhabanus greatly increased it. He boasts of its including all the religious and literary works ever written. He added some works of his own; other monks contributed commentaries on the Bible, &c. Rhabanus also favored the cultivation of the fine arts, especially for the adornment of churches. The monks Isambert, Rudolph, Candidus, and Hatto, are commended as artists. The mechanical arts were also attended to; tailors, weavers, tanners, cabinet-makers, &c., were trained there. In 838 the monastery of Hirsau, in Suabia, obtained its first monks and abbot from Fulda. Rhabanus was its abbot from 822–842. After he left Fulda its literary fame declined. But it acquired increased influence and wealth. Under Abbot Werner (968–82), Fulda obtained the primacy among the abbeys of Germany and Gallia, and Otto I. made its abbots arch-chancellors of the Empire, a dignity ratified by Charles IV. At the beginning of the 11th cent., its discipline had so declined that a total reform was necessary. In 1331 an assault was made upon the abbey by the burghers of Fulda, under Duke John of Ziegenhein. Some mischief was done, but the assailants were ultimately overpowered, and their leaders put to death. In 1513 the abbey of Hersfeld was joined to that of Fulda. Later, the abbots had some trouble in keeping the ideas of the Reformation out of their institution. In 1573, however, Abbot Balthasar succeeded in effectually counteracting the influence of evangelical doctrines. During the 30 years' war the Protestants had several times almost gained possession of Fulda. The Landgrave of Hesse, William IV., by his treaty with Gustavus Adolphus, August 12, 1631, obtained Fulda as a Swedish fief, and endeavored to introduce Protestantism into the district. But after the defeat at Nördlingen he had to surrender it, and Rom. Cath. abbots were again restored. In 1732 Benedict XIV. raised the abbey to a bishopric. In 1803 Fulda was conveyed as a temporal principality to the Prince of Orange, but in 1809 Napoleon incorporated it with the

grandduchy of Frankfort. In 1815 Prussia took possession of it, and attached it to the electorate of Hesse-Cassel, to which it now belongs. —(BROWER, *Antiq. Fuld.*, libri IV.: Antw. 1617. SEITERS, Bonif., Ap. d. Deutschen.: Mainz. 1845. KUNSTMANN, *Herabanus Maurus.*: Mainz. 1841. RETTBERG, K.-gesch. &c., Bd. 1, 2: Gött. 1846. NIEDNERS Ztschr. f. hist. Theol. 1846).

KLÜPFEL.*

Fulgentius Ferrandus, Deacon at Carthage in the 6th cent., the friend and pupil of Fulg. of Ruspe, whose banishment he shared, and with whom he lived in the monastery of St. Saturninus, returned to Africa in 523, and became deacon there. He died 550. — His works are *Vita Fulg. Rusp.*; *de duabus in Christo naturis*; a fragment of a letter to *Eugippius* on the Trinity; *de septem regulis innocentie*; *Breviatio canonum ecclesiasticorum*, an important source for canon law; and *Epistola pro tribus capitulis adv. Acephalos*. — His works were first published in part by Achill. Tatius, 1518. The *Breviatio* first by Pithöus: Paris, 1588, and often afterwards. His complete works by P. F. Chifflet: Dijon, 1649. — (See CAVE, *hist. lit.* I., 514. DUPIN, *nouv. Bibl.* V., 29. General Church Histories.)

WAGENMANN*.

Fulgentius of Ruspe, a Bishop and writer of the 6th cent., born in 478 in Telepte, North Africa, was carefully educated by his widowed mother, and other competent teachers. On account of his learning and good character, he was early chosen procurator of his native town, but, contrary to his mother's desire, he entered the monastery at Byzacene, and there practised the severest austerities. The persecutions of the Catholics in North Africa compelled him to seek another monastery, and afterwards to go to Sicily, Rome, &c. Having returned to Africa, founded a new monastery, and taken priestly orders, he was chosen B. of Ruspe, in the province of Byzacene. He had scarcely entered upon his duties when he, and 60 other Catholic Bishops of North Africa, were banished by the Arian Trasimund, King of the Vandals. In company with a number of the exiles he went to the Island of Sardinia, and there began to exert himself for the good of the inhabitants. He founded a monastery there. It was in Sardinia that he became acquainted with the work of Faustus of Riez: *de gratia Dei et lib. arbitrio*, which, at the urgent solicitation of the Scythian monks, and a Sardinian Synod, he refuted in his three books, *de veritate prædestinationis et gratie Dei*, and seven (lost) books, *de gratia et lib. arbitrio responsiones*, and this gave a new turn to the Semi-Pelagian controversy. After 12 years' exile, he was allowed to return to Carthage, on account of the mildness with which he had written upon the disputed points; but upon the accusations of some Arian bishops he was banished a second time, and did not return again until after Trasimund's death, in 523, when his congregation in Ruspe received him with great joy. He died Jan. 1, 533, at the island monastery of Circina. — The writings of F., of which we have only fragments,

are mostly controversial—directed against later Arianism and Semi-Pelagianism. To the former class belong *contra objectiones Arian.* l. III.; *de S. Trinitate*; *de process. SS.*; to the latter: *ad Monimum.* l. III.; *de fide ad Petrum*; *de remiss. peccat.* l. II.; *de veritate prædest. et grat. Dei.* l. III.; *de gratia et lib. arbitr. responsiones*; 18 *epist.*; ten strictly Augustinian sermons. F. was called the Augustine of his age ("in conf. fuit clarus, in script. divinis copiose eruditus, in loquendo dulcis, in docendo et disserendo subtilis," ISIDOR.). An old biogr. of F. was probably written by his pupil, *Fulg. Ferr.* — (Editions of F.'s remains by SIRMOND: Paris, 1623, fol.; RAYNAUD: Lyons, 1633, fol.; the most complete by MANGEANT: Paris, 1684, 4to. — See *Acta Sanct.* Jan. T. I., 32. CAVE *hist. lib. script. eccl.* I., 1373. The Church Histories of Gieseler, Neander, &c. BÄHR, *Gesch. d. r. Litt. Suppl.* III., § 184. WIGGERS, *Aug. u. Pel.* II., 369, &c.).

WAGENMANN*.

Funeral Addresses. — In some places great importance is attached to this part of funeral solemnities; in others (as in Rom. Catholic Churches), nothing but the liturgical service is allowed; in others there is an address at the grave besides the sermon in the church; in still others a printed sermon is read; and in others there is simply an address at the house, and a short prayer offered at the grave. — The primitive Christians had special solemnities (Acts 8: 2), but only of a liturgical character (*Constit. Apost.*, l. 8, c. 41, 42. *Celebretur dies tertius in psalmis, lectionibus et precibus, ob eum, qui tertia die resurrexit; item dies nonus, etc.*); but these were not limited to the time of burial, which, it is well known, was not delayed in the East until the third day. An address was not a part of these solemnities, until the influence of Greek elocution reached to Christian preaching in Basil, the two Gregories and Chrysostom. The heathen origin of these funeral addresses is betrayed by their eulogistic character. This became prominent, subsequently, in the funeral sermons of Bossuet, &c., under Louis XIV. — In the middle ages *sermones de sanctis* were preached; but there were more important duties to be performed for the dead than to eulogize them. The Reformation abolished masses for the dead; it lifted up, instead, the standard of the Word of God at the grave. PALMER*.

Furseus, a missionary and abbot among the East Angles, on the British Isles, and founder of the monastery Lagny near Paris, was born in Ireland. From Ireland he went to the East Angles, and erected the Abbey of Knobbersburg, which he soon gave in charge of his brother Foillan, that he might retire into solitude with another brother, Ultan. When Penda, King of Mercia, persecuted the Christians in E. Angles, F. fled to France. He died between 650–4. He attracted attention by his visions and spasms, during which he professed to see angels. — (See BOLL. in *vita S. Fursei ad.*, 16 Jan. MABILL. *Acta SS. Ord. S. B. I.*, ad. a. 650. *Annal.* MABILL. I., *catol. gen.* p. 731. BEDA, *hist. gent. Angl. eccl.* 2, 19–23. PALMER*.

G.

Gabriel (= *man of God*), the name of an angel. In Dan. 8:16, and 9:21, he is mentioned as sent by God to Daniel to explain a vision and communicate a prophecy; in Luke 1:19, 26, as sent to Zachariah and Mary to announce the birth of John and of Christ. In each case he makes known important divine purposes relating either to Christ or the anti-Christ (Antioch. Epiph.). Besides Gabriel, *Michael* is the only angel named in the Bible (Dan. 10:13, 21; 12:1. Jude 9. Rev. 12:7). It is significant that the N. T. allusions to both confirm the character they wear in Daniel; Gabriel being always associated with the Messiah; and Michael appearing as the champion of the people and cause of God; G. as the proclaimer of God's purposes; M. as their executor. If angels are the creature instruments of the acts and revelations (miracles and prophecy) of God among men, we may regard these two named angels, as chief representatives of the business of angels. M. is the angel who executes divine acts; G. the angel of the word. M. is called an archangel (Jude 9; cf. Dan. 10:13; 12:1). It is a question whether Gabriel is also one, though not expressly called such. In Luke 1:19, he calls himself ὁ πρεσβυτέρω ἐν ὀνόματι τοῦ θεοῦ, which reminds us of the seven angels in Rev. 8:2, of whom G. was probably one, and whom Bengel, de Wette, &c., suppose are archangels. In the rabbinical and apocryphal theology, G. is always called an archangel (Tobit 12:15. The number and names of archangels are variously given (see *Angels*). — (See G. L. HAHN, Theol. d. N. T. I., 286, &c. HOFFMANN, Schriftbeweis I., 293, &c.).

AUBERLEN.*

Gad (= *fortune*), was the first son of Jacob by Zilpah (Gen. 30:9, &c.). The tribe of which he was the progenitor numbered, at the Exodus, 45,650 warriors, but at the end of the journey only 40,500. Its position in the camp was with Reuben and Simeon, on the S. of the tabernacle (Numb. 2:14; cf. 10:17, &c.). The tribe was divided into seven families (Gen. 46:16; Numb. 26:15, &c. 1 Chron. 5:11, &c., mentions four main branches with seven offshoots). To the tribe of Gad an abode was assigned on the E. side of the Jordan, in Bashan and Gilead, a part of the modern Belka (BURCKHARDT, Reisen in Syrien, II., 598, &c., 628); it had Reuben on the S. and Manasseh on the N., and stretched in a narrow strip along the Jordan to the lake of Gennesareth (Deut. 3:12, 16), and was separated from Ammon on the E. by Jabbok (Josh. 13:24, &c.). The Ammonites were defeated by the Gadites under Jephthah (Judges 11:13, &c.; BERTHEAU, Comm. z. d. B. d. Richt. 158, &c.) The powerful Ephraimites, also, had to flee before them (Judges 10:8, 17; 11:4, &c.; 12). Gad had conquered its territory, which was chiefly suited to pasturage, in company with

Reuben and the half tribe of Manasseh, hence their common interest in certain fortified cities in that district (Numb. 32:34, &c.); and hence their conjoint erection of the altar in Josh. 22. As a nomade tribe we find them going beyond their proper limits in search of pasturage; hence the indefiniteness of the boundaries of the tribes on the E. of the Jordan. The Gadites were warlike, and engaged in many conflicts. Thus they acquired a reputation for heroism (1 Chron. 12:8, &c. Cf. Gen. 49:19; Deut. 33:20, &c.). Under Saul, Gad and Reuben extended their borders toward Arabia (1 Chron. 5:18, &c. Cf. Deut. 33:20). When the Gadites were led, with Reuben and Manasseh, captives to Assyria by Phul and Tiglath-Pileser, the Ammonites retook their land (2 Kings 15:29; 1 Chron. 5:26; Jer. 49:1). In the new ideal theocracy, Ezekiel (48:27, &c.), assigns Gad a place in the extreme S. on this side of the Jordan. By the river of Gad, 2 Sam. 24:5, doubtless the Jabbok is meant (Judges 11:33; Josh. 13:25; Is. 17:2. — See RELAND, Palest.; LENCERKE, Kanaan; EWALD, Gesch. Isr.; WINER, R. W. B.). — 2) *Gad* was also the name of a prophet (1 Sam. 22:5; 2 Sam. 24:11, &c.). 3) The name of a Chaldean deity worshipped by idolatrous Israelites (Is. 65:11). Rabbinical tradition makes it the planet Jupiter (according to the astrological character of the later Chaldean religion) as the star of good fortune (cf. BUXTORF, *lex. talm.*, p. 1034. Pococke, *specim. hist. arab.*, p. 130). It seems to be identical with Bel, and to have been worshipped in Syria; hence the name Baal-Gad (Josh. 11:17; 12:7; 13:5, &c. See *Baal*).

RÜETSCHL.*

Gadara was the fortified metropolis of Peræa (Jos. Ant., 13, 13, 3; B. J., 4, 7, 3; POLYB. 5, 71, 3), and lay on a hill S. of the river Hieronax (Yarmūk), S. E. of the southern extremity of the sea of Galilee, and 60 stadia from Tiberias (Jos. vita. § 65). At this city, which the Jews had destroyed, but Pompey restored (Jos. Ant., 14, 4, 4; B. J., 1, 7, 7), and of which there are still many coins which reckon years from that restoration, the highroads from Tiberias and Scythopolis, to the interior of Peræa and to Damascus, met. The inhabitants were mostly heathen (Jos. Ant., 17, 11, 4). Augustus gave it to Herod, after whose death it was attached to the province of Syria (Jos. Ant., 15, 7, 3; B. J., 2, 6, 3). It was reckoned with Decapolis (Matt. 4:25, &c. STEPH. BYZ., s. v.; PLIN., H. N., 5, 16), and became the seat of a Christian bishop. The place was discovered by SEETZEN (see *Zach's monatl. Corresp.* XVIII., 417, &c.), and BURCKHARDT (I., 434, 539), as also the anciently celebrated adjacent sulphur springs.—In consequence of various readings it is uncertain whether it was near this city that the demoniacs (Matt. 8:28, &c.; Mark 5:1;

Luke 8:26, &c.) were cured; the preponderance of the evidence, however, is in favor of the vicinity of Gadara (see GRIESBACH, *comm. crit.* in text. græc. N. T. I., 90, &c. LIGHTFOOT, *centur. chorogr. ad Matt.*, c. 75; *decas chorogr. ad Mark*, c. 7; *hor. hebr. ad Mark*, 5:1; RE-LAND, *Palæst.*, p. 203, &c.; RITTER's *Erdk.* XV., 2; RAUMER's *Paläst.*, 240, &c. (2 Ausg.); WINER R. W. B. RÜETSCHL.*

Galatia or *Gallogræcia*, a country in Asia Minor, bounded N. by Paphlagonia, E. by Pontus and Cappadocia, S. by Phrygia, and W. by Bythynia. From the time of Augustus its metropolis was Ancyra; but Favium and Pessinus flourished through commerce. It derived its name from its inhabitants, *Γαλάται* (= *Κέλται*. *Pausan.* 1, 3, 5). For the Trocmi, Tolistoboji and Tectosages, which were Gallic or Celtic tribes, entered Asia, c. 276, B. C. (*Liv.*, 38, 16, &c.; *Flor.*, 2, 11), and obtained land, as pay for military service, from the Bythynian King Nicomedes, which they gradually extended, until Attalus, King of Pergamus, 240 B. C., confined them to the fertile banks of the Halys (*Pausan.* 1, 4, 5; 1, 8, 2). Brave, and lovers of freedom, this people were often employed by neighboring cities and kings, so that the fame of their arms reached even down to Babylonia and Egypt (*Justin.* 27, 3; 25, 2; *Polyb.* 5, 53; 2 *Macc.* 8:20). Finally the Roman Consul, Cn. Manlius Vulso, conquered them, 189 B. C. (*Livy.* 38, 12; 20, &c.; 1 *Macc.* 8:2), but were long allowed to retain their language (which *Jerome*, on Gal. 1:2, compares to that spoken around Treves), and hereditary district government under their own tetrarchs (*Strabo*, 12, 541, 567, &c.), who were subsequently called kings (*Cic. pro rege Dejot.*; *Veiej.*, 2, 84; *Plut. Anton.* c. 61). By the favor of Augustus and Antony, its last king, Amyntas, added Pisidia and several districts of Lycaonia and Pamphylia to his domains (*Dio Cass.*, 49, 32), but after his murder (26 B. C.), the entire kingdom became a Roman Province, and had a governor placed over it and Lycaonia (*Dio C.*, 53, 26). At length Emperor Valens divided it into *Gal. prima*, under a consul, and *G. sec. s. salutaris*, under a president. As the people assumed the Greek language and manners in their new home, the country acquired the name of *Gallogræcia* (see WERNSDORF, *de republ. Galatr.*, 1743; RITTER, *Gesch. d. Gallier*, II.; THIERRY, *hist. des Gaulois*, I.; DIEFENBACH, *Celtica* II.; *Pauly's Realencycl.* III., 604, &c.).

Paul himself introduced the Gospel into G. c. 52, A. D.; he visited it on his second and third missionary tour (Acts 16:6; 18:23; Gal. 1:6; 4:13, &c.), although his labors are not reported in Acts. The congregations of G. chiefly, though not exclusively composed of heathen (Gal. 4:8, &c.; 5:2; 6:12), are mentioned in 1 Cor. 16:1; 2 Tim. 4:10; 1 Peter 1:1. Disturbances caused by Judaizing teachers, called forth Paul's ep. to the Gal., after he had failed, during his second visit (Acts 18:23; Gal. 4:13, 16; 1:9), fully to allay the strife (see *Paul*). The ep. was addressed to the Churches in Gal. proper, not to those in the previously enlarged domains of Amyntas (Acts 14:6, 24; 15:38; cf. 16:6; and *Plin. H. N.* 5, 25.—(See RÜCKERT's *Mag. f.*

Exeg. u. Theol. d. N. T. I., 1, p. 98, &c.; introductions to comm. on the ep. to the Gal.; WINER, R. W. B.). RÜETSCHL.*

Galbanum is mentioned in Exodus 30:34 (cf. Wisdom 24:21), as one of the ingredients of temple incense, which the Israelites were forbidden, on pain of death, to use for any other purpose. It is the gum of a shrub which grows in Abyssinia, Arabia, and Syria, which Pliny, 12, 56, calls *Stragonitis*, and Sprengel supposes to be *Bubon Galbanum* L., but which Don thinks is the *Galb. officinale*. The gum is obtained by making incisions in the bark; it is rich, adhesive, bitter and astringent, at first white, but when older yellow with white spots; when burning it emits an offensive vapor with which serpents and bugs are driven off. Pliny says, 13, 2, that *resina* or *gummi* was mixed with ointments *ad continendum odorem in corpore*; and hence Winer thinks that Galb. was mixed with incense to retain the odor, or to increase it. But it is more probable that it was designed to symbolize the bitterness of sorrow for sin, as a necessary ingredient of all true prayer.

PRESSEL.*

Galfried of Monmouth, *Galfredus Monumontensis*, *Jeffrey ap Arthur*, born in Monmouth, was, first, archdeacon there, and 1152 became B. of St. Asaph. During the political disturbance in Wales he left his post, and was kindly received by Henry II., and entrusted with the management of the Abingdon monastery. When the Archb. of Cant., at the instance of a Synod at London, 1175, directed G. to return to his see, G. resigned the see, and soon after the abbey was taken from him. He then wrote, in the best Latin of his age, a history of the Britons, consisting of a mixture of facts and fables. Besides this he wrote: *de exilio ecclesiasticorum*; *de corpore et sanguine Dom.*; *carmina diversi generis*; *comm. in proph. Merlini*, and a biogr. of Merlinus.—(See PARKER's *script. rer. brit.*).

DR. PRESSEL.*

Galileans.—The inhabitants of Galilee (see *Palestine*), were partly heathen. This mixture seems to have had a modifying influence upon their religious views, so as to render them more susceptible of the truths proclaimed by Christ, than the more bigoted Israelites of Judea. Josephus describes them as an industrious, spirited, brave people (*Ant.*, 13, 5, 6; *B. J.*, 3, 3, 1. Though adhering firmly to Judaism, they were less prejudiced than their brethren in Judea, and persevering in whatever they embraced; hence they were readily incited to insurrections (Acts 5:37; cf. Luke 13:1, &c.) The other Jews despised the Galileans, partly because they were thought not to be Jews of pure blood, partly because they were suspected of holding erroneous doctrines, partly for their broad dialect (John 7:52; Acts 2:7; Matt. 26:73; Mark 14:70; Luke 22:59). It is probable that the contempt in which they were held, led the Saviour to regard them with compassion, and to prefer them as the foundation of his kingdom (John 2:24, 25; Matt. 11:25, &c.). VAHINGER.*

Gall, *St. (the monk)*, properly Gallon, Gallun, or Gilian, was born about 560, in Ireland, of respectable parents. He was early sent to the monastery of Bangor, to be educated by Colum-

ban. With his teacher and six other monks of Bangor he left his country in 590, in order to preach to the heathens in the far east; but they stopped among the Franks and Burgundians, and Columban commenced at Luxeuil extensive monastic operations. This was interrupted in 610 by the intrigues of Queen Brunhild; but C. found in Neustria an honorable reception and liberty to missionate. Thence he went among the Alps. G. had never left his teacher and abbot; but on this missionary tour he stepped forward more prominently, and even eclipsed the other; for Columban was ignorant of the native language, of which G. soon became so thoroughly master, that he could preach to the natives. The first aim of C. was always to found colonies of Irish monks under his direction; G., though he also could not renounce his monkish tendency nor his relation to his abbot, had chiefly in view the conversion of the people and their connection with the Rom. Church. After the bold and eloquent G. had preached, chiefly in the company of C., in Tuggen, Arbon, and Bregenz, the two separated; for C., in 613, thought it necessary to leave Franconia, and went into Lombardy. As heretofore, G. was to accompany him; but G. was sick and remained. C. did not believe that G. was detained by sickness; but supposed, no doubt correctly, that he wished on this occasion to become independent and commence for himself: he therefore used his authority as abbot to forbid him ever to read mass during C.'s life. G. remained at Arbon until he was restored to health; then he sought a suitable site for a cell, to be the germ of a future monastery. They found such a place near the brook of Steinach. Here G. erected a cross and fastened to it the relics which he had with him. He next built a chapel, which subsequently became the most esteemed sanctuary of the Allemanic race, and from which arose the large, wealthy, and princely abbey of St. Gall (see Art.). The founding took place in 614. Monks soon gathered around G., who, according to an old monkish tradition, united only 12 under his guidance, and bound them under the strictest observance of the rule of Columban. G. was himself the strictest observer of the rule. Some incidents are told of G. concerning which we can arrive at no historical certainty; nor is their credibility strengthened by the miracles connected with them. Thus, *e. g.*, G. was persecuted by a certain Count Gunzo. The latter had a daughter, Fridiburg, espoused to King Siegbert, but possessed of an evil spirit, which would yield only to G. Gunzo now anxiously sought for G. who had fled to a place of safety. G. finally, by prayer and exorcism, restored Fridiburg, who, though sent to Metz to be married to the King, chose the veil and became abbess of St. Peter's, at Metz. Siegbert confirmed to G. the unencumbered possession of his settlement in the mountains, and commanded the Duke to protect him. This story is probably no more than a fable, intended to invest the monastery with remote royal favor and franchises. For history nothing is more available of this fable, than that Siegbert III., King of Austrasia (from 638), may have favored the monastery; and that G.

may have performed the above cure. Some other feature of the story, viz.: that Ganzo had richly rewarded G., enlarged his cell, and offered to him the previously promised bishopric of Constance, which, however, G. refused on the plea that the canons allowed no foreigner to be ordained as Bishop, and that Columban had laid the above-mentioned prohibition upon him—are subject to just historical doubts. The whole account seems to have been amplified, changed or invented to account for the fact, that the highly esteemed G. had never been Bishop; and also to combat the pretensions of the bishopric of Constance to supremacy over the abbey of St. Gall. It is also narrated that G. was called to the important and honorable office of abbot of Luxeuil, the model monastery of Columbans, and most celebrated and influential one in all Franconia; but G. refused to forsake Helvetia. Soon after this, G. died in his 95th year, at Arbon, whither he had gone at the request of Willimar to preach once more. His age rests upon credible tradition; but the year of his death is variously given; 655, as given by Rettberg, seems most probable. On Oct. 16, the Church celebrates the anniversary of his death.—The life of St. G., written by Walafried Strabo (*Mabillon. Acta SS. O. S. B. sec. II., p. 227, sq.*), is only an alteration of an older work, probably written by Winithar about 766. This older work, with various prose and poetical transformations and continuations, was published by v. ARX in the *Monum. Germ.*, II., p. 5, sq. See also PERTZ, *Archiv IV.*, p. 328, sq. *Acta SS. Bolland. Oct. VII.*, p. 860, sq.; and especially RETTBERG, *observat. ad vit. S. Galli spectantes: Marb.*, 1842, 4to.; and K.-Gesch. Deutschl., II., 40–48.

ALBRECHT VOGEL. — *Reinecke.*

Gall, Nicholas, properly Hahn, but commonly called Gallus, one of the most zealous adherents of Flacianism, a violent Lutheran and actor in the controversies and struggles against the Ratisbon Interim and its adherents, a bitter enemy of Osiandrist and Majorism, was born in 1516 at Köthen. Little is known of his early education. At Wittenberg, where he finished his studies, he read philosophy under Melanchthon, and theology under Luther. He very soon attached himself closely to these leaders of the Germ. Reformation, and manifested a lively zeal in the spread of the evangelical doctrines and Church. He preached at Mansfeld, where he became also rector of a school. Subsequently he, with Jerome Nopus, was sent by Luther as preacher to Ratisbon, when, in 1542, this city had adopted the evangelical doctrines. He labored here without much note for several years. Shortly after Luther's death the Smalcald war arose, the disastrous issue of which, together with the controversies caused by the Interims of Augsburg and Leipsic, brought the Prot. Church into the greatest danger. Gall now moved to Wittenberg, where for a time he supplied the place of Cruciger at the Schlosschurch. Here the Interim placed him in conflict with Melanchthon. The Elector Maurice had caused his theologians so to modify the Augsb. Interim, that the essentials of the Luth. doctrines remained in connection with the Cath.

organization and liturgy. This modified Interim stirred up the orthodox zeal of the strict Lutherans even more than the Augsb. Interim, and the controversies which now arose were the cause of the first schism in the new school. The rage of the zealots was disgorged especially against Wittenberg, most of all against Melancthon. Flacius became their chief, with whom Gall took an active part in the controversies. In 1550 Gall removed to Magdeburg, the Luth. Zion of that age, and which afforded an asylum to the zealots, who had been elsewhere banished for their turbulence. Here he became preacher, and subsequently superintendent. After the treaty of Passau he was again called to Ratisbon. Here he superintended the religious affairs of the city with diligence and zeal, and aided in extending the Evang. Church into Steiermark and Austria. He was actively engaged at the same time in new controversies stirred up by Osiander and Major. Though Albert, Duke of Prussia, had forbidden these controversies, Gall and Flacius published violent pamphlets, a catalogue of which is given by *Salig, Vollst. Hist. d. Augsb. Conf.*, II., p. 1008. A second decree of Aug. 11, 1555, shared the same fate. In consequence of the Leipsic Interim G. Major was attacked by Amsdorf, and afterwards by Gall. The latter demanded of the churches of Magdeburg, Hamburg, Lübeck, and Lüneburg, that they should condemn the new heresy of Major. They did so in the manner desired, and G. with Flacius published their declaration. In order to lay aside their controversies, Christopher, Duke of Würtemberg, sought (1556) to effect a compromise with Frederick II., Elector Palatine. Though he failed in this, he made a second effort; and for this purpose assembled the Elector Palatine, the Landgrave of Hesse, the Counts of Simmern, Zweibrücken, Nassau, and several others, and deputies from the imperial cities of Upper Germany, at Frankford (June, 1557). Gall appeared as deputy from Ratisbon. His subsequent works were all calculated to continue the dissensions of the Church. He died, 1570, at Celler-Bade.—(See *UNSEN, Leb. d. berühmten K.-lehrer, etc.*: Lpz., 1710.—*BECKMANN, Hist. d. Fürstenth. Anhalt*, VII., ch. 3, p. 339). *NEUDECKER.—Reinecke.*

Gall, St., former Benedictine monastery.—Of all the religious institutions of Switzerland, none ever attained to such celebrity and importance as St. Gall, and but few monasteries of Europe can compare with it in the cultivation of intellectual pursuits. It arose at the beginning of the 7th cent. The legend concerning it tells us that St. Gall, the founder, having selected a site, ate his evening meal and laid down to repose. On awakening, having devoutly prayed, he saw a bear devouring the remnants of the meal. He commanded the bear to gather wood for the fire, and afterwards to return to the mountains and nevermore to injure either man or beast; all which was done. Hence it was that St. Gall was depicted with a bear carrying wood at his side, and that the monastery up to its dissolution had this device stamped upon its coin. A building, mostly of wood, was soon erected in the inhospitable valley, and kindred minds soon flocked to the cell of the pious man.

The country around was rapidly cleared; other buildings arose; and Gall, with his disciples, Mang and Theodore, applied himself untiringly to the work of Christianization. In 640 he ended his noble career, but his active and pious spirit survived him. Numerous pilgrimages were made to his grave, and thus it happened that the solitary cell of St. Gall gradually became an important institution; for the monastery held property not only at home, but also in the interior of Switzerland, in Breisgau, Suabia, Franconia, and even in Lombardy.—Among the successors of St. Gall, *Othmar* deserves special mention. He governed the monastery from 720–760, and is regarded as its first abbot. During his time the wealth of the monastery had increased so much, that a larger number of devotees could be admitted, and new buildings, partly for dwellings and partly for entertaining guests, had to be erected. Othmar had often to defend himself against the neighboring Bishop of Constance, and other powerful lords; for the latter, charging him with a heavy crime, appropriated to themselves the property of the monastery. He died in exile; but his body was brought back to St. Gall, and he himself, as martyr, was subsequently canonized. At that time already a hospital for lepers was connected with the monastery. Its origin is due to Othmar, who himself performed the most menial offices in it. His successors also found violent opponents in the Bishops of Constance, who sought to deprive them of the free election of their abbots, and of the management of their possessions. The monastery seems, indeed, to have suffered such heavy losses at this time, that its own inmates declared it the poorest in the entire Frankish empire. Its condition, however, improved again; its possessions, or equivalents, were restored; nor do these reverses seem to have cooled in the least the zeal of the brothers, for the founders of the abbey of Tegernsee obtained their first monks from St. G., and the schools, which dated from an early period, became real models at this time. In fact St. G. became more and more a seat of science, to which end a distinguished abbot, *Gozbert* (from 816–837), assisted materially. His election had been once more a free one, since Louis the Pious had renewed to St. G. a charter of Charlemagne, which authorized it to elect its own superiors.—A plan for a large Benedictine cloister, dating from the time of Gozbert, is still existing. According to it the monastery was to form a parallelogram 430 feet in length and 300 feet in width. It presents the appearance of a town regularly laid off in squares, and includes a botanical and vegetable garden. The burial ground, also laid off and shaded with fruit and ornamental trees, but without gravestones or even crosses, has the appearance of a park. From this plan, prepared perhaps by an Italian, Gozbert adopted whatever suited the locality and the pecuniary resources of St. Gall. The building commenced with was the church. It was completed in seven years, and was regarded as fine an edifice as it was costly. After this the monastery was rebuilt with almost royal munificence. The vastness and populousness of the monastery appears from the fact, that in

the bakery there was an oven in which one thousand loaves could be baked at once, and that the mill needed annually ten new millstones.—The monastic school became more and more flourishing. It was divided into a general one, and one for such as wished to become monks. Emperors and kings obtained their private secretaries from this seat of science. Gozbert was also active in gathering literary treasures. Up to his time the monastery possessed only a small store of them; but his efforts laid the foundation to that remarkable collection of books, for which even now St. G. is famous in the kingdom of science. This success was due to various causes. For, on the one hand, St. G. stood from the time of its founder, in connection with Bobbio and other Italian monasteries; on the other hand it had a powerful patron in Charles the Fat, who, with his Queen, made frequent use of the library. After having been abbot 21 years, Gozbert retired; St. Gall, however, continued to be distinguished for its intellectual activity.—*Grimald*, the third successor of Gozbert, and a very learned man, was careful of the reputation of St. Gall, and was in correspondence with many of his most distinguished contemporaries. *Solomon* (abbot from 899–919) possessed the highest administrative talents, and was at the same time abbot of 11 other monasteries and bishop of Constance. He was distinguished alike for extensive erudition, stirring eloquence, diplomatic skill, but also for ambition and love of pomp.—Under such abbots, and successors like them, the monastery could achieve great things; the more so, as among the monks there was always a considerable number, who increased the reputation of St. Gall. The Latin was the language of literature, although the style was not classical. Some of the monks understood the Greek also. The old high German was also cultivated for literary purposes; and only several years ago H. Hattemer published the most important of these old German manuscripts, treating of ascetics, philosophy, lexicography, and natural history. Nor was history neglected, though it consisted mostly in pretty barren annals, martyrologies, and lives of saints. One of the monks wrote a life of Charlemagne. *Pertz*, in Vol. I., of his *Monumenta Germaniæ historica*, has given a catalogue of all works written on this subject at St. G. *Hartmuot*, abbot from 872–883, applied himself to geography, and prepared a map of the world. In medicine *Iso* was distinguished in the 9th, and *Notker*, called *granum piperis* for his rigid monastic discipline, in the 10th century. Some abbots and monks wrote hymns, elegies, roundelays, and comedies. The *glossæ Salomonis*, a kind of encyclopedia named after abbot Salomon, present to us the entire cycle of science in those days. It gives special attention to the interpretation of the Scriptures. Though much of its matter is taken from older works, it has much that is original, and even enters upon philosophical discussions. But all the monks of St. Gall were eclipsed by the fame of *Notker* (labeo), † 1022, who was at once a divine, mathematician, astronomer, German author, poet, translator, and musician.—Under such circumstances the monastic library could only increase. At St.

Gall all kinds of works were copied; the S. Scriptures, liturgies, sermons, Church Fathers, Greek and Latin classics, grammars, sacred and profane histories, works on medicine, and even collections of law. An accurate catalogue of them still exists. The manuscripts were written on parchment prepared in the monastery, with fine, often silver or golden, ink, and in a style of beauty which excited general admiration.—The schools were still places of genuine education, and continued to be divided into a *schola interior et exterior*. In both schools the rod was used to punish inattention and idleness of the mostly noble scholars. St. Gall also furnished other institutions with teachers. Among its most distinguished teachers were *Engelbert*, *Hartmann*, *Marcell*, *Ratpert*, *Notker*, the stammerer, *Reginbert*, Bishop *Salomon*, *Sigihart*, *Tuotilo*, *Waltram*, *Wikram*, and *Iso*.—But St. Gall was no less distinguished in the chief monastic arts—music and singing, which found there enthusiastic followers. *Notker*, the stammerer, not only supplied texts to melodies found in an antiphonary brought to St. Gall in the age of Charlemagne; but also composed music, in which other monks of St. Gall imitated him. The celebrated hymns, named sequences, were perfected by him, and found a wide favor in Germany, France, and England. Two of *Notker's* sequences, *Grates nunc omnes reddamus*, and *Media vita in morte sumus*, were translated by Luther into German, and have been a source of edification in the German Prot. Church to the present day. *Tuotilo*, the friend of N., gained as performer the admiration of all his hearers. He was able to perform on all known wind and stringed instruments. Musical instruction was also given in the monastery to those people who had a talent for it. The other plastic arts were equally cultivated in St. Gall. *Tuotilo* executed sculptures and works in demi-relief on all kinds of metal. He was, besides, painter and architect. Abbot *Immo* wrought a golden plate for the high altar, and prepared purple mass vestments on which sacred scenes were embroidered, and also adorned the walls of the minster with scenes from the life of St. Gall. *Tancho* gained distinction as metal-founder, especially of bells. Art and expense were also employed in ornamenting the church books with gold, gems, and ivory. Particular dwellings were assigned to the mechanics of the monastery, by whom even shields, swords, and glass-ware were made.—During this flourishing period already, the monastery had to endure many assaults from without; one by the Hungarians in 925. With its adjacent buildings it was therefore at that time surrounded with a moat and towers. In the 11th cent. its most troubled times began; its abbots, even, often laid aside their books for the sword. *Norbert*, Lord of Stoffeln, carried on, in 1067, with *Rumold*, B. of Constance, his spiritual superior, a private war; and gained thus the unenviable reputation of the first warlike abbot. A still more violent struggle was carried on between the second successor of N., and the abbot of Reichenau, during which the monastery and the city, which had gradually sprang up around it, were twice sacked and plundered.

Amid such circumstances, St. G. necessarily

departed from its original purpose; religion and science declined, and its light, which formerly shone far around, became nearly extinct. It is true, the *ignis sacer* still glowed beneath the ashes, and it must not be forgotten that its literary treasures were preserved from ruin. — Although formerly already violations of morals and monastic discipline had occurred, these had soon been suppressed; the excesses which were practised under the later voluptuous abbots, and amid the ignorance which then prevailed, could not show themselves. Another calamity for the monastery was the elevation, in 1204, of its superiors to the rank of princes, as was done by King Philip the Hohenstaufen; for this encouraged the prevailing warlike spirit, and aided in discouraging literature. This first prince, Ulrich VI., Lord of Hohenau, became so worldly, that two years afterwards on the day of the crucifixion he led an army to the relief of a neighboring besieged castle. Another abbot declared himself to be “a monk in the monastery, but a prince at court.” Some of the later abbots could not even write, and outside of the monastery often appeared in a secular garb. Their own court was often exceedingly expensive. — For a short time the minne-song, which spread in the 13th cent., was productive of good; for the *Nibelungenlied*, *Roland*, *Titarel*, *Percival*, the *Zug nach Troja*, &c., were read in the monastery; and one of its abbots even was a minnesinger. About the middle of the 15th cent., the abbey became allied to the Swiss confederacy, and thus gained vastly in political influence. In 1468 it enlarged its territory by the purchase of the county of Toggenburg; a purchase which entailed disastrous consequences both upon the abbey and Switzerland. It was made under prince abbot *Ulrich Rösch*, who, having arisen to this dignity from a scullion, was as enterprising as he was astute. He once more raised the revenue of the impoverished abbey to 26,000 florins; and, by converting the Latin school into a gymnasium and calling professors from abroad, he endeavored to restore the ancient renown of St. G. For nearly 30 years he presided over the abbey, and directed all his energies to its welfare. He died in 1491. — In the time of his successor, *Francis Geisberger*, the Reformation took place, and found such favor among the monks, that a minority of them laid aside the monastic garb. Zurich and the city of St. Gall intended immediately after Francis' death to take measures against the abbey, but especially against its supremacy. His death, at Rorschach, March 29, 1529, was hence concealed for six days; whilst those monks who had remained faithful to their vows, most of whom had betaken themselves to Einsiedeln, assembled at Rappersweil, and elected as abbot *Kilian German*, a man of great energy, who, however, continued in office only one year. After the fatal battle of Kappel (Oct. 11, 1531), the Cath. cantons reinstated German's successor in the abbey and the government of his territories, and the city of St. G. had to indemnify the abbey. — About the middle of the 16th cent., intellectual activity once more flourished in St. G., and ab. *Diethelm Blaarer* († 1564) is often called, on account of his many services, the third founder

of the abbey. Among the abbots of the 17th cent. must be mentioned *Pius Reher* (1630–1654), who was so given to studies that he often said that he would rather see an incarnate devil in his monastery, than an ignorant monk; and *Celestin* (1687–1696), a man of great learning, who, by his work against the four articles of the Gallican Church, obtained from Innocent XII. the Cardinal's hat. Many difficulties arose to the abbey from the fact that the Ref. Church had been able to maintain its ground in the county of Toggenburg; the more so, since the inhabitants of the county, a lively, enterprising people, were warmly attached to liberty. Bad feelings sprung up on both sides. The Ref. complained of encroachments on the part of their spiritual superiors; complaints, which at the beginning of the 18th cent. led to an open war. Zurich and Bern took sides with Toggenburg; Luzern, Uri, Schwyz, Unterwalden, and Zug, with the abbey. The latter was unsuccessful, and sustained large pecuniary and literary losses; for the larger part of its library was carried off to Zurich and Bern, part of which, however, was subsequently restored. From this time the abbey declined more and more; first from financial mismanagement, and afterwards from the revolutionary tendencies of the age. It was finally abolished in consequence of a law passed by the Helvetic authorities, Sept. 17, 1798. Its last abbot was *Pancratius Verster*. Its series of learned men is closed by two of its ex-monks, *Ildephons v. Arx*, author of a history of the Canton of St. Gall; and *Franz Weidmann*, the historiographer of the abbey library.

Meyer von Knonau.—*Reinecke*.

Gallicanism. — By this term we denominate the spirit of the Gallican Church; and also, collectively, its usages, immunities, principles, and views; in themselves, and in their relations to Rome. The Gallican Church is not an antiquity. It is the Frankish Church perpetuated in its peculiar national position. The true Gallicanism is not a national church carried out to independence of Rome, nor an opposition to the papacy bordering on heresy and schism. It is that which from the beginning distinguishes the Cath. Church of France from every other. Its connexion with Irenæus proves that a Gallican ecclesiastical association existed as early as the end of the third cent.; and it claims, not that it was then out of the common order, but that it held the common position of the time, and that this position has been since maintained more purely in France than anywhere else.

It is undeniable that the form which the Gallo-Frankish Church attained under the influence of Charles the Great, and of the bishops, literati and schools of his time, is, as it were, the ideal, followed unanimously by its defenders, patrons, the princes and bishops in later times. Not that the Church had it always in mind; not that the national spirit used it always with the same energy against Rome. In the varying interests of centuries, now the crown swerved, now the episcopate. But with a powerful king, a bishop of free thought, a regular meeting of the representatives of the realm, or an able parliament, that ideal shone forth at once. Thus the grand and courageous position of Hinemar

of Rheims is accounted for. Clearer, however, because more equable and mild, is the royal defender of the ideal, Louis IX. But his very mildness and equanimity secured his greater firmness. The true Gallican spirit of Louis appears with the greatest decision from the written ordinances of the years 1229, '39, and '70. The preamble to the first defines the "*Libertés et immunités de l'Eglise gallicane*." The second restricts excommunication, and subjects the clergy, in civil matters, to the civil courts. The third is the pragmatic sanction. It secures to the crown the right and the acknowledgment of the episcopal supremacy, as the general councils of the church define it. "And this," says Bossuet, "is what we mean by *Libertés de l'Eglise gallicane*. We wish only common justice, the true basis of all good order for the church, under the administration of the head of each diocese, according to the declarations of the councils and the institutions of the fathers."

Clearer and firmer stood forth this ideal continually. It was prominent in the conflict between Boniface VIII. and Philip IV. (see Art. Boniface VIII.). The weightiest matters were discussed there. For the nation, it was a question of nationality; for Boniface, in revenge on Philip IV., had, in a public address at the ratification of the office of the Roman Emperor Albrecht, placed the nation under the German Emperor. For the King, it was the important question of royal prerogative. For the kingdom, it was the serious question of taxation; since the Annates would require large sums from beyond the Alps. For the Church, it was a matter of deep concern; for its entire position with reference to the papacy was in danger from the new relation which Boniface proposed. And scarcely could a worse time have been chosen for such an aggression, than just when men of great spirit, splendid talents, and superior knowledge, treated everything with a masterly scrutiny, put all rights into definite forms, and insisted, no less perseveringly than clearly, in the lecture room, the pulpit and the council, on the superiority of the general councils over the Roman chair. And yet, resolute as were the French Kings, the Parliaments, the Episcopate, the Universities, and the Sorbonne itself at their head, not to recede from the principles laid down at Pisa, Constance and Basle, which were nothing else than pure Gallicanism, the Roman theologians could not omit any opportunity to commend their own in contrast, and to attempt anew their introduction into France.

Their only success was the famous abolition of the pragmatic sanction in 1516 by the Lateran Synod, with the consent of Francis I., in consequence of the concordat with Leo X. assigning to the crown the nomination of bishops. (See Art. Francis I.) But the causes of this reverse are well known to have been some personal aims of the King, and his chancellor's hope of obtaining the dignity of Cardinal. But the change was, after all, of little consequence. Gallicanism, being more excited, was from that time only the more energetic. The pragmatic sanction was, sure enough, abolished; but the three councils of which it was an epitome, con-

tinued to control the opinions of the nation and the position of the clergy. To the earlier decrees of the Church were soon added those of the Council of Trent, the full adoption of which would have been the death of Gallicanism; but France acknowledged only such of them as suited her own maxims of policy, her crown prerogatives, and her Church laws and customs.

The two successive Cardinals and Prime Ministers of Louis XIII. and Louis XIV., Richelieu and Mazarin, maintained the Concordat, like their predecessor Duperron. But how little Gallicanism lost by this, appears from the six famous declarations presented to the King by the Sorbonne on the 8th of May, 1663, of the following import: 1. It is not the doctrine of the faculty, that the Pope has any power over the temporal affairs of the King. 2. It is the doctrine of the faculty that, in temporal matters, the King acknowledges God alone as supreme. 3. It is the doctrine of the faculty that the subjects of the King owe him fealty and obedience, from which they can under no pretence be released. 4. The faculty do not approve certain propositions opposed to the power of the King, and the freedom of the Gallican Church, that the Pope can depose bishops contrary to the decrees of Councils. 5. It is not the doctrine of the Church, that the Pope is superior to an ecumenical Council. 6. It is no doctrine or dogma of the faculty that the Pope is infallible, except with the concurrence of the Church.

Thenceforward only these doctrines could be taught in the high schools, and the "*Déclaration du clergé de France*," was sent by Bossuet with a letter to the Pope himself. In vain did Alexander VIII. nullify the Declaration, and in a widely circulated letter, try to teach the French clergy better. The clergy persisted, though Louis XIV. descended to a step which was considered a retraction.—We have already said that the same maxims are still the fundamental law of the French Catholic Church, as they are of the French Empire. We only add that if Gallicanism finds itself yet only a minority in opposition to Rome, it is because the early ultramontanism has disappeared entirely from the Roman court. Especially is *political* ultramontanism totally extinct. Henceforth no reasonable Pontiff will think of claiming superiority to the royal or imperial crown. The *pecuniary* system is likewise gone; the old taxes will never more be thought of. The *hierarchical* feature can never disappear. So long as Popery maintains its character, and the French Church is Catholic, so long must the supremacy of the papal chair be upheld. Hence, since the favorite expression, National Church, is correct only in a narrow sense, there is here properly no independent National Church at all. Not even of an *independent* patriarchate, has Gallicanism said anything except when under high excitement. As for *liturgical* and even *dogmatical* ultramontanism, it is complained of in many quarters, in periodicals and pamphlets, nay, even by bishops, and the old Gallicanism invoked against it; but with a concurrence and effect all the less in proportion as people are disposed to agree with Rome in doctrine and liturgy, not to fear her lawless assaults, and to hope for support and

authority from this internal unity against external, churchly, and hierarchical independence. On this account, for Gallicanism, as for ultra-montanism, the head is broken. But that the French nation, Church, clergy or worship, can ever become Italian, no one beyond the mountains hopes, and no one on this side fears. What Bossuet wrote to the Cardinal d'Estrées, is still true: "Trois points peuvent blesser les Romains; l'indépendance de la temporalité des rois; la juridiction épiscopale immédiatement de Jésus Christ; et l'autorité des conciles. Vous savez bien que sur ces trois choses on ne braise point en France." This is the genuine Gallicanism. All the rest is of no importance except in the heat of conflict. The principal works are those of *Pithou* (Pierre); and Dupuy, commentator on Pithou.

MATTER.—Y.

Gallienus (*P. Licinius*), son and successor of the Emperor Valerian, (A. D., 259–268); a man of by no means small capacity, but not suited to his time. Amidst great disorders in his empire he spent his time in ease and luxury. His government is of marked importance for the Church, from his having ordered free indulgence towards it at the very beginning. He took less interest than Valerian in preserving the established religion, published an edict allowing the Christians the free exercise of their religion, and directed that their burying-grounds and other property which had been confiscated under the previous reign should be restored to them. This edict is recorded by Eusebius VII., 3. Gallienus was murdered by his own soldiers on the 20th of March, 268. The accounts of him are so incomplete, and so much from later writers, that an accurate chronological statement of the events of his reign cannot be given.

DR. PRESSEL.—Y.

Gallium, a district which, according to Is. 10: 30, must have been situated not far from Jerusalem, northward, and on the way of the Assyrians towards the city. RÜRTSCH.—Y.

Gallion (Γαλιών), Gallio, provincial governor of Achaia, residing at Corinth, under the Emperor Claudius, A. D. 53, 54. His proper name was Marcus Annæus Novatus. As adopted child of the orator Junius Gallio, he received the name of Junius Annæus Gallio. In the case of the Apostle Paul, he gave an example of firmness and dignity, in refusing to recognise religious disputes before a secular court. Having voluntarily resigned his place in Achaia, he was put to death at the command of Nero.

VAHINGER.—Y.

Gallus, *Vibius Trebonianus*, Roman Emperor, A. D. 251–253. On his accession it appeared first as if the Christians, so cruelly persecuted by his predecessor Decius, might expect a season of repose. But a deadly plague, which, having broken out in the preceding reign, gradually spread through the whole empire, and drought and famine in many districts, enraged the populace, as usual, against the Christians. There came out an imperial requisition that all Roman subjects should sacrifice to the gods to procure deliverance. When the Christians refused obedience to this edict, the persecution began. Corbalius, who, at the peril of his life, had accepted the office of bishop in Rome, under Decius, was

first proscribed, then condemned to death. Lucius, his successor in the episcopate became soon his successor also in proscription and martyrdom. Gallus was so occupied by wars and insurrections, that he did not push the persecution into all the provinces; and by these tumults, which resulted in his assassination in the summer of 253, the Christians at length obtained universal rest and peace. DR. PRESSEL.—Y.

Gallus.—The man known by this name from the middle of the 8th cent., is properly called Gallon, Gallun, or Gilian. He was born about the year 560, in Ireland, and belonged to a respectable family. He was placed early under the tuition of Columban in the Bangor monastery. With his teacher and eleven other pupils, monks of Bangor, he left his country in 590 to labor for the conversion of the heathen in the distant East. They stopped however among the Franks and Burgundians; and Columban made an effective beginning of his missionary operations. He was interrupted in 610, and went into the region of the Alps. Gallus now became prominent, from being able to preach in the language of the people, which Columban could not do. He labored with great zeal to Christianize the people, and to lead them into the Romish Church. After long and energetic labor in company with Columban, and under his direction, he availed himself of an occasion to separate from his leader, and take his own course. In 614 he founded the monastery of St. Gall (see Art.), which grew to princely wealth and dignity, made the name of its founder illustrious in the following centuries, and did important service to religion and the Church, besides much in memorable ways for the culture of the sciences. He enjoined the strictest monastic discipline on those who placed themselves under his superintendence. Beyond what is mentioned above we have few reliable accounts concerning Gallus; not anything certain even as to the time of his death. Several things are related which are worthy of little credit, as to his working miracles, particularly the healing of his daughter who was possessed of an evil spirit; also concerning his being appointed Bishop of Constance, and the great influence of the See of Constance over the Abbey of St. Gall. There was a life of St. Gallus prepared by Walafred Strabo from an older work, written perhaps by Winithar, A. D. 766. See also Pertz, Archiv. IV., 328, &c.

ALBRECHT VOGEL.—Y.

Gamaliel, an eminent Pharisee, held equally in honor by the Jewish Synagogue and the Christian Church; by the Synagogue, as the worthy grandson of the great Hillel, and as a doctor of the law in highest repute with all the people; by the Church, as the early instructor of the Apostle Paul, and as the author of a prudent decision concerning Christianity (Acts 5: 34–39). So great was his legal eminence, that he received the appellation, "the glory of the law." The title *Rabban* (our teacher), was first conferred on him. It was committed to him to fix the yearly calendar, the reckoning of feast days, &c., and he is said to have presided over the Sanhedrin, under Tiberius, Caius, and Claudius. The 18th year after the destruction of

Jerusalem is mentioned as the year of his death. In the Talmud he is distinguished as "the elder" from his son or grandson. PRESSER.—Y.

Gangra, anciently distinguished as the capital of the Kings of Paphlagonia, and subsequently as an Episcopal See, and especially as the place where the *Council against Eustathius, B. of Sebaste* (see Art.), was held (c. 362–370). Its canons were important for Protestantism, because they denied justification by works, especially by monastic asceticisms (see WALCH, *Luthers sämmtl. Schr.*, XVI., p. 2533). These canons were twenty in number (see them in MANSI, *Sacr. Concil. nova et ampliss. collectio* T., II., 1097, &c.; 1101, &c.), in which as many ascetic rules and customs were condemned as fanatical. Among other things Eustathius and his adherents were accused of refusing to pray or to receive the sacrament in the houses of married people, and of affirming that no rich person could get to heaven. The Council condemned E. and his peculiar views. (See SCHLWIG, *Exercit. in conc. Gangrense*: Danzig, 1721. Chr. W. F. WALCH, *Entw. einer vollst. Hist. d. Ketzerien*, III.: Lpz., 1766, p. 536–577).

NEUDECKER.*

Gardens (among the Jews) are often mentioned in the Bible, for they were, as elsewhere in the East, much esteemed by the Jews. They were not only connected with the palaces of Kings (Eccles. 2:5; 2 Kings 25:4; Neh. 3:15; Esth. 1:5), but plain citizens also had them connected with houses (Suzan. 4; Luke 13:19), as is known, e. g., there were very many in Babel (Jer. 50:16; Diod. 2, 7; see the Art. *Babel*), although later none were allowed in Jerusalem (*Lightfoot, centur. chorogr.*, before the *horis ad Ec. Matth. cap. 21, et horæ ad Matth. 26:36*), but there were many without the gates, especially in the valley of Gihon (Jos. B. J., 5, 2, 2). These gardens (גִּיּוֹן and גִּיּוֹן properly enclosure) were of different kinds; partly vegetable (גִּיּוֹן הַיֵּרֵק), herb, and fruit gardens for the use of man (Deut. 11:10; Jer. 29:5; Amos 4:9; 9:14; 1 Kings 21:2), partly proper pleasure gardens or parks (Suzan. 7; Songs of Sol. 6:2), in which forest-trees and groves of cypress, laurel, pomegranate, fig, nut-trees, etc., alternated with meadows and flower-beds. Such parks, called by the non-Hebrew name גִּיּוֹן, were often very large, and served as a hunting-ground, e. g., for the Persian nobles (Xenoph. *Cyrop.*, 1, 3, 12 (14); Anab., 1, 2, 7; Hellen., 4, 1, 15; see besides, Songs of Sol. 4:13; Eccl. 2:5; Neh. 2:8). The flowers which were cultivated in them, if less various than in our modern gardens, were not small in number or variety, particularly lilies, roses, and all kinds of odoriferous shrubs, as cypress (*al-henna*, especially native in Egypt, *Hitzig*, on Songs of Sol. 1:14), nard, balsam, saffron, etc., and some exotic plants (comp. the figure, Jes. 17:8), see Songs of Sol. 4:12, sq.; 5:1; 6:2, 11. In such enclosed pleasure groves there were also baths (Suzan v. 15; comp. 2 Sam. 11:2), and generally great care was taken to have these places well irrigated, either by locating them upon running streams, or by conveying water to

and through them by artificial arrangements (Isaiah 1:30; 58:11; Jer. 31:12; Songs of Sol. 4:15; Eccl. 2:6; Deut. 24:6, etc.). Kings and the wealthy made their family vaults in gardens (2 Kings 21:18, 26; Matt. 27:60; John 19:41). The worship of idols was also especially practised in groves and gardens (Isa. 1:29; 57:5; 65:3; 66:17; hence the so frequently recurring remark: they burnt incense under every green tree, 1 Kings 14:23; 2 Kings 16:4, etc.). On the other hand, our Saviour frequently retired for prayer to a garden on the Mount of Olivet, Matt. 26:36; John 18:1. — (See besides, v. *Lengerke*, *Kanaan*, I., p. 89, sq.; *Winer*, *Real-Wört.-Buch.*; *Pauzy's Realencykl.*, III., p. 1505, sq.; and *Tenffel*, the same, V., p. 1158, sq.; *Tobler*, *Denkbl. aus Jerus.* p. 94, sq. RÜTSCHI. — *Heck*.

Gardiner, Stephen, the natural son of Lionel Woodville, B. of Salisbury (brother of the wife of Edward IV.), was born in 1483 at St. Edmund's Bury, Suffolk, and, though possessed of no very elevated character, had superior natural talents. He studied at Cambridge, and distinguished himself for his attainments in canon and civil law, and the Greek language and literature, but never excelled in theology. He became the secretary of Cardinal Wolsey, and a member of the commission sent by Henry VIII. to the Pope to negotiate a divorce from Catharine. Gardiner succeeded in having Campeggio sent to England as papal legate, to settle the matter. In 1529, Gardiner, who had returned with Campeggio, was made a member of the King's council, and as such actively labored to bring about the divorce, even forcing Oxford to decide in favor of it. Thus he gained great favor with Henry, who appointed G. as his substitute in the conference between the Pope and the King of France (1533), and then bestowed on him the See of Winchester. G. gratefully became one of the most zealous advocates of the royal supremacy in eccl. affairs, and most active promoters of the schism. Personally, however, he firmly adhered to the Romish C., and even took part in a scheme for retaining old customs and traditions, and resisting innovations. At the same time he continued, by flattery and protestations of fidelity, to hold the favor of Henry. He lay under the reproach of secretly favoring Rome, for he strove to thwart Cromwell's schemes, promoted his downfall, prevented the union of England with the German Protestants, and had his spies out who reported to him secret Protestants, that he might procure their condemnation. In all this he managed to screen himself by making it a rule never to appear as the originator of an eccl. measure, and to do nothing without the King's approval or command. But towards the close of Henry's reign his influence declined. His hostility to Cranmer estranged the King; his participation with London in the overthrow of Cranmer, caused him to fall in the public estimation; his obvious effort to ruin the Queen, offended her husband. The King even erased his name from the list of the commission who were to manage the government during his successor's minority. To the remonstrance of the Rom. Catholics Henry replied: "Gardiner would involve you all in

trouble, for he has a restless revengeful spirit."—After Henry's death he zealously resisted the reformatory measures, and was cast into prison for some weeks. His continued opposition led to his deposition and second imprisonment (1551). Under Mary, when Romish Catholicism was restored, he was released, and again became prominent. He regained his See, and was made Chancellor of the realm. Now he took his turn at persecution. But he counselled the Queen to exercise eccl. supremacy for a time, in order more effectually to promote the restoration. Finding that persecution was making him unpopular, he made Bonner his executioner. He had the gratification of surviving the martyrdom of Latimer and Ridley. He died in Oct., 1555.—(See WEBER, *Gesch. d. akathol. Kirchen u. Sekten in Grossbritt.* 1. Th., 1845; 2. Th., 1853.—*Biogr. Britt.*) HERZOG.*

Garments and Jewels of the Hebrews.—The collective name for garments in Hebrew is,

ser melon. partis pro toto, מִלְּבָשִׁים pl. of מִלְּבָשִׁים = the upper garment, covering, used sometimes for a cover at night (Ex. 22 : 27; Amos 2 : 8, &c.); מִלְּבָשִׁים also designates a garment (Levit. 19 : 8; Ps. 109 : 18, &c.); and in poetry, and of more splendid apparel מִלְּבָשִׁים (Job 24 : 7, 10, &c.; Esther 6 : 9, &c.).

I. In Genesis we learn that in the earliest times, both animal and vegetable materials were used for garments; the former prior to the latter. Wool and goatshair were woven into garments in the age of the patriarchs; flax is first named in the time of Moses (Gen. 31 : 19; 38 : 12, &c.; Exod. 9 : 31). According to 1 Chron. 4 : 21, a family of the tribe of Judah devoted itself to the cultivation of flax (ROSELL, *mon. civ.*, I., 333, q.; WILKINSON, III., 137, &c.), especially to the making of linen. How early cotton was introduced is not ascertained. מִלְּבָשִׁים and מִלְּבָשִׁים

hence *byssus*), stand promiscuously for linen and cotton; etymologically they designate *whiteness* (1 Chron. 15 : 27, &c.; Esth. 1 : 6; 8 : 15; 1. Prov. 31 : 22). Their traffic with the Egyptians (see *Egypt*), renders it likely that the patriarchs indulged variety, not only in jewels, but in garments (Gen. 24 : 22, 30, 53; 37 : 3). Joseph's coat may have excelled not only in

colors, but in its cut (מִלְּבָשִׁים פְּסָתָהּ=garment of the ends, reaching to the ends of the arms and legs; extended garments). The Egyptian priests wore fine white linen (or cotton, CHAMOLL, *Figéac, Egypte anc.*, V., 192, &c.) garments (Gen. 41 : 42); they were forbidden to wear wool, or any dress made of animal material (HEROD., II., 37. On the linen worn by Jewish priests see next Art.). In all ages and among all people white garments, on account of their brilliancy and cleanliness, were held in high esteem, and considered emblems of light, fortune, purity, and holiness (cf. Jos. B. J., II., 1). Variegated, purple and red, purple and blue, and scarlet raiment were common among the Sidonians, Phoenicians, Canaanites, Assyrians, Babylonians, and Persians, and were the usual decoration of kings, nobles, and warriors (Judges

5 : 30; 8 : 26; Esther 8 : 15, &c., &c.; cf. ARRIAN, *var. hist.*, 6, 6). Garments ornamented with gold threads are named in Ex. 39 : 3; Ps. 45 : 10, 14, &c.; cf. VING., *Aen.* I., 646, &c.; XI., 72). Concerning the red and blue purple, and the yellow colors of the Phoenicians (Ezek. 27 : 16, 24; VING., *Georg.* III., 307; TIB., II., 3, 58; PLIN., XXI., 22), and Lydians (see HARTMANN, *Hebräer* I., 367, &c.; HEEREN, *Ueber d. Kunst d. Buntweberei* Id. I., 2, 88, &c.; BOCHART, *hieroz.*, III., 665, &c.; BRAUN, *vest. sacr. hebr.*, § 171–217). Silk is first mentioned in Rev. 18 : 12; some think even in Ezek. 16 : 10, 13. PLINY, *H. N.*, 6, 20, says that half silk garments were brought from E. Asia to Greece, and that there the silk threads were drawn out and woven into entirely silk cloth (SCHRÖDER, *vest. mul.*, 320, &c.). But it is doubtful whether this applies to the time of Ezekiel.—The Mosaic law ordered: 1) that garments of linen and wool mixed (מִלְּבָשִׁים מִלְּבָשִׁים, from the Coptic [so

GESENIUS and others] *schont-nes* = *byssus fimbriatus*, or from the Semit. (so BOCH., *hieroz.*, I., 486). MEIER, derives it from מִלְּבָשִׁים = to mix) should not be worn (Levit. 19 : 19, &c.; cf. Jos. Ant., IV., 8, 20); not because priests wore such mixed apparel (Jos. Ant., IV., 8, 11), nor as a moral symbol to show that God desired undivided love, and that Israel should not mingle with the heathen, but because all confusion of kinds, all departures from simplicity were evil. 2) Priests should wear linen garments. The colored threads in them were hardly of wool (Jos. Ant., IV., 8, 11), but of flax or cotton (see Ezek. 44 : 17).

II. The form of the garments. 1) Those worn by both sexes differed but little; those worn by women were somewhat longer and more variegated. The prohibition, Deut. 22 : 5, was probably directed against an Egyptian and Cyprian custom, though it is in harmony with the general prohibition of improper mixtures (comp. MAIMON., *more neboch.*, 3, 27; MICHAELIS, *Mos. Recht*, IV., 349, &c.; PEZOLD, *de promiscua vest.*, &c.: Lips., 1702, in *Ugol. thes.*, XXIX.; CREUZER, *Symb.* II., 34; MOVERS, *Phön.*, I., 455, &c.).—2) Generally garments are made full in the East, on account of the heat, and this was the style among ancient Hebrews, for 3) in this, as in other respects, custom has undergone but slight changes in the Orient. As we have no reliable Hebrew relics, the best evidence of their mode of dress is obtained from that existing among modern Bedouins. Intercourse with other nations gradually led to ornamental and luxurious additions to the original simplicity of style, especially in the times of the later kings (Is. 3 : 16, &c.; Jer. 4 : 30, &c.). Hence frequent reproofs of extravagance in dress (Is. 50 : 9; 51 : 6, 8, &c.). This was the state of things in the time of Christ and the apostles (1 Tim. 2 : 9; 1 Pet. 3 : 3; James 5 : 2).

III. The various articles of apparel used. The full dress of 1) a man included: a) *nether garment* מִלְּבָשִׁים, LXX. *χιτών*, by transposition *tunica*. It was a sort of shirt made of woollen, linen, or cotton cloth, woven whole, and striped, and worn next to the skin, to which it fitted more closely than the upper garments. At first

it was made without arms, but afterwards wider or narrower arms were added; it usually reached to the knees, later, when worn by more notable persons, to the ankles. As the aprons of our first parents were succeeded by garments made of the skins of animals, so this took the place of that simplest of all garbs called, by the Arabs, *ihram*, and which is still used by them in Hedjas (*Niebuhr*, *Beschr. v. Ar.*, 364; comp. *T.* 15, R. I., 268; *T.* 54, II., 132). As the figures on the ruins of Persepolis attest, the hosen of Dan. 3 : 21, 27, were a Perso-Mede costume (*Strabo*, XV., 734; *Herod.*, V., 49; *Xen.*, *Cyr.* VIII., 3, 13).—A girdle fastened the under-dress around the loins. He who only wore the under-dress was said to be γυμνός, John 21 : 7 (see also 1 Sam. 19 : 24; comp. 2 Sam. 6 : 20; Isa. 20 : 2; 58 : 7; Job 22 : 6; 24 : 7, 10). Fine linen shirts were regarded as luxuries by the Philistines (Judges 14 : 12), and afterwards by the Hebrews (Isa. 3 : 23; Prov. 31 : 24). Saal-

schütz supposes יִרְדָּ—which does not correspond to our shirt, as Schröder tries to show—to denote a fine linen, or woollen garment used as a mantle, which a person threw around him at night, Mark 14 : 51, or for enwrapping corpses, Matt. 27 : 59; Mark 16 : 4, 6; Luke 13 : 53. This gown, without arms, and with an opening at the top for the head, at first worn only by nobles (Job 1 : 20; 2 : 12), by Kings (1 Sam. 15 : 27; 18 : 4; 24 : 5, 12; 1 Chron. 15 : 27; Ezek. 26 : 16), and by priests, became in the time of Jesus a common article of dress, though even then regarded as a luxury (Matt. 10 : 10; Luke 3 : 11); it was the usual costume of Persians and Babylonians, and later borrowed by the Greeks and Romans. Concerning the Ephod, see Art. 6) The upper-dress, a wide cloak with folds, variant in material, color, and figure, originally a mere square piece of cloth about 6 ells long and 3 wide (comp. *Shaw*, 196; *Niebuhr* B. 62, R. I., 126, T. 29; *Chardin*, II., p. 100, T. 64). Its Hebrew name may be found in Gen. 37 : 29; 39 : 12; Gen. 9 : 23; 37, 33; 44 : 13; Jos. 7 : 6; 9 : 5; Exod. 22 : 8; Micha 2 : 8; Deut. 22 : 12. Of large size, it might be wrapped round the body several times (1 Kings 11 : 29; Ps. 104, 2), its two opposite ends hanging over the arms towards the body, and the garment with its two other extremities from the back, or, the cloak being put on the left shoulder, the hindmost end was drawn over the back, and the foremost over the breast and the abdomen; both being tied, or fastened by clasps. The head also might be covered with it, 2 Sam. 15 : 30; 1 Kings 19 : 13; Esth. 6 : 12. As it served for a cover by night, it was not lawful to retain it over night for debt, Deut. 22 : 17, 25; 24 : 12; Exod. 22 : 27; comp. Ruth 3 : 9; Ezek. 16 : 8; 18 : 7, 16; Job 22 : 6; 24 : 7, 10; Amos 2 : 8. The fold on the breast served for a pouch or bag in which were carried grain, bread, meat, Exod. 12 : 34; Ruth 3 : 15; 2 Kings 4 : 39; Hagg. 2 : 12; Luke 6 : 38. When not worn, it was used for a vessel, sack (Prov. 30 : 4; Judges 8 : 25; 1 Sam. 21 : 9), saddle (Matt. 21 : 7), curtain, tent-cover, sail, hammock (2 Kings 9 : 13; Matt. 21 : 8). Laid

24 : 18; Mark 10 : 50; John 13 : 4, 12; Acts 7 : 58; 22 : 23). A particular kind of mantle is denoted by מִטְנֶה, Micah 2 : 8 (see 1 Kings 19 : 13, 19; Zach. 13 : 4; Gen. 25 : 25), originally not so much an ornamental as a plain dress made of skins of animals, but, in the course of time, a highly-wrought fur-cloak worn by Assyrian kings and nobles (Jonah 3 : 6), and Babylonians (Josh. 6 : 21), and in our day by the Orientals (*Arvieux*, III., 240; *Russell*, *Nat.-G. von Aleppo* I., 127; *Niebuhr*, R. I., 158; II., 235, 317; *Rauhwolf*, R., 209). The figures on the ruins of Persepolis are clothed with sheep-skin fur, the wool on the outside (*Chardin*, *voy.* II., 144 t. 58; comp. III., 245). For Chald. name of mantle see Dan. 3 : 21, and in Esther 8 : 15, for that of a king of the Medes. In the Apoc. and New Test. are mentioned garments used by the Greeks and Romans. The χλαμύς, Greek military cloak, 2 Mucc. 12 : 35, fastened to the breast or right side, and reaching to the knees, the χλαμύς πορφυρή, Matt. 27 : 28, crimson-colored, worn by Roman emperors, generals and officers, and the παλῶνς, 2 Tim. 4 : 13, a travelling cloak, with a cap for the head. *Lamprid.*, *Alex.* Lev. 27. *Sueton.* in *Cal.* 52, *Cic. p. Mil. C.* 20, *Juv.*, 5, 78. *Senec.*, ep. 87. *Hor.*, ep. 1, 11, 18. *Stosch de pallio Pauli* : Lugd., 1709.

2) For women a) an under-dress, the כְּתוֹנֶת, Song of Solomon 5 : 3, over which was worn by the more noble "a garment of divers colors," 2 Sam. 13 : 18. b) As upper-garment, besides the common מִטְנֶה, Deut. 21 : 13; 22 : 5, different kinds of mantillas, or styles of that just mentioned, as, e. g., in Isaiah 3 : 22, veils (Isa. 3 : 23) without which ventured in public only slaves, Isa. 47 : 2, common women, professed singers (*Niebuhr*, R. I., 184; II., 162), and prostitutes. (Not in earlier times, Gen. 38 : 15). According to Oriental custom (Koran 33, 56), in the presence of strangers, the wife also wore a veil in her own house, which was only removed before her nearest relatives with whom marriage was forbidden. The מַעֲלָה, Isa. 3 : 19, = a veil from the head by the temples, leaving room for the eyes; מַעֲלָה, Song of Sol. 4 : 1, 3; 6 : 6; Isa. 47 : 2, = the veil covering breast, neck, and chin, and מַעֲלָה (Gen. 24 : 65; 38 : 14, 19) = a veil covering which, fastened behind the head, fell over the neck and might be thrown around the whole body. As among the ancient Hebrews women enjoyed greater freedom, the custom of the Orientals of our day cannot be taken as a criterion of the styles of veils. Rebecca travelled unveiled, and Tamar veiled herself, not from modesty, but from opposition to the previous practice. The pants of the Eastern women of our day (*Niebuhr* R. I., 304, 336, T. 59, 64) were unknown to Hebrew antiquity, otherwise they would have been mentioned in Isa. 3 : 16. The מַעֲלָה in Isa. 3 : 23 = vestes pellucidae, which concealed, as it were, the whole body, according to *Chald. Vulg. Gesen.* and A. Spiegel.

IV. To a full dress, in a wider sense, be-

onged 1) *covering for the head*, the turban used by the Orientals of our day as well as by the ancient Hebrews, for men and women, made of different stuff and in various styles, sometimes a mere cloth wrapped round the head, sometimes of very costly and splendidly wrought material, some made high and pointed, others round; called, when highly ornamented, *כִּסְיָאֵל* (Isa. 3 : 20; 61 : 3, 10; Ezek. 4 : 17, 23). The hooded turbans were tied round the head by means of a clasp fastened at the back part of the head (Exod. 29 : 9; Lev. 1 : 13; Jon. 2 : 6; Ezek. 16 : 10). The present Orientals wind them about with fine muslin (Niebuhr, R. I., T. 14-23). Kings wore the *liadem*, and warriors the *קִבֵּעַ כֹּבֵעַ*. It

was only in-doors that the turban was taken off. 2) *Gloves*, an article of luxury, unknown to Hebrew antiquity. The Talmud (*Mischn. Chel.*, 6, 6; 24, 15; 26, 3) mentions *כִּסְיָאֵל*, worn by laborers, and the Targ. on Ruth

1 : 7, of *נִרְתָּק* taken off by one who yielded the rights of a brother-in-law. 3) *Covering for the feet*. The *נַעֲלִים*, Am. 2 : 6; 8 : 6, *נַעֲלוֹת* only in Josh. 9 : 5 — like the Greek,

πδηματα, sandalia —, were leather soles fastened to the foot by two straps (Gen. 14 : 23; Isa. 5 : 27; Mark 1 : 7; Luke 3 : 16), to be seen on figures of Persepolis (Niebuhr, R. II., 132, T. 23, 6; B. 63, T. 2; Harmar, Beob. III., 304), and still used in the East. The nobles had slaves to put them on and off (Ezek. 24 : 17; Deut. 25 : 9; Isa. 20 : 2; Ruth 4 : 7; Exod. 3 : 5; Josh. 5 : 15), and to carry them (Matt. 23 : 11; Mark 1 : 7; John 1 : 27; Acts 13 : 25). Scholars thought it an honor to do the same offices for their teachers (comp. Talm. kiddusch. 2, 2; Ch. W. Volland, *de sandaligerulis Hebr.* : Viteb., 1712). On entering a room, and holy places, they were put off, on leaving, put on, Exod. 12 : 11; Acts 12 : 8; Exod. 3 : 5; Josh. 5 : 15. To go bare-footed was a sign of mourning, 2 Sam. 15 : 30; Ezek. 24 : 17, 23; Isa. 60 : 2. The women in particular, frequently ornamented them, Song of Sol. 7 : 1; Judith 10 : 4; 16 : 9. The *שַׁחֲמַיִם* were, according to

Jesen. and others, of seal-leather, still used for shoes by the Arabs. The Phoenicians (Virg. *Aen.*, I., 336), Babylonians, and Persians (Xen. *Cyr.* 8, 1, 41; Strabo, XV., 734; XVI., 746), after the Greeks and Romans, wore proper shoes with upper leather, also half boots, according to Persian inscrip. (Niebuhr, R. II., 30; T. 22; Rev. Porter, trav. I., T. 39). Shoemakers are mentioned in the Talmud (compare *Bynæi, de calceis vet. Hebr. in Ugolini thes.*, XXIX. Rottböll, *de vest. et calceis Isr.* : Iafn., 1755). 4) *Ornaments*, particularly of women. *Bracelets* worn not only by these, but by men (2 Sam. 1 : 10; Numb. 31 : 50), as marks of distinction, probably on the left arm, Sir. 21 : 23; of various styles, size (often from the wrist to the elbow), cost, and construction (gold, silver, an ivory ring fastened by a buckle of pearls and jewels, or gold chains, Isa. 3 : 19; Schröder, l. c., p. 56), perhaps, as is the case now with

the Bedouin tribes, a simple ring of precious metal without a clasp, and so arranged that the ends turned towards each other might be drawn apart. They were also used as amulets (comp. Bartholin, *de armillis vet.* : Amst., 1626. Niebuhr, R. I., 164). So, too, the *ear-rings*, as attested by Jonathan on Gen. 35 : 4; Maimonides, *idol.* 7, 10; Augustin, *ep.* 73; made (Gen. 35 : 4; Exod. 32 : 2; Judges 8 : 24) of horn or metal, smaller or larger, sometimes one, sometimes several (Mod. Travel. count from 15-20. Arvieux, Nachr. III., 250. Wellsted, R. I., 224. Russegger, II., 2, 180. Niebuhr, R., 164, B. 65), generally worn by women and children, but seldom by men. Strings of pearls were hung from them, Judges 8 : 26; Isa. 3 : 19 (Schröder, l. c., p. 45). Nose-rings, Gen. 24 : 22, 47; Isa. 3 : 21; Ezek. 16 : 12; Prov. 11 : 22, of precious metal or ivory (perhaps, also, worn by men, Job 42 : 11; Ex. 35 : 22; comp. Russegger, II., 2, 180), so constructed as to inclose the mouth. The Talmud allowed women, on the Sabbath, only ear, not nose rings (Arvieux, Nachr. III., 252; Harmar, III., 310; Marili, R., 216; Niebuhr, B., 65; Hartmann, Hebr., II., 166, 292; Schröder, contrary, 187). *Finger-rings* were worn by Egyptians and Persians (Gen. 41 : 42; Esth. 3 : 10; 8 : 2) as seals (see 1 Mac. 6 : 15; Curtius 10, 5, 4; Jos. *Ant.*, 20, 2, 3), and used by the Hebrews as marks of honor, (Jer. 22 : 24; Hag. 2 : 24; comp. Luke 15 : 23), worn by women (Isa. 3 : 21; M. Schabb. 6, 1, 3; Sola, 1, 6), known in the Patriarchal times (Chardin, IV., 23; V., 454; Robinson, I., 58; G. Longus, *de annul. signat.* : Mail., 1615). *Collars* were worn by the Israelites, Exod. 35 : 22, and Midianites, Numb. 31 : 50. For names and styles, see Gen. 41 : 42; Ezek. 16 : 11; Prov. 1 : 9; Song of Sol. 4 : 9; also by camels, Judges 8 : 26; Prov. 25 : 12; Song of Sol. 7 : 2; Hosea 2 : 15. In Prov. 25 : 12, a neck-chain of purest gold. The *סְרָסְרָיִם* were

neck-laces of precious stones, pearls, corals, Song of Sol. 1 : 10, with various ornaments pendant, Isa. 3 : 18; LXX. *μνηστροι, lunulae Tertull. cult. fem.*, 2, 10 (also, on the necks of camels, Judges 8 : 21, 26); also, scent-boxes, *olfactoriola*, Isa. 3 : 20, amulets in form of small serpents. *סְרָסְרָיִם* were small suns, Isa. 3 : 18, worn as medallions. Among the Persians and Medes (Xen. *Cyr.*, 1, 3, 2, 2, 4, 6; *Anab.*, 1, 5, 8; Curt., 3, 3, 13; Strabo, 4, 197) nobles and warriors wore necklaces. See Dan. 5 : 7; 16 : 29; comp. Xen. *Anab.*, 1, 2, 27; *Cyr.*, 8, 5, 18. Finally, in the East, both in ancient and modern times, *ornaments about the feet* were peculiar to women, Isa. 3 : 18; Judges 10 : 3, *πεποφύρα*, so arranged that, in walking, they made a tinkling sound, the object of which was either to warn off or to attract men, or to accustom the wearer to a graceful gait, or to protect the hymen (see Talm. *tr. Sabb. f.*, 63, 2. MICHAEL. *mos.* R. II., 156. C. G. Blumberg, *de סְרָסְרָיִם* : Lips., 1683, in *Ugol. thes.*, XXIX. Schröder, *de vest. mul.*, p. 1-17, 116-130). — The bride decorated herself with these articles of dress (Isa. 61 : 10; Ps. 45 : 10; Esth. 2 : 12); also, prostitutes (Judges 10 : 4; Bar. 6 : 8; comp. Rev. 17 : 4). In mourning all ornaments were laid aside, Exod.

23 : 4; 2 Sam. 1 : 24; Isa. 3 : 17, 24; Ezech. 24 : 17. For further information see *Hartmann's Hebräerin am Putztisch*.

V. Clothes were made by the women, 1 Sam. 2 : 19; Prov. 31 : 22; Acts 9 : 39, and cleansed by the lye of vegetable or mineral alkali. Tailors first mentioned in Talmud. For purification of infected garments (see *Leprosy*).

VI. *Peculiar customs*.—1) To denote intense sorrow, indignation, fright, &c., the upper-dress was torn, Gen. 37 : 29; Lev. 10 : 6; 13 : 45; 21 : 10; Gen. 37 : 29; Judges 11 : 35; 2 Sam. 1 : 2, 11; 3 : 31; 13 : 31; 1 Kings 21 : 27; 2 Kings 5 : 8, &c.; Matt. 26 : 65; Acts 14 : 14—but not by the high-priest, Lev. 21 : 10. The rabb. law (*Mischna, moed katon*, 3, 7; *Schabb.*, 13, 3) contains minute regulations, see *Othon.*, *Lex. rabb.*, p. 360: *laceratio vestium fieri potest excepto pallio extero et interula in omnibus reliquis vestis partibus, etiamsi decem essent, sed vix ultra palmæ longitudinem lacerant. Laceratio, quæ propter parentes fit, nunquam resuitur, quæ autem propter alios, post trigesimum diem. Lepers* were required to tear them, Lev. 13 : 45. *J. G.*

Heidenus, de scissione vestium Ebr. ac gentib. usit.: Jen., 1663. *Wichmannshausen, de lacer. vest. ap. Hebr.*: Viteb., 1716. 2) Deep mourning was denoted also by the wearing of *caaxos* (Gen. 37 : 34; 2 Sam. 3 : 31; 1 King 20 : 31, &c.; Matt. 11 : 21; Rev. 6 : 12), shape of a sack, without arms, of coarse stuff and black goat hair (Isa. 50 : 3), a rope round the loins (Isa. 3 : 24; 2 Sam. 3 : 31), worn by both sexes (Joel 1 : 8; 2 Macc. 3 : 15). Widows wore it (Gen. 38 : 14, 19), also prophets (Isa. 20 : 2), and rough, hairy cloaks (1 Kings 19 : 13, 19, &c.; Matt. 3 : 4; 7 : 15; Hebrews 11 : 37) in testimony of the sins of the people. Criminals appeared before court in filthy garbs, Zach. 3 : 3; comp. Isa. 64 : 6. Among the Greeks (*Eurip. Alcest.*, 440; *Crest.*, 458; *Helen.*, 1088) and Romans (*Ovid Met.*, 6, 568; *Tac. ann.*, III., 2) *atræ vestes* were customary.

3) White garments were worn on festival days (*J. Schmidt, de usu vest. alb. in Ugol. thes.* XXIX.); and on celebrated occasions, marriages (Matt. 22 : 11), social-banquets, &c. (*Olearius, pers. R.-B.*, IV., 280; *Tavernier, I.*, 207, 272)—*rich-apparel* (Ezek. 27 : 24), *holiday-attire* (Isa. 3 : 22), *changes of raiment* as is still done (2 Kings 5 : 6, 22; Judges 14 : 12, 19; Gen. 45 : 22; *Odyss.*, VIII., 249; XIV., 514). Kings and nobles had a wardrobe of splendid dresses (2 Kings 10 : 22) for presents (Gen. 45 : 22, &c.; Matt. 22 : 11; Luke 15 : 22); clothes were also taken as spoils of war (Judges 5 : 30; 2 Kings 7 : 8), and divided by the victors as gifts (2 Sam. 1 : 24). Such were the garments eaten by the moths, Matt. 6 : 19; James 5 : 2. Bokhteri, a celebrated Arab. poet, had received so many presents of clothing that he left behind him, on his death, 100 whole garments, 200 shirts, and 500 turbans. Frequent changes, and washing, are peculiar to the Orientals (*Niebuhr, R. I.*, 182; *Burkhardt, Arab.*, 272; *Harmer, II.*, 112; III., 447; *Rosenm., Morgenl. III.*, 49)—a custom rendered necessary among the Israelites by the Levitical uncleannesses (Gen. 35 : 2; Exod. 19 : 10, 14, &c.; particularly Zach. 3 : 4). 4) The Orientals were fond of saturating their clothes with sweet smelling oils, incense, and wood

(comp. Gen. 27 : 15, 27; Ps. 45 : 9; comp. *Plato Symp.*, I., 6, 1; *Odyss.*, V., 264; XXI., 52. 5) *Homage* was evinced by the spreading of the upper-garment on the way (2 Kings 9 : 13; Matt. 21 : 8; comp. *Talm. Chetub.*, 66, 2). 6) *Religion* impressed its marks on clothes. The *תפילין* (*zaphrentes*, Matt. 9 : 20; 14 : 36; 23 : 5), were purple-blue fringes by the size of which the Pharisees symbolized the amount of their piety. See Matt. 9 : 20; comp. 14 : 36; Luke 8 : 44 (*Hiller, de Hebr. vestib. fimbriatis*: Tüb., 1701)¹. The Persians also used them (*Niebuhr, R. II.*, 130, 150, T. 22, 30). 7) *The shaking of raiment* in one's presence denoted intense aversion, Acts 18 : 6. 8) Changing of clothes with another was a token of great friendship, 1 Sam. 18 : 4. 9) Persons elected to office were *invested* with the official dress, Gen. 41 : 42; Esth. 8 : 15; Dan. 5 : 29. 10) The cutting of one's garments, denoted great *disgrace*, 1 Chron. 20 : 4. With the Romans those condemned to death were stripped, the clothes (*spolia suntuum*) falling to the soldiers who performed the execution, Matt. 27 : 35.

Monographies: SCHRÖDER, *Comm. philos. crit. de vest. mulier. hebr. ad Jes.*, III., 16-24: Lugd. Batav., 1745. A. T. HARTMANN, *Hebräerin am Putztische*: Amst., 1809, 3 vols. UGOLINO, *thesaur. t. XXIX.*, *Archæol.*, by Jahn, *häusl. Alterth.*, II. p. 61-166. DE WETTE, p. 157-164. SAALSCHÜTZ, I., 3-32. GSENIUS, *Comm. zu Jesaj.*, III., 16, and *thesaurus*. WINER, *Realwörterbuch unter Kleidung, Mantel, Schleier, &c.*

LEYRER. — *Ermentrout*.

Garments, holy, among the Hebrews.—Chief passages, Exod. 28 : 1-53; 39 : 1-31. These will afford us the right point of view from which to contemplate them. They were intended to be a symbolical exhibition of the holiness of Jehovah and his followers, and of his sanctifying influence over the chosen people through the medium of the priests.

I. *The official dress of the ordinary priests* consisted of four pieces, a coat, a girdle, a bonnet, and breeches for the loins (Exod. 28 : 40-43); four being a *holy* number, and a symbol of Jehovah's government of the world, must be exhibited by the priests, his mediators. Not one of them could be omitted: *cautum est tam de מַחֲזִיקֵי כֹהֲנִים, sive Sacerdote, sive pontifice, cui deficerent vestes præscriptæ, quam de כֹּהֵן בְּרֵרִים eo, cui plures induerentur, quam lex præciperet. Quisquis sive inopia sive abundantia ita peccaret, ejus ministerium illegitimum fuisse ac profanari censebant* (*Selden, de success. in pontif.*, 7, *Ugol. thes.* XII. p. 360. *Abraham ben Dav., de vest. sac.* C. 1, *Ugol.*, XIII., 8, sq. *Braun, vest. sac. hebr.*, § 30). Hence the oft repeated phrase: "that he die not" (Exod. 28 : 35, 43). The material had to be linen—not wool (comp. Ezek. 44 : 17) which generated sweat, which is a sort of excrement, and so unfit for a priest who was the representative

¹ The Jews of our day wear these fringes on their wide prayer-mantles. JAHN, *häusl. Alterth.*, II., 96. BODENSCHATZ, *Kirehl. Verfas. der hentig. Juden*, IV., 9-14. He who observes the law of Zizith is to be regarded as having kept the entire law, whilst he who neglects or despises it, falls under the sentence pronounced in Job 38 : 13; comp. *Orach. chajim*, 25, § 6.

th of moral and Levitical purity (comp. *Ewald*, *Interth.*, p. 317). As *שָׂרָא*, *רָאָה* is made to be synonymous, in Ezek. 44 : 17, with *שָׂרָא* which is always translated in LXX. by *λινον* (Exod. 28 : 42 ; 39 : 28 ; Lev. 6 : 3 ; 16 : 4, 23), means, beyond question, linen. As the Egyptian linen was noted for its fineness and dazzling whiteness, we must conclude that to it refers the Hebrew word in Ezek. 9 : 2 ; Dan. 10 : 5. and *βυσσος*, Luke 16 : 19, and *βυσσινον*, Lev. 19 : 8, or *λινον καθαρον λαμπρον*, Rev. 15 : 6. It symbolized that the servants of Him who is clothed in light (Ps. 104 : 2 ; 1 Tim. 6 : 16) are covered with a reflection of it—light being a type of holiness (Job 18 : 5, &c.), of justice (Ps. 7 : 6, &c.), of purity (1 John 1 : 5, 7), as darkness is of malice and wickedness (Isa. 5 : 20 ; Rom. 3 : 12, &c.). *Bähr*, in his *Symb. des mos. Kultus*, II., 87, has conclusively pointed out the fallacy of the theory which supposes that the Israelites borrowed the style of these garments from Egyptian priests (for an account of whose dress see *Spencer, de leg. Hebr. rit.* 1, III., 5 ; *Braun*, § 10, 85 ; *Celsii hierobol.*, II., 290 ; comp. *Hengstenberg*, *Moses*, p. 149). An examination of these four garments will show that they all possessed a symbolical meaning. 1) The coat, as an emblem of righteousness, Isa. 61 : 10 ; 2 : 21 ; Ps. 132 : 9, 16 ; Job 29 : 14. Its white color denoted holiness ; salvation and righteousness were partly typified by the fact of its covering as much as possible the nakedness of the body (reaching down to the feet, Jos. *Ant.*, 3, 2, *κοδηγγς*), and partly by the fact that, like Christ's garments, John 19 : 23, it was without seam, woven from the top throughout. Whiteness is a symbol of perfection and spiritual soundness. Besides, there were quilted, so to speak, in the coat squares or cubes (v. 16, 20 ; comp. Ps. 45 : 14). The square woven pictures which looked like precious stones, were, perhaps, intended to remind one of the golden fillings of the stones in the breastplate (v. 16, 20), and, as these precious stones were, so to speak, collectors of light, either to exhibit this as an intensified light-dress (*Lichtkleid*), or, by this shadow of high-priestly splendor, to show that in each priest had to appear some reflection of the glory supposed to dwell in perfection in the high-priest. As precious stones seem to be the glorification, as it were, of the darker nature of earth into that of light, so Israel, as represented by its holy priests, seems to have been elevated above its natural state into that of light and holiness. 2) The girdle (for its spiritual meaning, see Isa. 22 : 21 ; 1 Macc. 10 : 89 ; 11 : 58 ; 14 : 44) only to be worn during the discharge of official duties, 32 ells in length and three fingers in breadth, after having been wrapped round the body several times reached down to the feet (Jos. *Ant.*, III., 7, 2 ; *Chemara*, *mass.* Rom. 7 ; *Maimon.*, *de vas. sacr.*, 8) ; it differed from the other articles of dress in having woven into it pictures of purple-blue, purple-red, and crimson ; sometimes ornamented with gold and precious stones. The four holy colors indicated the priests to be servants of the Lord in the sanctuary. According to *Bähr* (I., 363 ; II., 21, 16, 79) the flowers denoted them as mediators

of life. The reason why the girdle was not fastened around the loins, but under the breast, is stated in Ezek. 44 : 18, "they shall not gird themselves in sweating places" (*Braun*, § 319, tr. *massech sevach*, II, gloss. *Jarch.*). 3) The head-dress ; in shape, according to *Bähr*, II., 64, like the inverted cup of a flower, or a helmet. In favor of the latter supposition, the symbolical meaning of the word (Isa. 59 : 17 ; Eph. 6 : 17 ; 1 Thess. 5 : 8), of the former, the name of the high-priest's diadem, *קִטְנִי* (see Ps. 132 : 18 ; 92 : 14). The priest was never allowed to appear without this sign of life and salvation (Lev. 10 : 6 ; comp. 21 : 10). As to its form, no reliable information. The Rabbinical accounts (*Maimon.*, *de vas. sanct.*, 8 ; *Abrah. ben Dav.*, *de vest. sac.*, 2) agree in stating that the tiara, both of the priest and high-priest, unrolled, was 16 ells in length, that of the former being lower than that of the latter, and fastened like a hood (Exod. 29 : 9 ; Lev. 8 : 13). (See *Van de Wall*, *de pileis s. tiaris sacerdot. et pontif. Hebr.* : Amst., 1714 ; comp. *die Monogr. von Töpfer, de tiaris minor. sacerdot. in Ugol.* XII., 854). 4) The breeches (Exod. 28 : 42 ; 39 : 28 ; Lev. 16 : 4 ; Ezek. 44 : 18) reaching from the upper part of the loins to the thighs, and covering the privities both back and front (Exod. 28 : 42 ; Lev. 16 : 4), fastened around the body with bands (*Braun*, § 310–335). Not to be compared with the Persian hose, Dan. 3 : 21 (see previous Art.), but with the *linus* of the Roman *Feciali* (*Serv. ad Virg. Aen.* XII., 120 : *linus est vestis, qua ab umbilico usque ad pedes teguntur pudibunda poparum* ; comp. *Martial.*, *ep.*, III., 24). According to Exod. 28 : 42, the chief design of this garment was to hide the privities which, so far as infected with sin and death, had to be concealed with special care, in presence of the Holy One, by the priests who were the bearers of life and salvation. Hence, as a garb of which a person had need to feel ashamed, it was not named with the other parts of the priest's dress as *לְכָבִיד וּלְתַפְאֶרֶת*, but separately from them after the anointing and consecration, and was styled *לְכִסוֹת בְּשֵׂד עֲרוֹה*.—When officially engaged, the feet of the priests were uncovered. To go barefooted, *ἀνυποδησια*, though not commanded, was customary at holy places (Exod. 3 : 5 ; Isa. 5 : 15) ; comp. *Carpzov.*, *appar. crit.*, p. 769, *discalceatio rel. in loco sacro*. *Walch*, *de relig. ἀνυποδησια* : *Vet. Jen.*, 1706. *Bartenora*, *ad cod. Schekal.*, 5, 1. *Maimon.* *Chele hammikd.*, 7, 14. *Braun*, § 33. *Rosenmüller*, *Morgenl.*, I., 193, 261. From India to Rome, among Pythagoreans and Mohammedans, we meet with *ἀνυποδησια religiosa* ; the Egyptian priests, however, wore papyrus-sandals, *Herod.*, II., 37 ; *Schmidt*, *de sacerdot. Aeg.*, p. 35 ; contrary, *Sil Ital.*, 3, 28. — As no one was allowed to ascend the mountain of the temple with a staff, shoes, a money-girdle, or with dusty feet (*Mischna*, *Berach.*, 9, 5), the priests frequently suffered from *doloribus colicis*. For their benefit was stationed at the temple a *medicus viscerum* (*M. Schekal*, 5, 1, also *Bartenora*, and *Kall*, *de morb. sac.*, V. Ji. : *Hafn.*, 1745). — From

*cum tegens, ducit cordulas sub brachiis, et circumducens per dorsum ante pectus reducit et ligat. Tum ALBA inducitur, caput submittens; deinde manicam dextram brachio dextro, et sinistram sinistro imponens Albam ipsam corpori adaptat, elevat ante et a lateribus, hinc inde, et Cingulo per ministrum a tergo sibi porrecto se cingit. Minister elevat Albam supra singulum circumcirca, ut honeste dependeat, et legat vestes; ac ejus fimbrias diligenter aptat, ut ad latitudinem digiti, vel circiter supra terram æqualiter fluat. Sacerdos accipit Manipulum, osculatur crucem in medio, et imponit brachio sinistro: deinde ambabus manibus accipiens Stolam simili modo deosculatur, et imponit medium ejus collo: ac transversando eam ante pectus in modum crucis, ducit partem se sinistro humero pendentem ad dextram; et partem a dextro humero pendentem ad sinistram; sic que ad sinistram partem stolæ extremitatibus cinguli hinc inde ipsi cingulo conjungit. rubr., 5. Postremo sacerdos accipit Planetam (comp. Gavanti, thesaurus sacrorum rituum, ed. Merati, T. I., p. 135, seq.; Probat, Verwaltung der hochheiligen Eucharistie: Tüb., 1853).—At the consecration of a bishop the paramenta pontificalia consist of sandalia, amictus, alba, cingulum, cruz pectoralis, stola, tunicella, dalmatica, chirothecæ, planeta, mitra auri phrigiata, annulus pontificalis, baculus pastoralis, manipulus, gremiale. A few words about these not mentioned above. Sandalia, as ornaments for the feet since the 8th cent. (Gonz. Tellez., c. 7, de autoritate et usu pallii, Nr. 2; Binterim, die vorzüglich. Denkwürdigk. der christkathol. Kirche, I., 2, 359–361); Cruz pectoralis, time of its use not definitely known (see Thomassin, l. c., P. I., lib. II., cap. LVIII., § IV. V.); Chirothecæ, manicæ, gloves, the origin of them from the Apostles, according to Romish authors (Gonz. T., c. 1, X. I., 15. Nr. 34; comp. Du Fresne, s. h. v.); Mitra, cidaris, bicornis, infula, birretum, originally plain, since the 11th cent. with two horns, mystical sense of which: “utriusque testamenti scientiam significat: nam duo cornua duo sunt testamenta” (Gonz. T., l. c., Nr. 37; Thomassin, l. c., § XI. XII.; A. M. Calcagni, de mitra episcoporum: Venetiis, 1829); Annulus, symbol of dominion, or of the spiritual wedlock between the bishop and the Church; baculus pastoralis, sign of a spiritual shepherd (Gonz. T., l. c., Nr. 39; Thomassin, l. c., § II.; J. A. Schmid, de annulo pastoralis: Helmstadt., 1705, 4to.); Bishop's staff—being curved (*incurvatura*)—called a crook in distinction from *pedum rectum* of the Pope (comp. J. H. Bachmer, jus eccl. Protest. lib. III., tit. XX., § XXIV.); the Gremiale is a silken cloth spread over the lap of the bishop, which, on rising up, the deacon removes. Instead of the common *superpellicium*, the bishop wears the *rochetum* (*Mélanges théologiques . . . par des ecclésiastiques Belges. V. Serie: Liège, 1852, p. 152*). The Ritual books contain everything touching the changes of vestments and their colors. At first white was most common. Innocent III. (*de sacrificio Missæ, lib. I., cap. 65*) distinguished five colors, the white in memory of confessors and virgins; red, of Apostles and martyrs; green, on Sunday and festivals; black, for fasts, celebration of the dead; violet on Sunday Læ-*

taro, and the festival of the Innocents (comp. Gavanti, thesaurus, P. I., tit. 18, de coloribus paramentorum, together with Merati, observationes, P. I., p. 162, also Portal, des couleurs symboliques dans l'antiquité, le moyen âge et les temps modernes: Paris, 1857. For consecration of vestments, see Benediction. — The garments of the Greek clergy are, in all essential points, like those of the Roman; the *καθμῆς* corresponding with the alba, the *ζώνη* with the cingulum, &c.

Though the Reformation necessarily introduced a great change in the vestments of the clergy, the Evang. Church undertook it neither harmoniously nor contemporaneously. In the Formula Missæ, 1523, Luther says: “*Vestes præterivimus. Sed de his ut de aliis ritibus sentimus. Permittamus illis uti libere, modo pompa et luxus absit. Neque enim magis places si in vestibus benedixeris. Nec minus places, si sine vestibus benedixeris. Neque enim vestes etiam nos Deo commendant. Sed nec eas consecrari velim aut benedici, velut sacrum aliquod futura sint præ aliis vestibus, nisi generali illa benedictione, qua per verbum et orationem omnis bona Creatura Dei sanctificari docetur, alioqui mere superstitio et impietas est, per abominationis pontificis introducta, sicut et alia*” (Richter, Kirchenordnungen, I., 5). In the German Mass and divine worship of 1526, concerning Sunday service, Luther says: “We will leave remain the mass-vestment, altar and flowers, till they are all used, or change what seemeth fit, but if any wish it otherwise, let it be so.” While the Brandenburg-Nürnberg Church-reg. of 1533 allowed the ancient order, the Wittenberg-C. reg. of 1536 abolished it. To avoid scandal, in Switzerland it was retained (see Berne, Ref. of 1528; comp. Basle, Church-ritual of 1529, l. c., 106, 127). With the attempt to reunite the Evang. Church and Romish Church during the Interim of 1548, the cope was here and there again worn. Through the exertions of John a Lasco, it was determined for the Netherlands, 1550, that the altar . . . vestments, to which something mysterious was attributed, should be removed, and that matters appertaining to this subject should be generally classed among *adiapocæ*. The Reformed Synod of Berg, 1595, in reply to the question, Whether a preacher might officiate in a little white coat, answered that it could not be tolerated as a necessity, but as an indifferent thing (Jacobson, Gesch. des K.-Rechts von Rheinland-Westph. Urkundenbuch, p. 90). While the Lutheran Church retained some vestments (Richter, l. c., II, 138, 139; C.-Ord. of Waldeck, 1556, &c.) the Reformed Church frequently rejected them all, though not in accordance with the views of Calvin and other esteemed Ref. theol. (comp. Binghami, opera ed. Grischovius, Tom. XI., p. 495). For the black cope was frequently substituted the white casula. White collars (*collaria depressa*) became quite common (comp. Caspar Calvoes, rituale ecclesiasticum, P. II., p. 515: *de vestibus sacerdotum ecclesiæ evangelicæ*; also, J. H. Bachmer, jus eccl. Prot. lib. III., tit. XLI., § XLI.). From Spörl's Past. Theol. (Nürnberg, 1714), p. 17, may be inferred that during the 17th and 18th cent., the evang. clergy frequently changed the style. Thus, the Cuburg

Church-ritual of 1626, p. 351, forbade the use of frivolous, cut vestments," and insisted on *decorum clericale*. The head-covering also changed into a three-cornered hat, cap, &c. See second volume of Sebaldus Nothanker's life and thoughts (Berlin and Stettin, 1775), in which is exhibited the gradual change of the Genevese mantle, that was at last shortened to a simple tripe fastened on the back. In order to establish uniformity, it was ordered by the decrees of March 20, 1811, Oct. 14, 1816, that all should wear the gown, the collar, and cap, and that bishops and superintendents should be distinguished from the other clergy only by a black silk gown, over which the bishops were to have a smooth gold cross fastened to a black silk band round the neck, and hanging to the middle of the breast. Thus, in Prussia. Similar in the Electorate of Hesse, Nassau, Grand-Dukedom Saxony-Weimar (decree of July 3, 1854), in Luth. Church of Russia, 1832. In Sweden, besides the collar and the long mantle, on solemn occasions, in place of the latter, is used a white alb with wide arms, of fine linen, and over it a chasuble of black velvet, without arms, on the front of which a sun set in silver, having in its centre Jehovah in Hebrew letters, and behind, in silver, an image of Christ, or of the cross. Besides these, bishops and archbishops wore a golden cross, and, on solemn occasions, a bishop's mantle, on the back of which a collar of red silk hanging down to the hips, and thick woven with gold (*T. W. v. Schubert*, Schweden's K.-Verf. Bd. I., p. 373). By the Synod of 1854, was first recommended the use of the Toga in the Ref. Church of the Netherlands.

On the gradual change of clerical vestments and insignia, a work, the beginning of which has just appeared, promises satisfactory results: *Fr. Bock*, *Gesch. der liturgischen Gewänder des Mittelalt. oder Entsteh. und Entwick. d. kirchl. Ornamente und Paramente in Rücksicht auf Stoff, Gewebe, Farbe, Zeichnung, &c., und durch 100 Abbildungen in Farbendruck erläutert, mit einem Vorwort von Bischof Dr. Ger. Müller: Bonn., 2 Bde. (Erste Lieferung, 1856).*

H. F. JACOBSEN. — *Ermentrout*.

Gath, גַּת (wine-press), also גַּת־שֶׁן, גַּת־שֶׁן and גַּת־שֶׁן (Jos.), גַּת (LXX.), גַּת־שֶׁן (Euseb.), the name of four different districts in Palestine.

1.) The most celebrated is the Philistian city Gath (without affix), one of the five chief cities Josh. 13:3; 1 Sam. 6:17), and the home of the giant Goliath (1 Sam. 17:4). The captured ark of the covenant was brought hither from Ashdod, and then to Ekron (1 Sam. 5:8-10). This city was taken by the Jews under Samuel

1 Sam. 7:14, when the expression גַּת־שֶׁן

points to an earlier capture and recapture unknown to us), is again, in the time of Saul, the residence of a Philistian King, Achish (1 Sam. 1:10-15; 27:1-7), was captured later by David (1 Chron. 18:1), and remained in possession of Israel under Solomon (1 Kings 2:39 is without doubt to be understood as speaking of Achish as being a vassal of Solomon), under Rehoboam (2 Chron. 11:8), and the succeeding Kings of Judah, until under Joash, when it was captured

by Hazael (2 Kings 12:17), was recaptured by Joash King of Israel (2 Kings 13:25), fell again into the hands of the Philistines for a short time, from whom it was captured by Uzziah, and added to the kingdom of Judah, who made it an open place by tearing down its walls (2 Chron. 26:6), and thus destroyed its importance. The situation of this Gath was, according to 1 Sam. 5:8-10, in the neighborhood of Ashdod and Ekron; but it does by no means follow from this passage, that it is situated between these two towns, because it was not the geographical relations, but the consultation of the Philistian princes, which decided, whither the ark should be taken from Ashdod; this hasty inference, which even Ewald draws (*Ier. Gesch. II., 427*), also led Raumer and Stülpnagel astray in their map, and led Robinson to seek, although in vain, for traces of this city in this region. If attention is only given to the statements made by Jerome concerning the location of this city, there need be no doubt about it. He says (on Micha 1): "*Geth una est de quinque urbibus Palaestinae, vicina Judaeae confinio, et de Eleutheropoli euntibus Gazam hunc usque vicus vel maximus*," and (on Jer. 25): "*Geth vicina atque confinis est Azotho*;" accordingly Gath was situated 1) near to the confines of Judea; but also 2) very near to Ashdod; therefore between these two, but so, that it was also in the neighborhood of Ekron, with which agrees 3), that it did not lay far from Eleutheropolis; not far from the road from thence to Gaza. The truth therefore is, that we have to seek for the Philistian city Gath where Raumer and Stülpnagel have placed Gath Rimmon; and that Reiland is right, when he (p. 785) expresses the conjecture that the Philistian city and Gath Rimmon are identical, viz., that Gath Rimmon, of which Eusebius says in his *Onomast.*, it is "*hunc villa praegrandis in duodecimo milliario Diopolis pergentibus ab ea Eleutheropolin*." The affix of Eusebius (Rimmon), is so much the more unimportant, inasmuch as we are certainly allowed to think of the Philistian city Gath as a fortified "eminence" (גַּת־שֶׁן); and this expres-

sion is so frequently used concerning such points in Palestine, without it having been added, on this account, from the earliest times, to the name Gath.

2.) A second Gath, which has also the affix גַּת־שֶׁן in the Old Test., was, according to Joshua 19:45, a frontier town of the tribe of Dan, and, according to Joshua 21:24, at the same time a town of the Levites. The location of the second Gath in *Onomast.*, suits this Gath, which Eusebius calls גַּת־שֶׁן, and places between Antipatrus and Iamnia; as also the account of the Dominican Brochard, who (in the 13th cent.), describes it as a *parvum casale*, four French miles from Jaffa; and the account of Arvieux, who (at the end of the 17th cent.), speaks of a Gath lying on the right of the road from Jaffa to Ramla; the place designated Gath on the map of Berghaus, identical with Githaim on the map of Raumer and Stülpnagel, inhabited by the Benjaminites after the exile, according to Neh. 11:3.

3.) A third Gath, also with the affix גַּת already in the O. T., was, according to Joshua 21 : 25, a Levitical town of the tribe of Manasseh (but not in East Manasseh, as Raumer (in his Palestine, p. 190), affirms against the order of Levitical towns there enumerated). Because the LXX. in Josh. 21 : 25, reads Βαζαῖν instead of Gath Rimmon, and a Gath Rimmon of the Danites is already mentioned in v. 24, Winer (bibl. R. W. B., p. 394), and Welte (Kirchenlex. IV., 312), regard the Gath Rimmon of v. 25 as an erratum; but they are by no means justified in this, but rather to suppose that the LXX. already arbitrarily introduced Βαζαῖν to impose the supposed erratum; because (to conclude according to the comparison with the other Manassean Levitical town, Thanach), this Gath Rimmon was to be sought somewhere in this district.

4.) A fourth Gath, with the affix Hephher (גַּת חֶפְרָה or גַּת חֶפְרָה), is not difficult to locate. It was, according to Joshua 19 : 13, a frontier town of the tribe of Zebulun; according to 2 Kings 14 : 25 the birth-place of the prophet Jonah, and was situated, according to the account of Jerome (*Proëmium in Jonam*), 2 m. p. from Sepphoris towards Tiberias. The grave of Jonah is shown here in a mosque.

PRESSSEL.—Beck.

Gaudentius, Bishop of Brixia, i. e., Brescia, towards the end of the 4th century. No information concerning his native country, his birth-place and his other relations of life exists. He was made Bishop of Brescia, after the death of Philastrius, by the affection of the people, after he had, in the first place, declined this honor from modesty. Although he entered this office while a youth (about 387), he discharged all the duties of his high calling with faithfulness and prudence, and showed himself worthy of the friendship of an Ambrosius. In 405 he was most zealously engaged in the cause of the banished Chrysostome, as we see from a letter (No. 184) written by the latter to him. He must still have been living about 410, because about this time Rufinus appears to have made the translation of the Recognitiones of Clemens, which he dedicated to Bishop Gaudentius. The year of his death cannot be certainly fixed; Labbi and Ughilli say 427. His remains rest in the Church of St. John the Evangelist, in Brescia. His name is registered in the Roman Cath. Martyrology on the 25th of Oct. Ten festival-sermons (*Paschalis decem sermones*) bear his name, to which he added four others on the Gospels (called *tractatus* by him), and a fifth on the martyrdom of the Maccabees. To these must be added similar addresses, among which is one on the life and labors of his predecessor, Philastrius. A treatise: *Rhythmus de Philastrio* or *liber de singularitate clericorum*, has been erroneously ascribed to him—it belongs to a later time. — Another Gaudentius, a martyr, is regarded by Roman antiquarians as the architect of the Coliseum.—Comp. *Veterum Brixiae Episcoporum, S. Philastrii et s. Gaudentii opera*, by GALEARDI; Bähr, *Christlich-römische Theologie*, p. 164; and Ersch and Gruber, *Art. Gaudentius*. DR. PRESSSEL.—Beck.

Gaza, גַּזָּא, one of the oldest towns of Palestine, Gen. 10 : 19. It was first inhabited by the Avims, אֲוִיִּם, Deut. 2 : 23; Josh. 13 : 3. The etymology of the name גַּזָּא is Shemitic, and is either the feminine of גַּז, the strong, as most expositors suppose, or, according to Hitzig (*Urgesch. der Philistäer*, 5 : 3–5), the feminine of גַּז, goat (*contra* see Stark, Gaza, p. 46–48). At the conquest of Canaan by the Israelites, it is said, Josh. 10 : 41, that Joshua “smote all their kings from Kadesh-barnes even unto Gaza; and 11 : 22, “there was none of the Anakims left in the land of the children of Israel: only in Gaza, in Gath, and in Ashdod, there remained.” From this it may be concluded, that these towns were not conquered by Joshua, but remained in the hands of the original inhabitants. When, on the other hand, Josh. 15 : 46, 47, Ashdod, Ekron, and Gaza, with their towns and villages, unto the river of Egypt and the great sea, are spoken of as belonging to the tribe of Judah, this refers only to the ideal possession, and not to the real possession of them; and when it is said, Judges 1 : 18, that Judah took Gaza, Askelon, and Ekron, with the coasts thereof, this is to be regarded as an interpolation, because it contradicts the following verse, where it is said that Judah drove out the inhabitants of the mountains, but could not drive out the inhabitants of the valleys (comp. Stark, *l. c.* p. 129). About this period of the Israelitic conquest of the promised land, occurred probably the occupation of the coast-regions by the Philistines (see the Art.), and from this time Gaza becomes prominent as one of the five chief towns of the same. The province of Gaza seems also to have suffered from the destructive expeditions of the Midianites in the time of Gideon, Judges 6 : 4. In Gaza Samson performed one of his mighty deeds, Judges 16 : 1–3, and hither he was brought bound, after the betrayal of Delilah, and met with his death in the temple of Dagon, Judges 16 : 21–31. David, it is true, broke the supremacy of the Philistines over Israel, and brought them into a certain relation of dependence, 2 Sam. 8 : 1, Liv. 47 : 8; he even conquered Gath, 1 Chron. 18 : 1; but they never were subjugated, and Gaza, with the three other chief towns, remained independent. A similar relation seems to have continued to exist under Solomon, 1 Kings 5 : 1, 4; 1 Chron. 9 : 26. After the division of the kingdom, the Philistines became again perfectly independent, and perhaps the old hostilities between them and Israel broke out afresh, at least the prophets repeatedly predict the destruction of Gaza: Amos 1 : 6, 7; Zeph. 2 : 4; Zach. 9 : 5; Jer. 25 : 20; 47, eq. A subjugation of the Philistines and Gaza by Hezekiah is historically reported, 2 Kings 18 : 8; Jos. Ant., V., 2, 4. In the time of Jeremiah, Gaza was conquered by a Pharaoh (Jer. 47 : 2), who is, according to the general opinion, Pharaoh Necho, with which the notice in Herodotus, II., 159, that Necho, after the battle of Magdolos, conquered the great Syrian town Cadytis, agrees, if Cadytis is identical with Gaza, which may be accepted as true, according to the inver-

tigations of *Hitzig* (*De Cadyti urbe Herodotea dissert.*: Götting., 1829) and *Stark* (Gaza, p. 218 sq.). However, this conquest was not of long continuance. The overthrow of Necho at Carkemisch soon followed, and with it the loss of all the conquests of the Pharaohs in Asia (2 Kings 24: 7); Jer. 25: 20 refers to the conquest of Gaza, Askalon, Ekron and Ashdod by Nebuchadnezzar. After the destruction of Babylon, Gaza belonged to the Persian kingdom until Alexander the Great, after a siege of two months, at the end of Nov. 322 A. C., conquered and destroyed it (see *Droysen*, *Leben Alexanders*, p. 322; *Stark*, Gaza, p. 237-244). After the death of Alexander, at the first division of the kingdom under Perdiccas, Gaza, with all Syria, fell to Laomedon; but Ptolemy soon took it from him, and placed a garrison in it. From this time Gaza belonged alternately to the Ptolemies and Seleucids (Stark, p. 349-406), until it became the permanent possession of the Syrian kings by the siege and conquest of Antiochus III., A. C. 200. During the contests of the period of the Maccabees, Gaza was besieged and wasted by Jonathan; and upon the conclusion of a treaty of peace, the sons of the chiefs (ἀρχοντες) were taken to Jerusalem as hostages, 1 Macc. 11: 60 sq.; Jos. Ant., XIII., 5, 5. That the siege of Gaza by Simon Maccabee, mentioned 1 Macc. 13: 43, stands, through a false reading, for that of Gazara, Stark, p. 494 sq. has incontrovertibly proven. Later, Alexander Jannæus besieged Gaza for a year, conquered, burned, and totally destroyed it, Jos. Ant., XIII., 15, 3; B. J., I., 4, 2. The town remained a waste (ἐρημος) until it was founded anew by the proconsul Gabinus, A. C. 58, Jos. Ant., XIV., 1, 3, after it had received, four years before, already, from Pompey the privilege of a free (ἐλευθερία) town, Jos. Ant., XIV., 4, 4; B. J., I., 7, 7; wherefore the Gazians later dated an era from his time on their coin (Stark, p. 514). This new town (ἡ νέα Γάζα) was situated a little south of the ruins of the old (παλαιά Γάζα). The expression Acts 8: 26, αὐτὴ ἐστὶν ἐρημος, also refers to this ἐρημος Γάζα, as Stark, p. 510 sq., has shown; whilst others, as Robinson, Palestine, I., p. 747, and v. Raumer, Beiträge zur bibl. Geogr. p. 78 sq.; Palestine, latest edition, p. 73-6; Winer, Realwörterb., I., p. 395, refer it to the way (ὁδός). At the outbreak of the great Jewish war after the massacre at Cæsarea, Gaza was attacked by the Jews and burned, Jos. B. J., II., 18, 1, 2; but that this was no total destruction, appears even from this, that on the march of Titus from Egypt against Jerusalem, Gaza is called the fifth station, Jos. B. J., IV., 1, 5. Under the Roman emperors the towns of Palestine, especially Gaza, became more and more prominent as depôts for the Indian and East-Arabian trade, chiefly by the favor of Harian, A. D. 129, who established there a slave market, connected with a regular festival (πανηγυρίς Ἀδριανῆς), Stark, p. 550, sq., so that in the 3d cent. Gaza is mentioned among the egregiæ civitates of Palestine, by Ammianus and Marcellinus, XIV., 8, and is called by Jerome Onom. s. v. Gaza) usque hodie insignis civitas, and by Antonius Martyr (Itin., c. 33), at the end of the 6th cent., civitas splendida, deliciosa.

Later tradition (*Chron. Pasch.*, II., p. 129) reports the establishment of a congregation; that Philemon, of whom Paul speaks, was the first B. of Gaza. First, with historical certainty, a B. of Gaza, Silvanus († 285 A. D.), is mentioned during the persecution by Diocletian (*Euseb., Hist. Eccl.*, VIII., 22, 25, and such an one appears also at the Council of Nice. See *Reland.* Palestine. A few years afterwards, a bishopric was founded at the harbor of Gaza by Constantine (*Sozom. Hist. Eccl.*, V., 3), which continued independent of the one at Gaza. This harbor is first mentioned by *Strabo*, XVI., p. 759; according to whom it lay 7 stadia, according to Arrian 20 stadia, from Gaza; the name of which, *Majamus* (Μαίωμα), was changed by Constantine to Constantia, after his son (comp. *Ritter, Erdkunde*, XVI., 1, p. 60): since Julian it lost its political independence again, see *Ritter, l. c.*, p. 69. In the neighborhood of Gaza Hilarion founded the first hermitage, and from here monkery and the founding of cloisters spread over the whole of Palestine (*Hieron. vit. Hilarion, Ep.* 56; *Sozom. Hist. Eccl.*, III., 13). But it was also just at Gaza where heathenism maintained itself with the greatest tenacity, and under Julian the inhabitants of Gaza were very zealous in persecuting the Christians. Christianity first gained a complete victory under the Emperor Arcadius, when the Empress Eudoxia, A. D. 401, authorized Bishop Porphyry to destroy the Mararion, the temple of Maraas, the chief divinity of Gaza, and to build in its place a splendid Christian church at her expense. The town remained Christian until (A. D. 634) it was conquered by the Mohammedans, under 'Amr ben el-Ass; and it soon attained to celebrity among them by the tradition that the great-grandfather of Mohammed, Haschem ben 'Abd Monâf, traded and was buried there, see *d'Herbelot, Bibl. Orient.*, under the word Gazza, and the Arabian geographers. In 672 the town was shaken by an earthquake. During the many wars of the Crusades, it seems to have suffered greatly. In 1152 the Crusaders built here a fortress, which was given as fief to the Knight-Templars, who defended it with courage against their enemies (*Wilken, Gesch. d. Kreuzzüge*, III., 2, p. 10). But in 1170 the town and fortress were burnt down by Saladin (*Ibn el Atbir Chron.*, Vol. XI., ed. *Thornberg*, p. 240; *Wilken, l. c.*, p. 133); later, the crusaders were twice defeated near Gaza, in 1239 and 1244 (*Wilken*, VI., p. 580 sq.; 641 sq.). From this time the town is of no more importance in history. It again began to flourish in the middle of the 17th cent., when it became the chief city of Palestine and residence of an Ottoman Pasha, whose rule extended over 160 districts. When Robinson visited it in 1838, it was the residence of a governor or sheik. The present town is situated about 3 miles from the sea, 31° 27' 20" N. L., and 38° 25' 56" E. L. from Paris, upon a round elevation, which is the centre of the town, although only the southern half of the elevation is covered with houses. All traces of the ancient walls and fortifications have disappeared, according to Robinson, though Kinnear (Cairo, Petra and Damascus in 1839: London, 1841, p. 209) believes that they can be traced. The pre-

sent population is differently estimated; Robinson says about 15,000, with which Dr. Barth agrees (in *Ritter*, p. 50). The inhabitants live partly by trade, which is conditioned by the position of Gaza as a place of transit for the caravans between Syria, Palestine, Arabia Petra and Egypt, and partly by manufactures, especially cotton goods and soaps, partly by horticulture and agriculture.

Comp. *RELAND*, *Paläst.*, p. 787-800. *ROSEN-MÜLLER*, *Bibl. Alterthumsk.*, II., 1, p. 384-390. *Histoire des Sultans Mamelouks de l'Égypte écrite en Arabe par Takî-Eddin-Ahmed-Makrizî, traduite en français, etc., par QATREMER*: Paris, 1837, Tom. I., Append., p. 228-239. *ROBINSON*, *Palestine*, II., p. 634-648. *RITTER*, *Erdkunde*, XVI., 1., p. 45-64. Concerning the ancient history until the conquest by the Mohammedans, consult *STARK*, *Forschungen zur Gesch. u. Alterthumsk. des hellenischen Orients*. Gaza u. die philistäische Küste, eine Monographie: Jena, 1852, 8. A fine view of Gaza is found in *DAVID ROBERT'S Vues et Monuments de la Sainte Terre: Bruxelles*, 1845, fol. *Livr.* VIII., no. 45.

ARNOLD—Beck.

Gazelle, גַּזֵּל, *gazelle*, is an animal whose genus falls between the deer and the goat, of which there are several kinds. The Gazelle of Syria and Arabia (*Antilope dorcas*) is 2½ feet high, and about 16 inches long, has a brown-red back and white belly, black horns, which it lays back on its shoulders when running, ears 6 inches long and tail about 8 inches, on each knee a small tuft of hair, and beautiful, fiery, black eyes. It can leap from 2 to 3 ells, and walks very fast, whence it is the figure of the agreeably agile, 2 Sam. 2: 18; 1 Chron. 12: 8, of the fleet, Prov. 6: 5, and of the timid, Isaiah 13: 14. It is the image of feminine grace and loveliness to orientals, Song Sol. 2: 7, 9, 17; 3: 5; 4: 5, wherefore its name was sometimes given to females, 2 Kings 12: 1; 2 Chron. 24: 1; Acts 9: 36. This animal belongs to the clean animals, and its savory meat appeared regularly upon the table of Solomon, 1 Kings 4: 23.

VAHINGER—Beck.

Geba or Gaba, גֶּבָא (height), LXX Γαβᾶ, Josephus Γαβᾶ, a town of the tribe of Benjamin (Josh. 18: 24), given to the Levites; David smote the Philistines from Geba to Gazer (2 Sam. 5: 25); the army of the Assyrians passed through Geba (Isaiah 10: 29); King Aza built Geba and Mizpah with the stones and timber of Ramah (1 Kings 15: 22); and from this time Geba was the northern frontier town of the kingdom of Judah (2 Kings 23: 8); in the counting of those who returned from the Babylonish captivity, the citizens of Geba and of Ramah are counted together (Ezra 2: 26; Neh. 7: 30). Geba is to be distinguished from the different Gibeas, from Gebim, and from Gibeon; neither the etymological affinity, nor the geographical nearness, nor yet the variable appellations of Eusebius (see Art. *Gibea*), furnish any valid reason to suppose that such a change of names also exists in the text of the Old Test., and that Geba was to be confounded with these places. According to the above passages, Geba is close by Ramah, on the road from Ai and Mich-

mas to Jerusalem, about one German mile northeast of Gibea-Saul. It is called by the present Arabs Djeba, to distinguish it from El Djib (Gibeon) and from Tell-el-Ful (Gibea-Saul), see *Robinson*. *PASSER—Beck*.

Gebal, the name 1) of a tribe in Arabia Petra (according to Ps. 83: 6, גִּבְלִי, and 2) a Phœnician sea-town (according to Ezek. 27: 9). The latter was celebrated for its carpenters, whom Solomon already employed in building the temple (1 Kings 5: 32), and by whom the ships of the rich traders in Tyre were also built (Ezek. 27: 9). According to these statements, we cannot find ancient Gebal in the neighborhood of Laodicea (*Abulf.*, *Syr.*, p. 109, 59), but recognize it in the well-known Byblos, the seat of a worship of Adonis (*Strabo*, 16, 755), not far from the Mediterranean Sea, 24 miles from Berytus, between Sidon and the cape *des apaches* (*Plin.*, 5, 17; *Mel.*, 1, 12; *Eustath. ad Dion. perieg.* 912), according to Ptolemy (5, 15, 4) 67° 40' and 33° 56'.

The tribe Gebal appears in the above-named passage from the Ps. as the ally of the Edomites and Israelites, of the Moabites and Hagarites, of the Ammonites and Amalekites, etc., against the people of God. If we compare with this 2 Kings 14: 7; 2 Chron. 25: 11, it appears already that the Gebalites must have lived with or among the Edomites, although not as one and the same tribe. Herewith agree the accounts concerning Edom and Seir, in Gen. 36: 20; 23: 29, where, it is true, no tribe Gebal is named, but a son of Seir, named Sobal (סוּבַל), and a son of this Sobal, named Ebal (עִיבָל).

A Syrian Sobal is therefore also mentioned, Judith 3: 1, according to the text of the Vulgate, with Syria, Mesopotamia, Libya, and Cilicia; in the histories of the crusaders, the same name appears often as a province in the south of Palestine, constituting a part of Arabia Petra (*Guilielm.*, *Tyr.*, p. 781, 812, 834). The children of the Horite Seir, however, were the aborigines of the land of Edom, and were conquered by the Edomites, although not entirely dispossessed (Gen. 12: 6; 36: 25; Deut. 2: 12). Conquered and conquerors now lived together, and they were finally commingled in fact as well as in name, so that not only Edom and Seir are frequently used as synonymous, but, *pars pro toto*, Gebal also. Josephus calls an Idumean district Γοβαίτης, Eusebius (in *Onom.*, under *Idumea*) Γεβαίτην (comp. also *Steph. Byz.*, p. 251, 265); Euseb. limits the name to the environs of Petra, as there is still at the present day a district there, which is separated from the district Kerek by the valley El Ahsa, called Dcbetel (*Seetzen*, XVIII., 390; *Burkh. R.*, II., 674, 675, and thereon *Geogr. Ann.*, p. 1066; *Robinson*, III., p. 103 sq. 806); notwithstanding, it appears that Eusebius already used the word Gebalene for Idumea in general (comp. *Reland*, p. 84); wherefore the *Targ. Jonath.* always substitutes גִּבְלָא for גִּבְעָר (comp. Gen. 14: 6; 33: 16; 36: 8; Num. 24: 18; Deut. 1: 2; 2: 1), likewise the *Targ. hieros.* and *Targ.*

Chron., finally also the Samaritan version (*Dent.* 1: 2; 2: 1; 33: 2; *Gen.* 32: 3; 33: 14, 16; 36: 8, 9). **PRESSEI.—Beck.**

Gebhard II., Truchsess, Archb. and Elector of Cologne, of the noble family of Truchsessi of Waldenburg, son of William of Waldenburg and Johanna of Fürstenberg, rendered himself noted by his transition to the Evang. Church, and connection with the Duchess Agnes of Mansfeld. Born Nov. 10, 1547. Influenced by his uncle, Cardinal and Bishop Otto, of Augsburg, to devote himself to the Church, he studied at Ingolstadt, Dillingen, Bourges, Bologna, and Rome. In the 15th year of his age (1562) became canon at Augsburg; 1567, at Strasburg; 1570, at Cologne; in 1574, dean of Strasb., and 1576 provost of Augsburg. On Dec. 5, 1577, he was elected Archbishop of Cologne, in place of Count Sulentin, who had resigned. Though accused of leaning towards Protestantism, Pope Gregory XIII. confirmed his nomination, and on Aug. 24, 1578, at his consecration in Coblentz, he subscribed the oath of allegiance to the Pope. During the latter half of 1579, Gebhard became acquainted at Cologne with Duchess Agnes, whose beauty attracted universal admiration. Some have it that he had known her previously in the cloister of Gerisheim, *Brugs, Hist. de 5 Papes*, Tom. V., p. 39: "Il visitoit si souvent un convent de religieuse (Gerisheim), sous prétexte d'y faire les fonctions d'un bon Pasteur, qu'il avient éperdument amoureux d'une Chanoinesse de ce monastère, nommée Agnes de Mansfeld." Her brothers, greatly exasperated at his conduct, demanded that he should marry her, which, indeed, he did, after having joined the Evang. Church in 1582. The ceremony was performed by the well-known Zacharias Ursinus. He was deprived of his archiepiscopal dignity; and on April 1, 1583, was issued against him the Papal bull of excommunication, in opposition to which appeared: *In anathematismum, cui Gregorius XIII. P.P. Romanus illustriss. principum Gebhardum, etc., damnavit, Leonhardi Wamundi, Thuringi, admonitio etc.*: *Lugd. Bat.*, 1583. The cathedral-chapter elected archbishop May 23, 1583) Duke Ernst of Bavaria. Now ensued a conflict of arms, which decided the controversy between him and G., who had undertaken the defence of his rights. Yielding to the force of circumstances, G. withdrew to Strasburg, where he discharged the office of dean, and died May 21, 1601, without leaving any issue. Agnes survived him; the time of her death is unknown. — (Comp. *JOH. DAV. KÖLER, Diss. de actis et fatis Gebhardi, Truchsessi Archiepiscopi et Electoris Coloniensis, infaustis variis*: Altdorf, 1723; *BARTHOLD, im Histor. Taschenbuch von Raumer, Neue Folge, 1. Jahrg.*: Leipzig, 1840. **NEUDECKER—Ermentrout.**

Gedaliah, born of a noble family in Jerusalem for his father (see 2 Kings 22: 12; Jer. 6: 24; comp. v. 16), was placed by Nebuchadnezzar, after the sack of this city, governor over that portion of the people whom he had not carried off to Babylon (*Hitzig*, on Jer. 40: 7). He resided with a small garrison of Chaldeans at Mizpa, in the neighborhood of Jerusalem (Jer. 1: 8; 40: 7; 2 Kings 25: 22). His reign was of short duration. At the expiration of two

months, influenced by enmity to G., on account of his friendship for the Chaldeans, Ishmael devised a conspiracy which resulted in his death, and that of the Chaldeans and Jews who lived with him at Mizpa (Jer. 41: 1; 2 Kings 25: 25). He was a tool in the hands of the Ammonite kings, who hated the Jews, and were glad to be rid of the Chaldeans. Afraid of the vengeance of the Chaldeans, those who survived the slaughter fled to Egypt. For the remembrance of the death of Gedal. see Art. on *Jewish Festivals*.

OEHLER—Ermentrout.

Gehenna (Γέεννα), one of the two expressions of the New Test. for *hell*, viz.: Matt. 5: 29, 30; 10: 28; 18: 9; 23: 15; Mark 9: 43, 45; Luke 12: 5; James 3: 6, and only employed, in distinction from *ἄδης*, to indicate one of the leading torments of hell, or the disposition of a hellish tormentor. The above-cited passages of the New Test. show plainly that it was a national expression for hell, which Christ and his Apostles adopted; but to conclude from this, that no real state of the damned in the sense of Christ and the Apostles lay at the foundation of this image, is by no means allowable. This Chaldean and Greek word originated from the Hebrew גֵּי בֶן-הֲנוּם (Josh. 15: 8), in full גֵּי בֶן-הֲנוּם, or in Chetib גֵּי בֶן־הֲנוּם (2 Kings 23: 10), the name of a very beautiful and fruitful valley southwest and south of Jerusalem, which, at the time when the Jews were addicted to the worship of Moloch, was used for this purpose (2 Kings 23: 10; Jer. 7: 31; 19: 5, 6; 32: 35). This beautiful region became, on this account, so abhorred, that those who returned from Babylon threw corpses and foul things of all kinds into it, and in order to burn them, a constant fire was kept up (to which refer the words, "and the fire is not quenched"). The situation of this valley was placed at first southeast of Jerusalem (so still *Gesen., Lex.*, Art. גֵּי, and in the appendix to the Art. גֵּי בֶן־הֲנוּם); or the southeast-

ern low country of Kidron was reckoned to it (so *Cotovicus*, in his *itiner. hierosol., et syr.*, p. 260, also *Sieber*, on his map of Jerusalem); the valley of Rephaim has also been confounded with it, in that it has been allowed to begin south of Zion (comp. the map of Grimm), whilst this valley running from Bethlehem from south to north, only runs into the valley of Hinnom opposite to Zion, and according to Josh. 15: 8; 18: 16, it appears that the same mountain which limited the valley of Hinnom in the west, limited the valley of Rephaim in the north. According to Jer. 19: 2, it lay before the east gate; according to Josh. 18: 16; 15: 8, the borders of the tribes of Judah and Benjamin ran through the valley of Hinnom; according to Neh. 11: 30, Beersheba and the valley of Hinnom were the bounds of the tribe of Judah (see *Wilk., Tyr.*, 8, 2, in *Gest. Franc., Korte, Trav.*, 161, 186; *Brocke*, II., 38; and comp. *Reland, Paläst.* 353). The beginning of the depression of the valley of Hinnom is west of Jerusalem, south from the road to Joppa; its southern direction, however, turns at the western angle of Zion towards the east, and declines into the lower val-

ley of Kidron not far from the tombs of the kings (*Robinson*, II., p. 38, sq). The portion of the valley of Hinnom made notorious by the worship of Moloch (which Josias defiled, 2 Kings 23 : 10; Jer. 7 : 31; 19 : 6; 13 : 14; comp. Isaiah 30 : 33), was called Tophet (תֹּפֶת, *Tophēd*, *Tophā*, *Taphēd*) from the Chaldean ܬܦܬ = to vomit (comp. *Böttch. de infernis*, I., p. 80, 85), and it is just this extreme point (described by *Robinson*, I., 365, 366, as a chasm filled with gardens and groves), where the valley of Hinnom descends into that of Kidron. Jerome says (*ad Jer.*, 7, 31): *Illum locum significat, qui Siloe fontibus irrigatur et est amœnus atque nemorosus hodieque hortorum præbet delicias*. Eusebius says (*Onom.*, under *Θαπέδ*): *Εν προαγείοις Αιλίας ἔτι νῦν δείκνται ὁ τόπος οὕτω καλε- μένος, ὃ παράκειται ἡ καλυμμένη τε κρυφίως καὶ ὁ ἀγρὸς τε περαμίως, ἢ τὸ Ἀχιλδαμάχ χωρίον*. Concerning this parallel, comp. the Art. *Aceldama*. PRESSER—Beck.

Geiler, of Kaisersberg. — The latter part of the 15th century is important for the history of homiletics. The pulpit strives to free itself from the yoke of scholasticism, and to gain a fresher life. This advance is due less to the revival of classical studies, than to a desire generally felt, and increased by the invention of printing, to come nearer to the apprehension of the laity, and thus to exert a stronger influence upon them than hitherto. In order to do this, the preacher had to accommodate himself to the views of the people, use their language, renounce the stiff rules of scholastic homiletics, and speak with more liveliness and ease. Such popular preachers arose contemporaneously in France, Italy, and Germany. Their works abound in expressions and images, which offend our more refined taste, but were then necessary to popular eloquence. Use has at times been made of these phenomena, to establish a special class of grotesque and burlesque preachers, whose sorties of wit have excited merriment, and who have received more attention in comic than in theological literature. But it has been forgotten that this very return to the imaginative and often uncouth language of the people, this exodus from the terminology and method of scholasticism, was an advance which deserved far more serious consideration. In Germany Geiler was the most eminent of these popular preachers. He was born at Schaffhausen, March 16, 1445. In his third year he lost his father, but was educated by his grandfather, a wealthy citizen of Kaisersberg. In 1460 he visited the University of Freiburg, where, in three years afterwards, he became *doctor artium*. In 1465 he lectured on the commentaries of Alexander of Hales, the sentences of P. Lombard, and several books of Aristotle. In 1469 he became dean of the *facultas artium*. He does not seem at this time as yet to have purposed to enter the priesthood; to this purpose he was led by the reading of mystical books, especially those of Gerson. In order to study these, he went, in 1471, to Basle, where also he lectured on philosophy, and in 1474 became *Decanus artium*. In the same year he was made Baccalaureus, and

in 1475 Doctor of Theology. In 1476 he was called to Freiburg as Professor of Theology; shortly after he was elected rector of the University. But the entire constitution of his mind qualified him more for the office of preacher than of professor; when, therefore, he was called as preacher to Würzburg, he did not hesitate to accept the call. When he was about to remove to this new sphere, he was prevailed upon by P. Schott, bailiff at Strasburg, to choose the latter city as the sphere of his labors. At Strasburg there was at that time a want of pious and qualified preachers. Protracted quarrels between the begging friars and the clergy had done great injury to religion, especially in the congregation of the minster. To prevent further disturbances, the authorities had even taken down the pulpit of the minster. But the first movements of a better spirit brought effectual help. Schott established from his own income an endowment to support a preacher, who was to be a D. D., and to belong to no order. Geiler was the first one called to this endowment. He followed the call, and, from 1478 to his death, labored at Strasburg with a zeal which has brought his memory down to the present time. One of his first sermons was on the death of Bishop Robert. April 18, 1482, he opened a Synod at Strasburg with a sermon on the degeneracy of the clergy, especially the higher; and the necessity to restore purer morals. Bishop Albrecht, though little inclined to adopt Geiler's counsels, nevertheless instituted a visitation of his diocese, by which many abuses were brought to light. In 1485 Geiler was urgently invited by Frederick, Bishop of Augsburg, to become his chaplain; and if not this, at least to spend a year at Augsburg, in order to be a model to his clergy and a teacher to his people. In 1488 Geiler satisfied this wish; he delivered at Augsburg a series of sermons, which was afterwards printed. The Bishop with difficulty allowed him to return to Strasburg; but Geiler again visited the city the year after. At the same time Basle made him a brilliant offer. Philip, Archbishop of Cologne, also wished to secure him; but the requests of his friends detained him at Strasburg. Here he was so popular, that the chapel in which he preached soon became too small, and the wardens of the minster created for him in the nave of the church a beautiful pulpit, which is still an object of admiration. The Emperor Maximilian, who often visited Strasburg, also formed an attachment for Geiler, attended his preaching at every visit, and created him imperial chaplain. In 1503 he invited Geiler to visit him, and sent to him 50 florins for his traveling expenses. Geiler was also highly esteemed by the authorities, who listened respectfully to his proposals for the elevation of morals, and the improvement of the Church. Nor did he enjoy in a less degree the confidence of the people, to serve whom was his constant aim. He strove above all to establish a public Latin gymnasium, and a higher school for theology and canonical law. Though he did not succeed in this, a Latin school was nevertheless established in connection with the minster; and, at Geiler's suggestion, a distinguished humanist

from the school at Schlettstadt placed at its head. He urged, moreover, the abolition of the rack, a more humane treatment of prisoners, the erection of a public charity fund, in order to stop street-begging, and that the sacraments should be allowed to criminals condemned to death. At the election to supply a successor to Bishop Albrecht, deceased, he exhorted the chapter to have in view the good of the Church alone. He died March 10, 1510, universally lamented by the people, who loved him for his benevolence, gentleness, independence and purity. Brant, Rhenanus, Reuchlin, and some younger humanists, among whom was Melanchthon, wrote elegies and epitaphs upon him. The monks of St. John, at Strasburg, erected in their church a tablet to his memory. By his will G. devised his excellent library to remain in the minster parsonage for the use of his successors. His other property he devised to his relatives, the poor, the hospital at Colmar, and various churches. — In theology Geiler was a mystic, though of the *French* school. He therefore condemned not only those who wished to become too ecstatic in their contemplation, those of the free spirit, but even said of Tauler that he could be followed only when properly understood. His favorites were St. Bernard and Gerson; to the latter of whom he showed a remarkable similarity of mind and labor. On a journey to Marseilles in order to visit the grave of M. Magdalene, he stopped at Lyons to visit Gerson's grave and obtain copies of some of his works. Some of the Chancellor's works he translated and published with a preface from his own pen; others he explained in his sermons. At the same time, however, Geiler moved yet wholly within the sphere of scholasticism; for although at times he denounced useless discussions and subtleties, he nevertheless wished the scholastics to be used in the schools; and when the war against them commenced, he urged Wimpfeling to defend the "disputations theologians." He rejoiced in the revival of classical studies, but this only to a certain extent; for although he had been classically educated, although intimate with Reuchlin, Wimpfeling, Rhenanus, Brant, and other humanists; he nevertheless feared with some of the latter, that these revived studies would injure the "noble and subtle dialectics" of the middle ages, and that the reading of the heathen poets would taint the morals of the young. His reformatory tendencies have been set at too high an estimate. It is true, he preached against the degeneracy of the clergy and the worldliness of the monasteries; he complained that there were so many *theologi*, but so few *theophili*; he expressed some few evangelical ideas; nevertheless all his labors have in view the reformation of life, and not the purity of doctrine. Although attacked by immoral monks and ignorant priests he still regarded the Church as the highest authority in matters of faith. He preached "that the Scriptures must not be interpreted according to private judgment" as is done by those of the Free Spirit; nor according to the text, as the Hussites; but we must understand the text as the holy teachers have interpreted it. He believed in astrology, witches, and ghosts; out-

ward works were not without value; and although he urged the removal of indecent customs and noisy displays in worship, sought to lighten the penitential code, and refused to countenance the preachers of indulgences; he yet on the other hand insisted upon other exercises and customs, which are peculiar to Catholic piety. Besides the pilgrimage to the grave of St. Magdalene, he made frequent others to a hermitage in Upper Alsace; and one, at the head of numerous citizens of Strasburg, to Maria Einsiedeln. He loved the monastic life, and often retired to the monasteries of the Carthusians and of St. John. In his earlier life, the dissuasions of others had prevented him from becoming a hermit; in his later years, amid the battle between the new regeneration and the defenders of the middle ages, he often longed to retire into solitude. He warned against the delusion of those, who hoped for a restoration of the Church according to the model of the first centuries; and advised all to attend to their own souls, and commend themselves to God. — As to his sermons, preached at various places, he published few of them himself. They were preached from sketches previously prepared. In his earlier years his sermons, according to the prevailing custom, were very lengthy; but he soon saw the inutility of this, and confined himself to a more reasonable time. Some of his hearers wrote them down as he preached them; many of them were translated into Latin for the benefit of other preachers. J. Other, of Speier; P. Wickgram, and J. Biethen, of Reichenweier, formed collections of them. Some of these Latin editions were afterwards again translated, with more or less freedom, into the German. But most of Geiler's sermons were published in German contemporaneously with the Latin. The latter generally give a shorter text, omitting mostly the "*accidens facietia*." But in all these collections the same spirit, style, and language prevail. — Geiler did not always take his text from the Bible; nor was his matter always original, for many of his sermons are derived from theological works at his command. In this way he made use of the works of Gerson, Albert the Great, the Dominican Humbertus, St. Bernard, Nicholas of Dinkelsbühl, Chrysostom, and others. But he did not use theological works only; it was quite consonant to his free and popular manner to make use of other works also, especially such as exposed the follies and vices of the age. His themes were often taken from particular circumstances, events, and occasions. His exegesis is allegorical throughout; his analogies, though striking at times, are often very far-fetched; his allegories are often carried out to the minutest particulars. But the chief characteristic of his sermons is his return to the language of the people. The language of the pulpit at that time was an unintelligible medley of Latin and German: Geiler was one of the first to condemn this, and to use in his sermons the German only. With a living language he combined an outspoken earnestness against the follies and sins of all ranks, a deep knowledge of life in its minutest particulars, and a lively sympathy with the views of the people in his age. Besides contemporary poets,

jurists and theologians, he quotes heathen philosophers and historians, the Church Fathers and scholastics, of whom, perhaps, his hearers knew little; but narratives, anecdotes, proverbs, analogies from nature, or from men and animals, all these render his discourses exceedingly popular, forcible and clear. His humor, which in conversation with friends found vent in sportive sallies, was not wanting in his sermons. Such *facetiae*, having always a moral bearing, were several times collected into a volume. G., however, always avoided any violation of the pious sense. It is true that he uses expressions, plays upon words, and comparisons, which offend our taste; but our taste is not that of the 16th century. Even if Geiler at times excited the laughter of his hearers, and joined in it himself, this did not in those times injure his usefulness. Only by this racy, popular style he could gain that influence of which his contemporaries speak. In this way he also prepared the way for the Reformation, especially in Strasburg. For the perfection of the German language he did important service, as he tried to remedy its poverty in theological and philosophical terms. — The various editions of G.'s sermons have become scarce: the following catalogue, though as perfect as possible, is confined to the most necessary data. — I. Das irrig Schaf, etc.: Strasb., 4to., 1514. Der Seelen Paradis, etc.: Strasb., 1510, fol. These were collected or revised by Geiler. — II. Sermons published by unknown persons: Predigen teutsch und viel gutter leeren: Augsb., 1508 and 1510, fol., published without Geiler's knowledge. Das Buch Granatapfel, etc.: Augsb., 1510, fol.; Strasb., 1511, 1516, fol. Das buoch arbore humana: Strasb. 1510, 1518, 1521, fol. Von den dry Marien: Strasb., 1520, fol. Das buoch der sünden des munda: Strasb., 1518, fol. Fier predig von U. L. F. himelfart u. empfangnis: Strasb., 1512, fol. — III. Sermons published by J. Othet: *Navicula sive Speculum fatuorum*: Strasb., 1510, 1511, 1513, 4to. Christenlioh fol. *Navicula poenitentiae*: Augsb., 1511, fol.; bilgerschaft zum ew. vaterland: Strasb., 1512, Strasb., 1512, 1513, 1517, 1519, 4to. *Fragmenta passionis dom. nostr. J. C., sub typo placenta melleae*: Strasb., 1507, 1508, 1511, 4to. *Sermones de orat. domin.*: Stras., 1509, 1510, 1515, 4to. — IV. Sermons published by J. Pauli: Das Evangelibuch: Strasb., 1515, fol.; Basle, 1522, fol. Her der Kunig ich diene gern.: Strasb., 1516, 1517, 1520, fol. Die Emeis, das buch von der Omeissen: Strasb., 1516, 1517, fol. Die brüsamlin ufgelesen von F. J. Paulin: Strasb., 1517, fol. — V. By H. H. Wessmer: Postill über die fyer Evangelia durchs johr: Strasb., 1522, fol. — VI. By P. Wickgram: *Sermones et varii tractatus*, Strasb., 1518, fol.; 1519, 4to. The *Predigen von den Stufen-psalmen*: Strasb., 1515, fol., mentioned by Oberlin, are unknown to me. Some other works by Geiler are mentioned by Trithemius in his *Catalog. illustr. vir. Germ.*, written in 1495. — See concerning Geiler, the brief biographies by Wimpfeling and Rhenanus. — RIEGGER, *Amoenit. literar. Frib.*: Ulm, 1775; *Fascic.*, I. p. 54, etc. OBERLIN, *D. Joh. Geileri script. german.*: Strasb., 1786, 4to. Jörden's *Lexik. deutscher Dicht. u. Prosaisten*: Leipz.,

1807, Vol. II., p. 589, and Vol. VI., 383. AMMON, *Geiler's Leben, Lehren und Predigten*: Erlang., 1826. AUG. STORBER, *Essai hist. et littér. sur la vie et les serm. D. G.*: Strasb., 1834, 4to. C. SCHMIDT. — Reinecke.

Gelasius I., Pope from 492–496, was one of those occupants of the Roman See who aimed at the enlargement of the papal prerogatives. Claiming for it the highest judicial authority and supervision over the orthodoxy and execution of ecclesiastical laws in entire Christendom, on the ground of the primacy transmitted by Peter and exercised by him in conjunction with Paul, he wrote in a letter to Faustus (MANSI, *Sacrorum Concil. nova et ampliss. collectio*, T. VIII., p. 19): *Quantum ad religionem pertinet, non nisi apostolicæ sedi juxta canones debetur summa judicii totius*. Greater than the authority of Councils was that of the Papal See, as we read in his *Decretum de libris recipiendis et non recipiendis* (in MANSI, *l. c.*, p. 157): *Sancta Romana ecclesia nullio synodico constitutio ceteris ecclesiis prælata est, sed evangelica voce Domini et Salvatoris nostri Primatum obtinuit: Tu es Petrus*, etc. An appeal from the Roman chair he held to be inadmissible. The so-called *Decretum Gelasii de libris recip.*, &c., incorrectly ascribed to one Gel., it having received its present form, in all probability, in the 6th cent. The *De duabus in Christo naturis adversus Eutychen et Nestorium, liber sacramentorum*, and several other less important works, were composed by him. His letters, of most consequence. Numbered among the saints of the Romish Church, his memory celebrated on Nov. 18. — (Comp. MANSI, *l. c.*; SCHRÖCKH, *K.-Gesch.*, XVII., p. 181; REGENBRECHT, *de canonibus Apostolorum et codice Eccl. hispanæ Diss. Vratisl.*, 1828, particularly in relation to *Decretum Gelas.* — II., Pope, before John of Gaeta, of noble family, educated at Monte Casino by Abbot Oderisius, made Chancellor by Pope Urban II., Cardinal-deacon by Pope Paschal II., after whose death, elected Pope Jan. 18, 1118, by the party opposed to Emperor Henry V., and consecrated at Gaeta, Feb. 24. Forced by his opposition to the claim of the Emperor to investiture, he fled to Gaeta. The Emperor having set up an anti-Pope at Rome (March 14, 1118) Gel. went to Capua, convened a Council and issued a bull against him and Greg. VIII. Having wandered a fugitive, he finally arrived in France and died in the monastery Clugny, Jan. 29, 1119. — (See *Vita Gelasii*, by Pandulph of Pisa, in *Muratorii, Scriptores Rerum Italicarum*, III., p. 367; MANSI, *l. c.*, XXI., p. 162, 166; SCHLOSSER's *Weltgesch.*, III., 1, p. 239.

NEUDECKER. — Ermentrout.

Gelasius, of Cysicus, in the Propontis, the son of a presbyter, and himself a clergyman. Whether a bishop in Cæsarea and Palestine, is more than doubtful. Chiefly known as the author of a work: *Συντάγμα τῶν κατὰ τὴν ἐν Νιζαία ἀγίαν οὐνοῦ προχθιῶν*, in three parts, the first treating of the conflict between Constantine and Maxentius, and the victory of the former over Licinius; the second, of the ground and spread of Arianism, the debates between the Arians and the orthodox; the third, of its history to the death of Constantine. So full of

errors that *Cave* characterizes it: *sed ut verum fatear, prolixæ istæ disputationes ex ipsius Gellertii, saltem antiquissimi codicis ab eo usurpati auctoris cerebro mihi fluxisse videntur.* More severely *Elias Dupin*: "mauvais compilateur" who "a recueilli sans jugement ce qu'il a trouvé de bon et de mauvais sur le concile de Nicée, sans examiner si cela était vrai ou faux." — (Comp. according to *Bähr*, 476, first publ. in Lutet., 1599, then 1604. To be found in collections of Councils, and in German in *G. D. Fuch's Bibliothek der K.-versammlung* (Leipzig, 1780), I., p. 416; comp. *Cave, hist. lit. scr. eccles.*, I., p. 454; *Du Pin*, nouvelle bibl. des aut. eccl., IV., p. 280; *Schröckh*, K.-gesch., V., p. 354 and 386). DR. PRESSEL.—*Ermentrout*.

Gellert, Christian Fürchtegott, born in 1715 at Haynichen, a small town in Saxony, was the third son of a clergyman. His earliest education he obtained at the school of his native town. He showed an early fondness for versification, in which he was encouraged to persevere by a successful poem on the birthday of his father. He continued his studies at Meissen, and after 1734 studied theology at Leipsic. *Mosheim* and *Ernesti* were his theological ideals. After four years of study, he ventured for the first time, though with much diffidence, to preach in his native town. In his 15th year, in making an address at the funeral of a child, he had broken down. This misfortune seems to have decided his future career. His timidity never forsook him; his memory also was treacherous: so that with all his other qualifications for the pulpit, the latter was not destined to be his sphere. Providence, however, opened another sphere of usefulness for him. At first he was entrusted with the education of the two young lords of Löttichau; afterwards he prepared a nephew for the university (of Leipsic), and in 1741 accompanied him thither. Here he in a manner studied a second time; and, in order to gain a subsistence, gave instruction to youths. About this time he first appeared as author by publishing several of his fables, narratives, and poems. Somewhat later he published, in connection with some friends, especially *J. E. Schlegel* and brothers, the "*Vermischten Beiträge*." Having in 1744 become A. M., he now appeared as *docent*, and also published at short intervals his fables and narratives, comic and pastoral plays, his romance called the "Swedish Countess," his spiritual odes and hymns, besides miscellaneous in prose and verse. This is not the place to examine G.'s services in the sphere of literature. But that the same man who, as a writer of fables, deeply affected the life of the German people, especially its middle classes, "who wrote verses and plays," should also create an epoch as a writer of hymns, and by his character give an edifying testimony in favor of the practical effects of Christianity, at a time when the latter was suffering severe attacks from Deism, which was just spreading in Germany, this secures for him no insignificant position in the history of the Church, or rather, of religious life in Germany. In 1751 G. became *Prof. Extr.* of poetry and rhetoric at Leipsic. His lectures, at first on literature and afterwards on ethics, were so crowded that the lecture-room became too small.

From all sides, too, he received the most touching proofs of love and respect. With what scrupulous conscientiousness he sought to restrain the students from excesses, and to imbue them with a love for religion and virtue, of this *Gæthe* has given testimony, though not without a taint of irony. That the vein of hypochondria which appears in G.'s life gave to his lectures a lachrymose cast, and to his ethics a penal irksomeness, which forms a strange contrast with the sprightliness and sportive mischief of his writings, may readily be granted; although it would be exceedingly unjust to ascribe this disposition of his mind to Christianity. It is well known how highly Frederick the Great esteemed him. He wished to enlist G. in the service of Prussia; but G. preferred to remain at Leipsic, where, after much bodily and mental suffering, but nevertheless in a joyful trust in the help of God and the mercy of his Savior, he died Dec. 13, 1769. — G. was long admired as a hymnic poet; and although this former unbounded applause has considerably lessened, yet the most unsparing criticism would not succeed in ejecting the poet from the hearts of the people, or his hymns from the Church. On their first appearance (1757), several of them were immediately introduced into newly published hymn-books. They found favor even in the Romish Church. Their success in his own and later ages, is due to G.'s hearty piety, which was the truest and most faithful expression of his life.—The publication of his hymns, according to *Cramer*, his biographer, was to him the most solemn and important labor of his life. He never worked upon it, without striving with all the earnestness of his soul to experience the same emotions which they were intended to express. He generally devoted to it his serenest moments; and often paused in order to allow the disposition, which he wished to arouse in his Christian brethren, to gain strength in his own heart. This reveals to us the secret of the power of G.'s hymns. Objective criticism may discover in them many violations of taste, and doctrinal inaccuracy. Many of them are not properly Church-hymns; others possess the true characteristics of the hymn, besides a certain lyrical elevation; so that they may, though bearing the impress of *their* age, be used as witnesses of their age along with the best of ancient and modern hymns. The poet's own pious subjectivity is the keynote of his hymns; a subjectivity, however, which has found an echo in thousands of hearts, and has thus become truly objective. G.'s odes and hymns were translated into the French, Danish, Russian, and Dutch, and were furnished with music by various composers.—G.'s prose writings also exerted a salutary influence upon the religious mind of their age, although they do not, as regards distinctness of ethical and dogmatic ideas, satisfy the strict demands of science. The specifically Christian is often confounded with the merely religious; and the latter, again, with the moral. But in judging him, we must not forget his age—the transition from a worn-out orthodoxy to a still groping and uncertain illumination. He always seeks to rescue the positive doctrines of Christianity as sacred mysteries.—(See his biography

by J. A. Cramer, 1774. His complete works were published, Leips. 1766, 1769, and often reprinted. The latest ed. is that of Weidmann, Leips. 1839, 10 vols. 8vo, with portrait.—See also the *Histories of Literature*, by *Gelzer, Gervinus*, and *Vilmar*; *A. Koch*, *Gesch. des K.-Lieds*, III., p. 22.—*Gellertbuch von F. Naumann*, Dresden, 1854.) HAGENBACH.—*Reinecke*.

Genealogical Registers are the simplest, most primitive styles of history, whether oral or written; and, when containing births and ages (as in *Exod.* 5 and 11), are of great service in the department of chronology. They are history in its most general outlines, as consisting of names and dates which, among a people like the Orientals, who were beginning to elevate themselves above the mere consciousness of nature to that of history, were always connected with recollections ever fresh, and oral narratives (comp. *Gen.* 5 : 22–24).—In this form was composed *Genesis*—the first historical book of the Israelites—which, containing the rise of the holy people from the family, and going back to the beginning of humanity itself, starts with the generations. But as in Abraham all the nations were to be blessed (*Gen.* 12 : 3), and, as through revelation the people were led to look beyond themselves to God, and so to man as such, there arose a universal consciousness, and with it the writing of history proper. Hence were carefully preserved the primitive, pre-Israelitish traditions (*Gen.* 1–11), in which were interwoven genealogical registers of the whole human family (*Gen.* 10). Genealogy thus became Ethnography, and Ethnography History (comp. *Acts* 17 : 26). But as the Messiah, in capacity of *ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου*, had necessarily to be of the nature and race of man, out of this general genealogy emerged the Messianic, or, to speak more correctly, the former grew out of the latter.

As the Messianic genealogy formed the central-point of the Jewish economy, those races only are mentioned in the sacred records which stand more or less directly connected with it. Thus, in the time before the deluge, the Sethitic genealogy (*Gen.* 5) is minutely stated, while but few of the Canaanite stem are mentioned; and the order interrupted the moment it reached, in the person of Lamech and his family, a certain height of wickedness (*Gen.* 4 : 17–24). The same relation obtained between the genealogy already mentioned and the Shemitic genealogy (*Gen.* 11 : 10). The former are continued only to a certain point (see *Baumgarten's Theol. Comment. on Pentateuch*, I., p. 134), while the latter progresses from the new humanity in Noah to the beginning of God's people in Abraham, from whose time onward, in place of mere genealogy, we find in *Genesis* detailed family histories, and the lateral branches only of the holy family given genealogically, as *Nahors*, 22 : 20–24; *Keturah*, 25 : 1–4; *Esau*, chap. 36. When Jacob went to Egypt, in order to show the continuance of the chosen race, a careful genealogical enumeration of its members is given in *c.* 46 : 8–27. This Egyptian sojourn over, his family had become so numerous that the Scriptures only mention the twelve chiefs of the tribes (*Exod.* 1 : 1–7), the genealogy of Moses and Aaron excepted, which are given more in detail

(*Exod.* 6 : 14–27). From this time the rule was to state the more immediate descent of the leaders in Israel (*Exod.* 35 : 30–34; *1 Sam.* 1 : 1; 9 : 1; *Zeph.* 1 : 1; *Zach.* 1 : 1). When the Israelites were called upon to conquer the promised land, a roll of their fighting men was drawn up (*Numb.* 1), and a catalogue of the people on the plains of Moab (*Numb.* 26). In the course of time, the dying Jacob having already designated Judah the Messianic stem (*Gen.* 49 : 8–12), the Messianic family began to be distinguished from among the people generally. The design of the book of *Ruth* being to point out the descent of David, it concludes with a genealogical register which runs from Judah to David (4 : 12, 17–22). From David onward to the Babylonian exile, his dynasty was the bearer of the Messianic lineage, while, during this period, a census of the people was taken (*2 Sam.* 24 : 1), and, no doubt, the old registers continued or new ones begun (perhaps referred to *1 Chron.* 9). After the exile, we find in the *Chronicles* a general history of the people, from the theocratic point of view, to their captivity in Babylon. They contain, on the one hand, the Davidico-Messianic conception, and, on the other, a reference to the institutions of the priesthood and of the sanctuary. The narrative proper begins with Saul's death and David's reign (*1 Chron.* 10), the earlier history being represented by genealogical registers which, running from Adam to some point in the prophetic period, fills up the first third of the first book. They include also the Messianic genealogy with its lateral branches; Adam to Abraham and Israel, chap. 1, Israel and Judah to David, chap. 2, David to beyond Serubabel, chap. 3; to which are added the descendants of Judah and the remaining tribes, *Sebulon* and *Dan* omitted, while *Levi* is treated of in detail (5 : 27–6, 66, comp. chap. 23–26). In *Ezra* and *Nehemiah*, a genealogical register (*Neh.* 7 : 5) of the Jews who returned with Serubabel from exile (*Ezra* 2; *Neh.* 7), in *Ezra*, of those that came back with him (8 : 1–14), and a list of priests and Levites who had married foreign wives (10 : 18–43). See also *Neh.* c. 11, and 12 : 1–26.

In the New Test. is continued the Messianic genealogy, by Matthew and Luke; the former, designing to show for the benefit of the Jews that the Messiah was the son of David and Abraham (1 : 1), begins with the rise of the chosen people in Abraham, and, through forty-two generations, descends to Jesus (*v.* 2–17); while the latter, who wrote for the Gentiles, and wished to prove that Jesus was not only the Messiah of the Jews, but the Saviour of the whole world, does not trace the genealogy to Jesus, but starting from *Him* runs it backward not only to Abraham, but to Adam and God. For the difficulties connected with these genealogies, see *Comment.*, part. *Wieseler* in the *Studien u. Krit.*, 1845, II.; *Ebrard*, *wissenschaftl. Krit. der ev. Gesch.*, 2 Aufl., p. 188; *Riggenbach* in the *Stud. u. Krit.*, 1855, p. 575, who agree with *Lightfoot*, *Bengel*, *Paulus*, *Olshausen*, *Lange*, &c., in the conclusion—no doubt the most correct one—that Matthew, in order to prove Jesus to be the legitimate heir of David's throne, gave the genealogy of Joseph, and Luke that of Mary, to

prove that he stood in blood-relationship with humanity.—With the death and resurrection of Jesus, terminates the significance of genealogy. For, as He was not only *κατὰ σάρκα*, the son of Abraham and Adam, but *κατὰ πνεῦμα*, the Son of God (Rom. 1:4; 9:5), in which latter aspect Melchizedec was his type as *ἀγενεαλόγητος* (Heb. 7:3); so, having elevated, through death, his flesh to a life-giving spirit, He begat "a new humanity of heavenly seed, and removed the significance of natural generation." — (*Nagelsbach, der Gottmensch*, I., p. 366.)

AUBERLEN.—*Ermentrout*.

General-Vicar (*vicarius, officialis generalis*).

—As the Bishops were not able to discharge in *propria persona* all the duties devolving upon them, it soon became customary to appoint assistants, the first of whom were the Archdeacons (see Arts. *Archdeacon, Bishop, Coadjutor, &c.*), who were clothed with a portion of their jurisdiction. As these, however, soon became too independent of the *B.*, from the 13th cent. they were superseded by Vicars. For districts *foras sedem episcopalem, vicarii foranei* were appointed, and as proper representative of the *B.* a *vicarius generalis, principalis, in spiritualibus* (see note to c. 2; *Clem. de rescriptis*, I., 2).

The General-Vicar was selected either by the *B.*, or by the Apost. Chair (*Ferraris, biblioth. can. s. v. Vicarius gen.*, Art. I., nro. 6, 7). Qualified for this office any clergyman who, besides being 25 years old, possessed the requisite knowledge of canonical law (*Conc. Trid. sess. XXIV., cap. 16, de reform.*). A member of his Chapter generally chosen by the *B.*, but not a *Pœnitentiarius* (*Ferraris, l. c.*, Art. I., nro. 36), nor one who had *curam animarum* (see *Congreg. Trid. of 1685, in Richter's Ausg. der Tridentin. zur sess. XXIV., cap. 12, de reform.*, nro. 31, page 354), who also fixed the sphere of his duties. He was allowed to discharge all those episcopal acts for which no *mandatum speciale* was required; not the *jura ordinis* of the *B.*, nor the *jura jurisdictionis episcopalis* which were based on Papal delegation, nor those that flowed from the *lex diœcesana*, nor the more important *Jurisdictionalia*, such as the bestowal of Benefices, visitation of the Diocese, nor dispensations from irregularities and suspension from *ordo* on account of some crime in *foro conscientie* (*Conc. Trid. sess. XXIV., cap. 6, de reform.* "per vicarium ad id specialiter deputandum." Comp. *Ferraris, l. c.*, Art. II., nro. 19–83, *Benedict XIV., de synodo diœcesana, lib. II., cap. VIII.*). Canonists have frequently disputed whether the jurisdiction of the General-Vicar be ordinary or delegated (see Art. *Jurisdiction*). As his authority, though resting on the episcopal decree, was legally bound to his office as a *jurisdictio ordinaria*, making him thus to represent the *B.*, and to exercise the same judgment (*idem auditorium utriusque—unum et idem consistorium sive auditorium consendum*, c. 2, *de consuetudine* in VI.^o, c. 3, *de appellationibus* in VI.^o), it would seem that no appeal could be carried from him to the *B.*, but to his superiors, those instances excepted which were assigned him by a special mandate (comp. *Ferraris, l. c.*, Art. 41, nro. 41–43, and *s. v. jurisdictio*, nro. 15, *Gonzalez Telles*, on c. 5, X., *de officio vicarii*, I., 28), as was always

the case with the *vicarius foraneus*. Among other official rights, the General-Vicar was entitled to compensation. The office ceases either by the recalling of the appointment, or by the death or removal of the *B.* The see becoming vacant, it is filled by the Vicar appointed by the Chapter (*Conc. Trident. sess., XXIV., cap. 16, de ref.*).—If the extent or duties of a diocese demand it, several Vicars are appointed. More recent regulations place by the side of the General-Vicar a College, of which he is president. Besides this, also, a special Consistory, &c. These together constitute the *Ordinariat*.

See *Kober über den Ursprung u., die rechtl. Stellung der Gen.-Vic., in der Tübing. theol. Quartalschr. von Kuhn*, u. A. 1853, Heft IV., p. 535–590. H. T. JACOBSON.—*Ermentrout*.

Genesis, see *Pentateuch*.

Genesius.—For an account of the wonderful conversion of this man, see *Vita Sancti ad diem XXV. Aug.*, by L. Surius; *Acta Martyr. Amstelod.*, 1713, fol., p. 269, by Th. Ruinart; *Act. SS.*, Antwerp, August, T. V., p. 122, by W. Cuper; *Gesch. der Relig. Jesu Christe*, 9 Bd., p. 353, by Fr. L. Stolberg. Its genuineness has been doubted. The story runs in this wise: At a farce performed in obedience to the orders of the Emp. Diocletian, the object of which was to ridicule the Christians, Genesius plays the part of a drunken candidate for baptism, who, this sacrament received, wishes to die a Christian. Two other actors now appear, the one as priest, the other as exorcist. In reply to the question why they were called in, Gen., not hypocritically, but sincerely answers: "Because I wish to receive the grace of Christ, and, through it, to be delivered from my sins." Baptized and clothed in white, the soldiers conduct him before the Emperor, who was amazed at hearing from Gen. the reality of his conversion. Neither the scourge nor the rack could alienate him from the faith, and he was beheaded on Aug. 25, 290, on which day the Church celebrates his memory. As there seems to be some chronological error connected with this legend, the Bollandists date his conversion from the end of the 3d, or the beginning of the 4th cent.

DR. PRESSEL.—*Ermentrout*.

Gennesaret, Lake of.—The deep interest which this beautiful mountain lake with the country around it, as being the chief scene of the earthly life of the Saviour, and the home of several of his apostles, possesses to every Christian, justifies us in giving a detailed account of it. This lake of N. Palestine was anciently called *ים כנרת*, or *כִּינֶרֶת*, Numb. 31:11; Deut. 3:17; Josh. 11:2; 12:3; 13:27. It shared this name, derived according to the most probable etymology from *כנרת* (Lute), with a town and its territory situated on its N. W. coast, and belonging to the tribe of Naphtali (Josh. 19:35; 1 Kings 15:20). Once, Isa. 9:1, it is called simply *the sea*, the connection leaving no doubt what sea was meant. In the New Test. it is called *λίμνη Γεννησαρίτ*, Luke 5:1; comp. *ὄθρον Γεννησαίρ*, 1 Macc. 11:67; Jos. Ant., 13, 5, 7; *λ. Γεννησαρίτ*, ib. 18:2, 1, and under this name it is also best known to

the Greeks (*Strab.*, 16, p. 755) and Romans (*Plin. H. N.*, 5, 15), as also the Targumists. This name is derived from a small district on the W. coast of the sea, which is mentioned, *Matt.* 14 : 34 ; *Mark* 6 : 53, as the land of Gennesaret ; and is described, *Jos. B. J.*, 3, 10, 8, in such glowing colors. From these data, *Robinson* (*Pal.*, III., p. 535, etc.) thought that he had found this district in the modern *el-Ghuweis*, as laid down on Kiepert's map. *Lightfoot, centur. chorogr. (hor. ad Math.) cap.* 70, supposes Gennesaret to be a later corruption of "Chinnereth." In the time of Christ the sea was very commonly called the "sea of Galilee" (*Matt.* 4 : 18 ; 15 : 29 ; *Mark* 7 : 31 ; *John* 6 : 1), from its situation in the contemporaneous Galilee (for before that time only a single district of this northern country was called גליל, see

Gesenius, Is. 1, p. 350), to which, of course, only its western shore belonged. Another common name was "the sea of Tiberias" (*John* 6 : 1 ; 21 : 1 ; comp. *λίμνη Τιβερις*, *Paus.*, 5, 7, 3) from the chief city of Galilee ; this name became the prevalent one among the Arabs, and has continued to the present day (*Bahr-Tubarigeh*). — Surrounded by the territories of Naphtali and Zebulon on the west (*Matt.* 4 : 13), and of Gad on the east, the lake has a nearly oval-shape. The accounts concerning its dimensions vary very much, since accurate measurements have not yet been taken. *Jos. B. J.*, 3, 10, 7, gives the length at 140 stadia, and the breadth at 40 stadia, with which *Pliny, H. N.*, 5, 15, agrees very nearly. In 1847, Lieut. Molineux traversed the entire length and breadth of it in a boat, and estimates its length at about 18 miles, and its breadth at 8–9 miles. *De Bertou*, who, in 1839, sailed around the lake, gives it a circumference of about 9 Germ. miles. *Robinson* (*Pal.*, III., 573) estimates the length of the sea at about 12 miles, and its breadth at about 6 miles. There is a similar difference in the estimates of the altitude of its surface, compared with that of the Mediterranean ; it seems certain, however, that the former is at least several hundred feet below the latter. The depth of the water, according to Molineux, is about from 120–156 feet. In ancient times the sea was traversed by numerous ships ; *Vespasian*, indeed, gave a battle upon it (see *Jos. B. J.*, 3, 10, 1, 5, 6, 9). In our own century, *Burkhardt* saw only a single, half-rotten boat upon it. — The water of the sea is clear, cool, sweet and wholesome (*Jos. B. J.*, 3, 10, 7). Besides sweet-water snails, of the same kinds as those of the lower Jordan (*Schubert, Reise*, III., p. 238), many and excellent fish are found in it, for which it was also distinguished in the time of Christ and his apostles, *Luke* 5 : 4 ; and which seems to be indicated by the names of towns along the coast, as *Bethsaida* = Fishham, and *Tarichæ* = Pickle-town. It is remarkable, but observed already by *Josephus* (*B. J.*, 3, 10, 8), and verified by subsequent travellers, that in the fountain at Capernaum the same fish are found as in the Nile. The fishery at present is a farmed monopoly, and is carried on only along the shores, though even now it might become very profitable. Water-fowls also, the pelican among

others, frequent it (*Wilson, the Lands of the Bible*, II., pp. 113, 134). Since the Jordan traverses it, though not, as is sometimes asserted, without mingling its waters with those of the sea, it is not improbable that at certain places a movement of the water may be observed (*Irby and Mangle's Trav.*, p. 295 ; *Robinson*, III., p. 567). During the rainy season the sea rises 3–4 feet above its usual level (*Burkhardt*, II., p. 577). Being closed in by high mountains, it is at times exposed to violent gusts of wind, which are dangerous to the fisheries ; *Matt.* 8 : 24–27 ; 14 : 24, etc. ; *Luke* 8 : 23 ; *John* 6 : 18. *Russogazn, Reisen* III., p. 136. — As regards the scenery along the shores, the reports of travellers have differed, owing to the different seasons in which the sea was visited. Its sacred associations, indeed, never lose their interest (*Robinson*, III., p. 500 ; *Schubert*, III., p. 231) ; and yet there is no picturesque charm ; no green meadows, shaded groves, or majestic peaks. Only bleak cliffs and mountain declivities without trees and sparsely covered with withered grass surround the sea, which is enlivened by not a solitary sail or bark. In its own time, the first months of spring, when the scorching sun has not yet destroyed all verdure, it is not wholly devoid of beauty. If we remember that the shores of this sea were once thickly populated and crowded with towns and villages ; whilst at present the chief places have been converted by earthquakes and human vandalism into heaps of ruins ; the entire eastern side the avoided home of the Bedouin robbers ; the western side an almost total solitude ; we can readily understand that the description given in *Jos. B. J.*, 3, 10, 8, of the beauty and fertility of the shore of the sea, and the mildness of its air, was once strictly true. He speaks with admiration of its trees of many species, walnuts, palms, figs, olives, and grapes. Almost throughout the entire year the orchards yielded the most excellent fruits, for the different mountain elevations afforded a variety of climates, as also shelter. At the present time, the nakedness of the scenery makes a sad impression. The shores are sandy, shut in by steep, often precipitous, and naked mountains, which on the eastern side of the sea rise to 800 or 1000 feet, but are rather lower on the western side. But although almost wholly neglected by its indolent inhabitants, the nature of the soil has not changed. The shelter afforded by the mountains favors the growth of nearly all the tropical plants ; dates, citrons, oranges, indigo, rice, and sugar-cane grow almost in spite of the indolence of the inhabitants, who mostly cultivate only wheat, barley, tobacco, cotton, and excellent melons. The temperature of elevated places is moderate ; the neighboring, high plateaus are in winter covered with snow ; whilst in the lowlands snow is very unfrequent, the climate hot and unhealthy, since the unchecked access of the warm south winds, together with the abundant irrigation of the snowy region of Mt. Hermon, is very favorable to vegetation, but also in summer withers it almost entirely. In spring, on the other hand, hills, valleys, mountains and precipices are clothed in the most luxuriant verdure (see *Sectæen, Burkhardt*,

Schubert, III., p. 232; *Robinson*, III., pp. 514, 540).—The basin of the sea of Galilee belongs geologically to the formation of the valley of the Jordan, and the Dead Sea to the gulf of Ailah on the Red Sea, and is evidently of volcanic origin. This is evident from the already mentioned depression of the level of the sea beneath that of the Mediterranean; from the geognostic formation of the surrounding mountains, which in the East are prevailingly basaltic, but belong in the West rather to the Jura-system, though also interrupted by veins of basalt. See *Seetzen*, p. 353; *Schubert*, III., p. 237; especially *Russeger*, III., pp. 134, 258; from the springs containing sulphur and common salt, with a temperature of $+46-49\frac{1}{2}^{\circ}$ Réaum.; and from the frequency of earthquakes in this entire region.—(See also *RELAND*, *Palest.*, p. 258; *HAMELSVELD*, *Bibl. Geogr.*, I., p. 476; v. *LENGERKE*, *Kanaan*, I., p. 43; *WINER's R.W.B.*; and especially *RITTER*, *Erdkunde*, XV., I., p. 281.

RÜTSCHE. — *Reinecke*.

Geneva Consensus and Catechism, see *Calvin*.

Gennadius, Presbyter at Marseille towards the close of 5th cent. († after 495), continued Jerome's work, *de viris illustribus*, to his own time (—495); (frequently published, e.g., Basle, 1529; best by I. A. Fabricius in the *bibl. eccles.*: Hamburg, 1718; and the treatise *de fide* in the Maur. edit. of August. (t. VIII.), and ed. *Elmenhorst*: Hamb., 1614), to the end of which he himself added eight books against all heresies, six against Nestorius, three against Pelagius, a tract, *de mille annis et de Apocalypsi b. Joannis*, and an *epistola de fide mea ad Gelasium Urb. Rom. Ep. sive de dogmatibus eccles.*; the first and last of which writings alone survived. Offended by Augustin's doctrine on predestination, he attached himself to the Semi-pelagian school that flourished in his day in the South of France (see *Fabricius*, l. c.; *Neander*, C. H., Vol. II., p. 647; *Wigger's* Aug. u. Pelag., II., p. 150; *Bähr*, chr. Dicht. u. Geschsch.). — **Gennadius**, Patriarch of Constantinople, theol. and philos. author of the 15th century. He was present at the conference (1438-39) between Pope Eugene IV. and the Greek Emperor, John VIII., Palæologus and the Patr. Joasaph, held at Ferrara and Florence for the purpose of effecting a union between the Greek and Rom. Churches, and frequently spoke in favor of a reconciliation. Finding, on his return home, that the people were opposed to the union which had with great pains been brought to pass, he changed his position and waged war against it.—Constant. having been taken by the Turks, 1453, Mohammed II. ordered the vacant Patriarch. see to be filled, and Gennadius—previously known by the name of Georgius Scholarius—was selected for that post.—As an author he was uncommonly prolific; as a theologian, able and erudite. His most important works: 1) *Professio fidei*, ὁμολογία περὶ τῆς ὁρθῆς καὶ ἀληθοῦς πίστεως τῶν Χριστιανῶν, a Conf. of Faith for the Sultan, frequently published in various languages—translated into Turkish and Arabic. 2) *De via salutis*, περὶ τῆς ὁδοῦ τῆς σωτηρίας ἀνθρώπων. 3) *contra Automatas et Hellenistas*, κατὰ Ἀντοματιστῶν καὶ Ἑλληνιστῶν. 4) *De providentia et prædestinatione*,

περὶ προορισμοῦ. Also, a large number of homilies (e.g., *de eucharistia*, ed. Renandot: Paris, 1704), hymns, philos. and theol. essays.—(See *Gass*, *Gennad. u. Pletho*, *Aristotel. u. Platonis*, in d. gr. Kirche: Breslau, 1844).

WAGENMANN. — *Ermentrout*.

Genoveve, a saint of the Romish Church and patroness of Paris—her festival day on Jan. 3,—was born 424 or 425 at Nanterre, near Paris, according to some at Montrieux. Influenced by Bishop Germain of Auxerre, she took the vow of eternal chastity and virginity. Her austere life, however, failed to shield her against the charge of hypocrisy. The success of Aetius who defeated Atila near Chalons (451) was attributed to the prayers of Gen., whose reputation for sanctity was heightened by the miracles reported to have been done by her, such as restoring the blind and lame, &c. Died, 500, or, as some have it, 512, and was buried in the church she had built, 460, near Chastevil, over the graves of St. Dionysius and Eleutherius. Chlodwig erected a chapel for the preservation of her bones, which bore her name and remained to 1809. Under Louis XVIII. the Pantheon was called after her. In the 16th cent. miracles were still attributed to her remains, which were carried in procession and exposed to veneration when St. Anthony's fire raged among the inhabitants of Paris. Father Charpentier has written her biog., Paris, 1687.

NEUDECKER. — *Ermentrout*.

Genovevans (or canons of St. Genoveve), the name of an order instituted, 1614, by the monk Carl Faure, of the Abbey of St. Vincent, at Senlis. Occasioned by rules drawn up for the reformation of his order, the excellency of which caused their adoption by other monasteries. Cardinal Rochefoucault even availed himself of his services to reform the Abbey of St. Genoveve, and the Chancellor of the Sorbonne was a member of his establishment. Died 1644. To a general was entrusted the government of the order. The religious were obligated to give instruction, to hold divine service, to attend hospitals, to go to church at eight o'clock in the evening, and to fast every Friday.

The sisters of this order — *Genovevaneses* — daughters of St. Gen., now commonly called *Miramionens*, were established, 1636, by the piety of a woman, by name Blusset. In the year 1633 they were combined with a cloister, which had been founded, 1630, by Marie Bonneau de Rubelle Beaubarnois de Miramion, who became Superior. At her death (1694), her institute had reached a wide extension. Its members were bound to works of love, to the care of the sick and poor, the gratuitous education of children, to the daily recital of the office of Mary, to spend one hour each day and night in mental prayer, to serve a two years' noviciate, and to take the simple vows.

NEUDECKER. — *Ermentrout*.

Gentile, *Joh. Valentin* (see Antitrinitarians).

Gentillet, *Innocens*. But little is known of this distinguished Protestant jurist; not even the day of his birth and death. Born at Vienne, in Dauphiné. From Geneva, after the peace of 1576, he removed to Dié, as chief of the council, and soon after was made President of the Par-

liament of Grenoble, of which position he was deprived by an edict of 1585, and compelled to quit the country. Senebier (*Histoire littéraire de Genève*, II., 116) attributes to him several works, some of which were not composed by him. Of those known to be his, two, 1574 and 1576, discuss political subjects; a third is a translation of the Swiss Repub. by Simler. Also, *Apologia pro Christianis. Gallis religionis evangelicæ seu reformatæ* (according to Seneb., pub. 1558, but from the dedication to King of Navarra, Feb. 15, 1578, pub. 1578; ten years later a second edition, revised by Gentillet, Geneva, 1588, 8vo.; French, 1584, 1588, 8vo.), one of the best vindications of the Ref.; and *Le bureau du concile de Trente, auquel est monstré qu'en plusieurs poincts iceluy concile est contraire aux anciens conciles et canons et à l'autorité du roy*, ded. to the King of Navarra, Geneva, 1586, 8vo.; Latin, *Examen concilii Tridentini*, Gen. 1586, 8vo.; German, Basle, 1587, 8vo., one of the most thorough refutations of Trid. Conc.—See the *Biographie Universelle* and the *France Protestante*.

SCHMID. — *Ermentrout*.

Geography, Biblical, is that part of Biblical Archæology which treats of the knowledge of the earth, as far as it comes into view in the books of the Bible, and hence describes the ideas which the Hebrews had of the earth in general, as well as of the nations, countries, and cities which were known to them. (See Art. *Arabia*.) Their ideas of Mathematical and Physical Geography, like those of most of the nations of antiquity, are only popular ones, such as are derived from mere appearances. To the Hebrew, the earth is the centre of the Universe. For a light to it, the sun, moon, and stars, the greater and lesser lights in the firmament, are created. These are to give it light, warmth, and make it fruitful, and determine the division of time. (Gen. 1:14-18; Psal. 74:16; 136:7-9.) The sun moves around the earth from east to west, from one end of heaven to another, where it has its tent in which to rest over night from the labors of the day (Psal. 19:4-6; Eccl. 1:5). It may be miraculously arrested in its course at the command of God (Josh. 10:12, &c.), and may even be made to turn back (2 Kings 20:9, &c.; Isa. 38:8, &c.). Concerning the views of old Hebrews as to the *form* of the earth, nothing definite is recorded. From some poetical representations it may be assumed that their views on this point were middling confused, and far removed from all pretensions to scientific accuracy. To reproach the Bible on this account is just as unreasonable as to attempt, whilst professing faith in the same, to show, against the results of science, its conceptions on this subject to be the only true ones; for, on the one hand, the Bible is no text-book on Astronomy, Geography, and Natural Sciences, and its truths belong to an entirely different sphere; and, on the other hand, Divine Revelation, in order to be at all accessible to men, had to be clothed in the conceptions of those times in which it was given, otherwise it would not have been understood, and would at once have been rejected. Hence this *one truth*, often enough repeated in the Bible, is incontestably certain: God has cre-

ated heaven and earth, and is their Lord. All beyond is merely human, imperfect, and partly even false conception. Such is the conception that God raised the earth from the surrounding water, and set bounds to this, which it cannot pass (Gen. 1:9; Job 38:8-11). The heavens are spread out over the earth as a brazen arch (עֲרֹכֶיץ), or as a tent or a curtain (Gen. 1:6; Isa. 40:22; 51:13). According to Job 26:7, the earth "is hung upon nothing," that is, floats freely in space; according to Psal. 136:6, it is founded upon the water. Of the founding of the earth as firm and immovable, Psal. 75:3, 104:5, also speak; hence also the foundations of the earth were laid by God (Prov. 8:29; Job 38:6). These foundations are the same as the "pillars" of the earth (Job 9:6; Psal. 75:3). According to Micah 6:2; comp. Prov. 8:25, the mountains are the foundations of the earth, the scaffolding upon which the earth rests. Whether this is an idea different from that of Job 26:7, where the earth is represented as "hung upon nothing," or whether, as Hirzel thinks (Comment. on this passage), they may be reconciled by supposing the writer to conceive the disk of the earth to be resting upon the foundations of the mountains; but these, instead of being laid upon a firm basis, as a building, resting themselves in the air, is not very clear. This latter view is, however, not necessary, if we will only distinguish properly between the poetical and popular conception, and the true knowledge. It is certain, however, that the writer of the book of Job regarded the subsistence of the earth, how founded, and how it was in void, as a Divine mystery (ch. 38:6). The ancient Hebrews, as well as the Greeks, seem to have conceived of the form of the earth as of a disk; at least such passages as the "circle (חֶגְגִּל) of the earth" (Isa. 40:22), and passages such as Prov. 8:27, Job 26:10, lead to this conclusion. The (four) "corners of the earth," כְּנָפֹת חֲאָרֶץ (Isa. 24:16; 41:12; Job 37:3; Ezek. 7:2), the "ends of the earth," קְצוֹת חֲאָרֶץ (Isaiah 40:28; Job 28:24; comp. the "four ends of heaven," Jer. 49:36), or the uttermost parts of the earth, יְרֵכָתִי חֲאָרֶץ (Jer. 6:22; 25:32), do not refer to a quadrangular form of the earth, but only to the four known regions of the earth. The Hebrews usually call these: the *East*, rising of the Sun, מוֹצֵא (Psal. 75:7), usually מִזְרָח, see Lexicon, or that which is before, the foreside עַל-פָּנֵי קֶדֶם (Gen. 16:12; 23:19; 1 Kings 9:7, &c.), because the oriental, in describing the regions of the heavens, turns his face towards the rising of the Sun. Hence, West is behind him אַחֲרָי (Job 23:8; Isaiah 9:11); South to his right יָמִין (Psal. 89:13; Job 23:9), תֵּימָן (Josh. 12:3; Job 9:9; Isaiah 43:6); North to his left שְׂמֹאל (Job 23:9; Gen. 14:15). For *West*, we also have: *Setting of the Sun* שֶׁשׁ שָׁמַיִם (Psal.

1: 1; 113: 3; Joshua 1: 7); or "the sea," namely, the great Mediterranean, because West of Palestine, **יָם** (Exod. 10: 19; 27: 12); **יָם** toward the West, (Gen. 28: 14; Exod. 26: 22; Num. 2: 18, &c.); for North, **צָפוֹן** (Exod. 6: 35; Num. 34: 7, &c.), i. e., the hidden, ark region, because the North was regarded as the land of darkness. On the contrary, the South is called **קֶרֶן** (Deut. 33: 23; Eccl. 1: 6; Ezek. 21: 2); i. e., the light region. So the South is also called **נֶגֶב** (Josh. 15: 4; 18: 19; Kings 7: 39, &c.), i. e., the dry, arid region.

Passing now to the biblical representation of the surface of the earth, as inhabited by man, we leave out of view whatever of mythical geography is contained in the description of Paradise (Gen. 2: 8-14), as this has been attended to in the article *Eden* (see Art.). Perhaps the oldest document of the geographical knowledge of the Hebrews we have, is the register of nations attached to the history of the flood (Gen. 10). As the waters of the flood began to disappear, Noah's ark rested upon the Armenian mountain group of the large and little Ararat (Gen. 8: 4). From here, Noah and his three sons, and other inhabitants of the ark, descended upon the earth, now dry; and from here the new human race spread abroad over the whole earth. The author of Gen. so describes this spreading abroad (ch. 10), as to derive all nations known to him, in three great groups, from the three sons of Noah, inasmuch as he represents the relations of nations under the figure of personal descent. This would furnish us with appropriate data as to the geographical horizon of the ancient Hebrews, and with a good foundation for our representation of biblical geography, were it not that this genealogical table is constructed more from an ethnological, than from a geographical point of view (*Knobel*, *die Völkertafel der Genesis*, s. 15), and, therefore, for our purpose, of less use. In addition to this, the table in question represents only the geographical knowledge of a certain period, which itself is not yet determined beyond all controversy; so that the later developments of geographical knowledge would require to be completed and added. For the purpose of a representation of Biblical geography, we must start with our knowledge of the countries here coming to view, and show how far these are known in the Bible. Of course, we can here only give an abstract in general outlines, as a detailed description is not the purpose of this article. We start, first of all, with Palestine—not as though we shared the views of the later Jews and the oriental Christians, that the Bible itself regards this land as the centre of the earth; a view which the rabbinical expositors deduce from Ezek. 38: 12 (see *Buxtorf*, *Lex. Chald.* col. 854, and **יִרְמְיָהוּ**), and Christian expositors from Ezek. 5: 5 (see *Rosenmüller*, *bibl. Alterth.* I. 1, p. 150, &c.). The latter passage rests certainly not upon a geographico-physical, but upon an ethical idea. We begin with Palestine, partly because it is the centre of biblical history; partly because the geographical knowledge of this land stands before us in the

clearest light, whilst that of other lands grows faint as they are removed from this, until darkness covers the "ends of the earth."—The importance of Palestine demands a separate article, to which we refer. If we pass from Palestine over the countries east of the Jordan, eastward, we first come to the Great Desert of desolate Arabia (see Art.), in whose northern part, in an oasis, Tadmor, built by Solomon, lies (**תַּדְמוֹר** or **תַּמָּר**, 1 Kings 9: 18; 2 Chron. 8: 4), the Palmyra of the Greeks and Romans. This desert separates Palestine from Mesopotamia, which, as **אֲרָם**, or **אֲרָם נַהֲרַיִם**, constitutes a part of Aram, (see Article), which again includes Syria and Mesopotamia. Mesopotamia (Acts 2: 9) is the country between the rivers Euphrates and Tigris, in the northern part of which (Ur of the Chaldees and Haran) dwelt the ancestors of the Hebrews, with which they afterwards also continued their connection. Beside these cities of Northern Mesopotamia, the Bible mentions: Tel Abib, **תֵּל אַבִּיב**, on the Chebar, where dwelt a colony of exiled Jews, to whom the prophet Ezekiel went (Ezek. 3: 15); Carchemish, **כַּרְכַּמִּישׁ**, (Isa. 10: 9; Jer. 46: 2; 2 Chron. 35: 20), a fortified city on the Euphrates, where Pharaoh Necho was conquered by Nebuchadnezzar; Hena, **הֵנָּה**, Ivob, **עֵוֹב**, and Sepharvaim, **סַפְרַיִם**, cities or small territories in Mesopotamia, which were subjugated by the Assyrians (2 Kings 17: 24; 18: 34; 19: 13; Isa. 36: 19; 37: 13)—the latter being probably the *Σιπάρρα* of Ptolemy (v. 8), and *Σιππαρηών* of Abydenus in Eusebius (*præp. evang.* IX. 41), on the eastern shore of the Euphrates. Thelasar, **תֵּל אֶשָׁר**, (2 Kings 19: 12), or **תֵּל אֶשָׁר**, (Isa. 37: 12), is probably also situated in Mesopotamia, and perhaps the same as Ellasar, **אֶלְסָר**, of Gen. (14: 1, 9). Immediately to the north of Mesopotamia, on the east side of the Tigris, lies Assyria proper, containing the cities of Nineveh, Keilah (Josh. 15: 44), Resen, and Rehoboth Ir, concerning which see art. Nineveh. Middle or Southern Mesopotamia included the land of Shinar **שִׁנְעָר**; the first dominions of Nimrod (Gen. 10: 10; see Nimrod), containing the cities of Babel, Erech, Accab, and Calneh, and, in a wider sense, also the later Babylonia (see Article), which extended to the Persian Gulf. Adjoining Southern Babylonia on the east, lay Elam, **עֵלָם**, *Ἐλαμίς*, separated from the Persian Susiana by the river Ulai (**אֵלַי**, Dan. 8: 2), or, according to the Greek, Euläus.

Beyond the lowlands of the Euphrates and Tigris, upon the Iramian (Persian) high tablelands, and south of the Caspian sea, Media (**מִדְיָן**) is situated, containing the ancient city of Rages (*Ῥάγα*, *Ῥάγαι*, Tob. 1: 16; 3: 7; 4: 21),

and Ecbatana (עֲבָתָנָא, Esr. 6 : 2, *ἐκβα-
ρανα*; 2 Macc. 9 : 3; Judith 1 : 1, &c.; Tob.
5 : 9). Persia, adjoining Media on the south,
is first mentioned during the exile, and after the
exile, as פָּרֶס (Ezek. 27 : 10; 38 : 5; 2 Chron.
36 : 20, 22; Esr. 4 : 5, &c.), together with the
summer residence Susa (שֹׁשַׁן), in the pro-
vince Susiana (Elam in the more extended
sense, Dan. 8 : 2; see Article). The capital
properly, Persepolis, is mentioned in 2 Macc.
9 : 2, in place of *Ἐλυμαίς*, 1 Macc. 6 : 2, al-
though Persepolis had then long been destroyed
by Alexander. To the northeast of Media is
the province of Parthia, the Παρθία of Ptole-
mæus, whose inhabitants, the Parthians (Παρ-
θοί, Acts 2 : 9), founded upon the ruins of
the Persian Empire, in Middle Asia, a great
empire. The geographical knowledge of the
Hebrews extends no further eastward. India
seems only to have been known to them in
name, as הִינד (Esth. 1 : 1; 8 : 9), as well as
χώρα ἡ Ἰνδία (1 Macc. 8 : 8), if the reading and
sense be correct, only shows the entire ignorance
of the author concerning the country. Only
indirectly is India mentioned (1 Macc. 6 : 37),
as the native land of the war elephants in the
army of Antiochus. Whether the land of gold
(חֵילָה, Gen. 2 : 11) points to India, depends
upon the interpretation given to the river of
Paradise, Pison, concerning which see *Eden*;
and just as uncertain is it to interpret Ophir
(see Art.) of India.

Adjoining Palestine on the south, is the
peninsula of Sinai, the stony Arabia (see Arti-
cle), called, by the Hebrews, the Wilderness
(מִדְבָּרָה, *zar' 'elozhar*), in which they wan-
dered about for 40 years (see Art. *Wilderness—
Arabic*). Southeast of Palestine lies the large
Arabian peninsula עֲרַב, whose principal tribes
were well known to the Hebrews, as the regis-
ter of nations, Gen. 10 : 7 : 25–30, and the gene-
alogies in Gen. 25 : 1–6, 12–18, sufficiently show
(see Art. *Arabia*, &c.). The Red Sea (Schilf-
meer, יַם סוּף, see Art. *Sea, Red*) separates

Arabia from Africa, with which it is united only
by the narrow Isthmus of Suez. With the He-
brew, Africa passes for the country inhabited
by the descendants of Ham, as being the inha-
bitants of the Southern Zone (*Tuch*, Comment.
on Gen., p. 202, &c.), or as being the dark-col-
ored race (*Knobel*, *Völkertafel*, p. 11, &c.; p.
239, &c.). The southernmost people known to
the ancients are the Ethiopians, Αἰθίοπες, who
inhabit the country of Egypt, Nubia, and Aby-
ssinia, and are designated in the Bible by the
name Cush, כּוּשׁ. In a wider sense this name
denotes, in general, all the dark-colored inhabi-
tants of the southern borders of the known earth;
and hence Ethiopians may be shown to exist in
all southern Assyria. The word bears this sense
in the Pentateuch, in poets, and later authors.
In its narrower sense, the word denotes the in-
habitants of Nubia and Abyssinia, bearing this
sense ever since Ethiopia appears in history as
an organized state, and has conquered a part of

Egypt and entered into various connections with
Asiatic states; thus Isa. 11 : 11; 18 : 1; 20 : 3;
2 Kings 19 : 9; Ps. 68 : 31, &c.; see Art.
Abyssinia; *Knobel*, *Völkertafel*, § 27; *Tuch*,
Comment., p. 219, &c. As sons of Cush, that
is, descendants of Ethiopians, are mentioned in
the national register (Gen. 10 : 7, 8): 1) *Seba*,
שֶׁבָּא, the ancient Meroë, an island of Ethiopia
formed by two arms of the Nile, the Astaboras
(Atbara, Tacazza) and the Astagus (Bohr el
Azrak), mentioned also in Isa. 43 : 3; 45 : 14;
Ps. 72 : 10 (שֶׁבָּא). 2) *Havilah*, חַוִּילָה, *Αἰ-
λίτης*, on the African coast, near Bab-el-Mandel
(*Arrian*, *Peripl.*, p. 5, 6), different from the Jek-
tan Havilah of Gen. 10 : 29. 3) *Sabta*, סַבְתָּה,
i. e., Sabotah, in southern Arabia. 4) *Raama*,
רַעְמָה, with his sons Sheba שֶׁבָּא and Dedan
דִּדָן, are all to be found in southern Arabia,
and are derived in other passages from a differ-
ent ancestry (see Art. *Arabia*). 5) *Sabtecha*,
סַבְתְּכָה, on the eastern side of the Persian
Gulf, in Carmania. 6) As last son of Cush,
Nimrod is mentioned Gen. 10 : 8, who established
his empire in Mesopotamia. For his connection
with the Cushites, see Art. *Nimrod*. North of
the Ethiopians dwelt the Egyptians. *Mizraim*,
מִצְרַיִם, from whom are the Egyptians (Gen.
10 : 12), is mentioned (v. 7) as the second son
of Ham; concerning him, his sons (v. 12, &c.),
sufficient has been said above (see *Abyssinia*,
&c.). His third son, also mentioned in the cata-
logue of nations, was Phut, פּוּט, from whom
an African people, the Libyans, are descended,
who dwelt westward from Egypt, through the
whole of northern Africa, and are the ancestors
of the Berber tribes—not to be confounded with
the Egyptian Libyans, לִיבְיִים or לִיבְיָיִם, who
constitute only a part of the Libyan nation.

To the west Palestine is bordered by the
Mediterranean Sea, the great sea, יַם הַיָּבֵשׁ,
(Deut. 34 : 6, &c.; Josh. 1 : 4; Ezek. 47 : 10);
also called the hinder, i. e., Western sea,
יַם הַיָּבֵשׁ הַחֲדָרִי, (Deut. 11 : 24; Zach. 14 : 8);
sea of the Philistines, יַם הַפְּלִשְׁתִּים, (Exod.
23 : 31); also, merely the sea, יָם, (Josh.
19 : 26), as in the Apocrypha and the New
Test. ἡ θάλασσα (1 Macc. 14 : 34; 15 : 11; Acts
10 : 6, 32. Of its several divisions, the Adriatic
sea, ὁ Ἀδριακός, alone is named (Acts 27 : 27).
Of the islands of the Mediterranean, designated
by the general name: "Islands of the Sea"
יְהִי יָם, *νησοὶ τῆς θαλάσσης* (Isa. 11 : 11;
1 Macc. 6 : 29, 15); "islands of the heathen"
יְהִי יָם (Gen. 10 : 15; Zeph. 2 : 11) are
especially named: *Samothrace* (Acts 16 : 11);
Patmos (Rev. 1 : 9); *Lesbos* (Acts 20 : 14);
Chios (Acts 20 : 15); *Samos* (1 Macc. 15 : 23;
Acts 20 : 15); *Delos* (1 Macc. 15 : 23); *Kos*
(1 Macc. 15 : 23; Acts 21 : 1); *Rhodes* (1 Macc.
15 : 23; Acts 21 : 1); *Crete* (1 Macc. 10 : 67;
15 : 23; Acts 27 : 12; Tit. 1 : 5), at the southern

point of which was situated the little island *Κλαύδη*, mentioned in Acts 27 : 16; Malta, *Μελίτη*, Acts 28 : 1, and Sicily, or at least its capital Syracuse, Acts 28 : 12. Of the countries of Western Europe, whose mention is next connected with that of the Mediterranean sea, the ancient Hebrews had an imperfect idea. In the register of nations (Gen. 10) we find the natives which inhabited the *אִיֵּי הַגִּימָּוֹת*, v. 5 (islands of the Gimmims) there recorded as the descendants of Japheth, 2-4. The proper exposition of these names is still involved in much uncertainty, the most light having lately been thrown on the subject by Tuch, and especially Knobel's ingenious investigations. As the first son of Japheth, 1) *Gomer* *גֹּמֶר* is indicated, i. e., according to the general acceptation, the *Κυμμέριαι* in the Black sea and the sea of Azoph, from whence they were driven further westward by the Scythians, and they appear next upon the British peninsula in North-Germany and North-Ireland, as the *Κίμβροι*, Cimbri (see Art. *Cimbri*). Gomers descendants are a) *Ashkenas* *אֲשְׁכְנַז*, whom Knobel recognizes the ancient Germans, the race of the Asi or Asæ, divinities (*אֲשֵׁנָה*, As god). *אֲשֵׁנָה* gens, genus), but Tuch, because in Jer. 51 : 27, they seem to be connected with Ararat and Minni, finds in them a people dwelling near Armenia, on the borders of the Black and the Caspian seas. Notwithstanding the dazzling glitter of Knobel's supposition, I feel inclined to adopt the other view; for such an accurate and detailed knowledge of the European races, as Knobel here takes for granted, in the author of the Register of races (Gen. 10), seems scarcely admissible, and that in the explanation of these names we are not directed merely to Europe and Northern Asia, is sufficiently clear from the names Togarmah and Madai. b) *Riphat* *רִפְתָּ*, reminding one of the *Ῥίφα* *Ῥίφα*, *Riphæi montes*, which, in the geography of the ancients, bordered the northern rim of the earth and extended from the West of Europe over the Caspian sea into Asia; Knobel refers especially to the Celts, who immigrated over the Carpathian mountains into Western Europe. c) *Togarmah*, *תֹּגַרְמָה*, the Armenians (comp. Ezek. 27 : 14; 28 : 6), and, according to Knobel, connected with the Phrygians. 2) *Magog*, *מָגוֹג*, is the second son of Japheth, the ancestor of the Scythians (see Art. *Gog* and *Magog*); 3) *Javan* *יָוָן*, the Greeks, Ionians, *Ἰάονες*. The sons of Javan are a) *Elishah* *אֵלִישָׁה*, according to Tuch the Greeks of Europe, as the name would remind of Hellas or Elis; according to Knobel, the Aeolians. b) *Tarshish* *תַּרְשִׁישׁ*, according to Tuch, Tartessus, the distant land of the West; according to Knobel the Tyrrhenians *Τυρρῆναι*, *Τυρῆναι* or Etruscans. c) *Kittim* *כִּיִּתִּים*, according to Tuch the Cyprians (see Article *Cyprians*), according to Knobel the Libyans on the islands between Greece and Asia. d) *Dodanim* *דּוֹדָנִים*, according to Tuch, in accordance with the reading of 1 Chron. 1 : 7,

דּוֹדָנִים, the Rhodians; according to Knobel the Dardanians, as the representatives of the Illyrians, of the whole North-Grecian race (see *Dodanim*). The fourth and fifth sons of Japheth, *Tubal*, *תּוֹבַל*, and *Meshech*, *מֶשֶׁח*, occur almost exclusively in connection; they are the Tibarenians and Muscovians, who appear, according to Knobel, in Western Europe, as the Iberians and Ligurians. 6) *Tiras*, *תִּירָס*, finally, indicates, according to usual acceptation, which Knobel here also follows, the Thracians, and, according to Tuch, the Tyrrhenians. — Whilst thus ancient times afford us only that which is most general, and that in uncertain outlines and confused conceptions, isolated countries of the West, and above all Greece, rise before us in clear light. To the ancients the Greeks are known only in general as Ionians, and these at most in individual tribes, and as a commercial people (Isa. 66 : 19; Ezek. 27 : 13; Joel 3 : 4). Only after the captivity were the Greeks known to the Hebrews, especially after Alexander the Great secured the closer contact of the Occident with the Orient. He is that "King of Grecia" *מֶלֶךְ יוֹן* (Dan. 8 : 21), who brought the Persian monarchy to an end, (1 Macc. 1 : 1-8; 6 : 2; comp. Dan. 2 : 32, 33; 7 : 7, &c., and who, on his march to or from Egypt, came to Jerusalem and treated the Jews in an honorable manner (Jos. Ant., XI., 8, 5). Under his successors, the Ptolomies of Egypt and Seleucidæ of Syria, the Jews were brought into continually closer contact with Greeks, so that the influence of Grecian affairs even threatened, for a time, the entire suppression of the patriarchal faith and customs; as a reaction against which tendency the Maccabees arose. Hence the Greeks first appear under their own proper name *Ἕλληνες* in the Apocryphal books (1 Macc. 8 : 18; 2 Macc. 4 : 36, and so in the New Testament, in Acts 18 : 17; 19 : 17; Romans 1 : 14; 1 Cor. 1 : 24; Galatians 3 : 28; Col. 3 : 11, where they mostly appear over against the Jews and Barbarians, as the representatives of refined heathenism. Of the isolated portions of Greece named in the Bible, are 1) *Illyricum*, west of Macedonia, Rom. 15 : 19; 2) *Macedonia*, Rom. 15 : 26; 2 Cor. 9 : 2; 1 Thes. 1 : 8, where Paul planted Christianity, Acts 16 : 9; 20 : 1; comp. 1 Cor. 16 : 5; 2 Cor. 1 : 16, &c.; with the cities of *Philippi*, Acts 16 : 12, &c.; 1 Thes. 2 : 2; Philip. 1 : 7, &c.; *Neapolis*, Acts 16 : 11; *Apollonia*, Acts 17 : 1; and *Berea*, Acts 17 : 10. Greece proper, *Ἑλλάς*, is distinguished, Acts 20 : 1, 2, from Macedonia. *Achaia*, including Hellas and the Peloponnessus, is mentioned, Acts 18 : 12; 19 : 21; Rom. 15 : 26; 1 Thes. 1 : 7; 2 Cor. 9 : 2; see Part I., p. 95. Of Greek cities are mentioned, *Athens*, 2 Macc. 9 : 15; Acts 17 : 16; 1 Thes. 3 : 1; *Corinth*, Acts 18 : 1, and in the Epistle to the Cor.; *Sicyon*, 1 Macc. 15 : 23; *Sparta* or *Lacedæmon*, 1 Macc. 12 : 6, 8; 14 : 6; 2 Macc. 5 : 9. *Italy* is mentioned in the accounts of Paul's travels, Acts 18 : 2; 27 : 1, 6; and in Heb. 13 : 24. *Rome* and the *Romans* are mentioned first in 1 Macc. 8 : 1, &c. (see Art. *Rome*). Of Italian cities, Paul touched

on his way to Rome (Acts 28), at Rhegium, Puteoli, Apii Forum (see respect. Arts.), and Tres Tabernæ (three taverns); also at the islands of Malta and Sicily, with its capital, Syracuse. Further westward, the Bible only mentions Tarshish, **תַּרְשִׁישׁ**, Tartessus of the Greeks, the southwestern portion of the Pyrenees peninsula, as the farthest, rather indistinct land of the West (see Art.).

To the North, Phœnicia and Syria border on Palestine, the latter being sometimes included under the name Aram (see Article Aram). Northeast of Syrian Aram, beyond Assyria, on the southern declivity of the Gordisean mountains, we have the ancient *Arphaxad*, the proper domicile of the Hebrews (see Art. *Arphaxad*); adjoining which we have, on the north, the highland of *Armenia*, which, however, never appears in the Bible under its own proper name, its different parts only being named. These are

1) *Togarmah*, **תֹּגַרְמָה** (Gen. 10 : 3; 1 Chron. 1 : 6; Ezek. 27 : 14; 38 : 6). The interpretation of this of Armenia is confirmed by the native tradition of the Armenians and Georgians, according to which they trace their descent from Thorgom as their ancestor, and call themselves the "house of Thorgom," precisely as **בֵּית תֹּרְגֹמָה**, Ezek., and other places. See *Gesen.*

thes. and the word itself, p. 1493. *Rosenmüller*, *Altherthumsk.* I., 1, p. 252. 2) *Ararat* **אַרְרָט** (2 Kings 19 : 37; Isa. 37 : 38; Jer. 51 : 27), which is central Armenia, upon whose mountains, **אַרְרָטִי**, the Ark rested (Gen. 8 : 4).

3) *Minni*, **מִנִּי**, stands, in Jer. 51 : 27, in connection with Ararat, and is the country *Minnæ* of *Nicol. Damasc.*, *Joseph. Ant.* I., 3, 6.—Westward of Aram is *Asia Minor*, which comes to view less in the Heb. O. T. than in the apocryphal books and in the N. T. In the former it appears at most as the abode of several tribes belonging to the Japhetite race, as the *Phrygians*, whom Knobel understands under *Togarmah*; the Asiatic Greeks, included under **יָוָן**; the Carians (**כָּרִי**), and others. In the N. T.,

Asia Minor is simply designated as *Asia* (Acts 2 : 9; 6 : 9; 1 Cor. 16 : 19; 1 Pet. 1 : 1; Rev. 1 : 4, 11), which name has a more extended significance in the Macc., since there it denotes the whole Syro-Seleucidian kingdom (1 Macc. 8 : 6, 8; 12 : 39; 2 Macc. 3 : 3; 11 : 13). The Greeks divide *Asia Minor* into different provinces, which are also mostly mentioned in the Bible. On the Black Sea is 1) *Pontus* (Acts 2 : 9; 1 Pet. 1 : 1), the native country of *Aquila* (Acts 18 : 2; see Art. *Aquila*), containing the city **Σαυδάκη**, or **Σαυδάμη**, (1 Macc. 15 : 23). 2) *Paphlagonia*. 3) *Bithynia* (Acts 16 : 7; see Art. *Bithynia*). In the west, on the *Ægean Sea*, is: 4) *Mysia* (Acts 16 : 7, &c.), with the cities of *Troas* (Acts 16 : 8, 11; 20 : 5; 2 Cor. 2 : 12; 2 Tim. 4 : 13), *Assos* (Acts 20 : 13, 14), *Pergamos* (Rev. 1 : 11; 2 : 12); 5) *Lydia* (1 Macc. 8 : 8), whose inhabitants are perhaps the **לֵדִי** of Gen. 10 : 22, with

the cities: *Thyatira* (Acts 16 : 14; Rev. 1 : 11, &c.), *Sardis*, the capital (Rev. 1 : 11; 3 : 1-6), and *Philadelphia* (Rev. 1 : 11; 3 : 7, &c.); 6) *Ionia* (1 Macc. 8 : 8), with the cities, *Smyrna* (Rev. 1 : 11), *Ephesus* (Acts 18 : 19-21; 19 : 1; 1 Tim. 1 : 3; Epistle to the Ephesians; Rev. 1 : 11; 2 : 1-7; see Article *Ephesus*), *Trogylium* (Acts 20 : 15), *Miletus* (Acts 20 : 15, 17; 2 Tim. 4 : 20). On the south-western point of *Asia Minor* is situated 7) *Caria*, with its capital, *Halicarnassus* (1 Macc. 15 : 23). Three provinces are situated on the southern coast: 8) *Lycia* (1 Macc. 15 : 23; Acts 27 : 5), with the cities: *Putara* (Acts 21 : 1), *Myra* (Acts 27 : 5), *Phaselis* (1 Macc. 15 : 23); 9) *Pamphylia* (Acts 2 : 10; 14 : 24, &c.), with the cities: *Attalia* (Acts 14 : 25), *Perga* (Acts 13 : 13; 14 : 25), and *Side* (**Σίδη**), (1 Macc. 15 : 23); 10) *Cilicia* (*Jadith* 2 : 25; 1 Macc. 11 : 14; 2 Macc. 4 : 30, &c.; Acts 15 : 23, 41; 27 : 5; Gal. 1 : 21; see Art. *Cilicia*), with its capital, *Tarsus*, the birthplace of the Apostle Paul (Acts 9 : 11; 11 : 25, &c.), and *Mallos* (2 Macc. 4 : 30). In the interior are situated, north of *Pamphylia*: 11) *Pisidia*, with the city of *Antioch* (Acts 13 : 14, &c.; 14 : 24, 2 Tim. 3 : 11); 12) *Cappadocia*, between *Cilicia* and *Pontus* (1 Pet. 1 : 1); 13) *Lycaonia*, east of *Cappadocia* (Acts 14 : 11), with the capital, *Iconium* (Acts 13 : 51; 14 : 1), *Lystra* and *Derbe* (Acts 14 : 6; 16 : 1, 2; 2 Tim. 3 : 11); 14) *Phrygia*, eastward from *Mysia* and *Lydia* (Acts 16 : 6; 18 : 23), with the cities of *Hierapolis* (Col. 4 : 13), *Colossa* (Epistle to the Col.), and *Laodicea* (1 Tim. 6 : 22; Rev. 1 : 11; 3 : 14); 15) *Galatia*, between *Cappadocia*, *Pontus*, *Paphlagonia*, *Bithynia*, and *Phrygia* (Acts 16 : 6; 18 : 23; 1 Pet. 1 : 1; 1 Cor. 16 : 1; 2 Tim. 4 : 10; Epist. to Gal.). The proper North of the Bible, whose name **צָפוֹן** (see above), already indicates

the limited knowledge the Hebrews had of it, is inhabited by nations which likewise belong to the Japhetite tribe, and with whose names we have already become familiar, as *Riphat*, *Gomer*, *Ashkenas*, *Gog* and *Magog* (the *Scythians*, Col. 3 : 11), *Meshech*, and *Tubal*. Add to this, *Rosh* **רֹשׁ** (Ezekiel 38 : 2, 3; 39 : 1), a people of the North under the dominion of *Gog*, which is named besides *Meshech* and *Tubal*, and which are perhaps the ancestors of the Russians (see *Gesen. thesaur.*, and the word, p. 1253). Most of these people dwell along the Black Sea and the Caucasus. That the North, being so little known, should also be regarded as the land of Wonders, is easily conceivable; and upon this principle it is to be explained. The Godhead is described as appearing in the North (Ezek. 1 : 4; Job 37 : 22); as also *Isaiah* 14 : 13, reminds of the mountain of the gods, which, according to ancient oriental conceptions, existed in the North (comp. *Gesenius* Von dem Götterberg im Norden, nach den Mythen der asiatischen Völker, first supplement to his Comm. on *Isaiah*, Part II., p. 316, &c.). In answer to the inquiry whence the Israelites had this geographical knowledge, it may be said, that they derived it partly from their own observation and contact with other nations, partly, especially concerning distant lands, with which an immediate contact was not easily pos-

ible, from the Phœnicians and also from the Egyptians (compare *Delitzsch*, Comment. on Gen., p. 282).

Among the works treating especially of biblical geography, exclusive of works on biblical archæology in general, and hence also treating of biblical geography (see Art. *Archæology*), and exclusive of works on Palestine itself, and which will be mentioned more fully in the Art. under that head, we mention the following: *Eusebii monasticum urbium et locorum SS. græce cum lat. vers. Hieron. op. Jac. Bonfrerii* (Par. 1659, fol.) *rec. et. animadverss. suis auxit Jo. Clericus*: Amstel. 1707, fol. (also in *Ugolini thesaur. antiquit. sacrr.* Tom. V.). The same work constitutes one volume of: *N. Sanson, Geographia Sacra ex V. et N. T. desumpta et in tabl. 4 concinnata*: Amstel. 1704, &c. fol. — *Sam. Bochart, Geographia Sacra cujus P. I. Phaleg dispersione gentium et terrar. divis.*; P. 2. *Canaan de coloniis et sermone Phœnicum agit.* Cadom. 1646, fol.: Lugd. Bat. 1692, 1707, fol.: Francof. ad M. 1674, 4to. As supplementary are to be considered: *J. D. Michaelis, Spicilegium geographiæ Hebræorum exteræ post Bochartum*: Gotting. 1769–70, 2 Tom., and *J. Reinhold Forster, Epistolæ ad J. D. Michaelis, hujus spicil. geogr. Hebræor. exteræ jam confirmantes jam castigantes* (ed. *J. D. Michaelis*), Gotting. 1772, 4to. *Bochart's* work is, in its first part, properly only a commentary on the ethnological tables (Gen. 10), to which we here add the later treatises on this important chapter: *Beke, Origines bibliæ, or Researches in Primeval History*: London, 1834. *Feldhoff, die Völkertafel der Genesis in ihrer universalhist. Bedeutung*: Elberfeld, 1837, 8vo. *Krücke, Erklärung der Völkertafel im ersten Buch Moses*: Bonn, 1837. *Joseph v. Görres, die Japhetiden und ihr Auszug aus Armenien*: München, 1845. *Knobel, die Völkertafel der Genesis. Ethnographische Untersuchungen*: Giessen, 1850, 8vo.; which last work, together with the researches of Tuch, in his: *Kommentar über die Genesis*: Halle, 1838, eclipses all former attempts at interpretation. *F. Spanheim, introduct. ad. geogr. sacram, patriarchalem israeliticam et christianam*: Lugd. Bat. 1679, 8vo.: Francof. 1698, 4to. *Jac. Schmidt, Biblischer Geographus*, 1740. *Ed. Well, Sacred Geography*: London, 1708, 12mo. 5 vols., new ed. Lond. 1811, 4 vols. 8vo., in 1817, 3 vols. 8vo. Translation of the last, by Panzer: Nürnberg. 1765, 4 vols. 8vo. *Ysbrand van Hamelsfeld, Aardrijkkunde des Bijbels*: Amster. 1790, 8vo. German: *Y. v. H., Biblische Geographie, übers. mit Ammerk. von R. Jänisch*, Hamb. 1793–96, 3 vols. 8vo. (not completed). *Mansford, Dictionary of the Biblical Geography*: Lond. 1829. More popular treatises are those of *Frege, geogr. Handbuch bei Lesung der heil. Schrift*: Gotha, 1788–89, 2 vols.; *Löwisohn, Bibl. Geographie*: Wien, 1823; *Hornung, Handbuch zur Erläuterung der bibl. Gesch. und Geogr.*, 2 Aufl.: Lpz., 1826. Chartographical representations we have in the English Bible-Atlas of *Palmer*, published in London by *Weiland*, elucidated by *Ackermann*: Weimar, 1832; and *Kiepert*, Berlin, 2d edition, 1854.—For the purposes of biblical geography, as far as it constitutes a part of the ancient geography of the Greeks and Romans,

use may be made, in the corresponding parts, of *Cellarii, Notitia orbis antiqui s. geographia plenior.* (Lips., 1701, 3 Tom. 4), *c. observ. J. Chr. Schwarzii*: Lips., 1731, 2 Tom. 4to., together with *Append. triplex*: Lips., 1776, 4to.; *Mannert, Geographie der Griechen und Römer*: Nürnberg, 1788, &c., 8vo., Pt. I., 3te Aufl.: Leipz., 1829; the last vol., Pt. X., appeared Leipz., 1824. Here belong especially: Pts. IV.–VIII., X.—*Handbuch der alten Erdbeschreibung, nach Anleitung der d'Anvillischen Landkarten*: Nürnberg, 1785, &c. New improved edition by Heeren, Hummel, Brunn, and Paulus: Nürnberg, 1796–1800, 6 Bde.—*Forbiger, Alte Geographie*, 3 Bde.: Leipzig, 1842–48.

ARNOLD. — *J. H. Derr.*

George, St.—The legend in Metaphrastes tells us, that he was from a high family of Cappadocia. Having entered the Roman army, he arose under Diocletian to high honors; but resigned them when the emperor persecuted the Christians, protesting otherwise, also, against such injustice: wherefore he was beheaded Apr. 23 (?), about A. D. 303 (?), near Nicomedia (?). It is certain that very early veneration was paid, and chapels dedicated to him; this appears, as regards Gaul, from Gregory of Tours, and from the fact that Gregory the Great rebuilt a church which had been dedicated to him. After this simple, antique, and unique little church, the *St. Giorgio in velabro*, one of the cardinals is still named. A church in Constantinople, situated near the sea, gave the name "arm of St. George" to the Hellespont. The belief that St. G. was fighting for them, led the Crusaders, especially under Richard Cœur de Lion, to victory. The National Council of Oxford, in 1222, elevated his anniversary to an English national one. Under his patronage the Order of the Garter was instituted in 1330. He was represented in mail, and was regarded as the patron of the entire knighthood, especially of the Suabian and Venitian.—The acts of his life and martyrdom are evidently fictitious, for which Baronius makes the Arians in part responsible. Calvin denies the personal reality of St. G.; and there really are considerations in explanation of the myth. The dragon which he slays is regarded as a symbol of heathenism. But since the veneration of St. G. came twice from the East to the Germanic West, he may have originated from Mithras, the first light-spirit of Ormuzd, who slays the dragon of darkness. It is remarkable here, that Constantine the Great was a special patron of his worship: since he, even as Christian, venerated the sun, or light, as God, Christianizing thus the Mithras-mysteries of the Romans. This may have been the way in which the worship of the militant light-genius passed over from the Persians to their kindred, the knightly Germans. His early and deep veneration by the Armenians, Georgians, and Genoese, who carried on with the former nations an exclusive trade, also agrees with this supposition. REUCHLIN—*Reinecke.*

George, of Trapezus, was born in 1396, in Crete. He adopted this surname, because he supposed his family to have come from this city of Cappadocia; and perhaps, also, because he feared that the surname of Cretan would afford

a poor antecedent for literary respectability. In 1420 he came to Italy, and was teacher of rhetoric first at Venice, and afterwards at Rome. In opposition to the prevailing tendency, he adhered as warmly and decidedly to the Aristotelian philosophy, as he was passionately blinded against the Platonic; and was drawn in this way into a violent dispute with Bessarion, Pletho, and other learned Greeks, which degenerated into the most offensive personalities. By this course he lost the favor of P. Nicholas V., and would thus have been reduced to the utmost necessity, if King Alphonsus had not, through compassion, granted him a pension. A very doubtful tradition says that G., in the hope of a rich reward, had given to the Pope several important documents; but that, having received only 100 ducats, he had thrown the money into the Tiber, and become very sick through anger, from which he passed into a state of childishness. It is certain, however, that in old age he entirely lost his memory, and became childish. He died in 1486. Although extensive erudition and great skill in writing cannot be denied to G., it must nevertheless be admitted that in his translations of Greek authors, he was neither accurate nor faithful; in that of Eusebius he is guilty not only of interpolations, but also of gross distortions and perversions. His character was thoroughly disfigured with envenomed passions and bitter pride. By his disposition to traduce and depreciate others, he injured both himself and his friends. He was especially bitter against T. Gaza, who, like him, had translated into Latin the N. H. of Aristotle. Bessarion wrote his "*contra calumniatorem Platonis*" against him. His two works against the Greeks, on the procession of the H. S., are printed in the 1st vol. of the *Græcia orthodoxa* of Allatius. —(See BRUCKER, *hist. crit. philos.*, IV., p. 65.)

DR. PRESSEL—Reinecke.

George III., Prince of Anhalt, surnamed *the Godly*, is representative of a very important but not duly considered interest of the Reformation, viz., its ecclesiastical organization. He belonged to the line of Dessau, and was born at Dessau, Aug. 13, 1507. In his ninth year he lost his father, Prince Ernst, but his pious mother, Margaret, a duchess of Münsterberg, still survived until 1530, a blessing to him, his two brothers, and the entire province. In 1518, G. was appointed canon at Merseburg. In 1519, he visited the University of Leipzig, in order to study the civil and canonical law. M. Geo. Helt, of Pforzheim, was his teacher. In 1524, he was consecrated priest by his cousin Adolph, B. of Merseburg, and in 1525, he became subdeacon. In 1526 he was appointed by Albrecht, elector of Mayence, as Archb. of Magdeburg, provost at the cathedral of Magdeburg; he was also employed as counsellor by the officers of the cathedral, for which reason he abode for a time with the elector in the Moritzburg at Halle. Up to this time he had held with the utmost tenacity to the Rom. Church, and had zealously opposed the innovations of the Reformers. In order to fortify himself still more against the "new doctrine," he gave a thorough study to Ch. history and the Scriptures. But his studies only served to convince him that the

doctrine of Luther was Scriptural. Of this he gives an account in his defence, contained in his "Anzeigung an Herz. Georg v. Sachsen," and in the preface to his sermons on the false prophets. When, therefore, in 1530, his cousin, Wolfgang von Anhalt, subscribed the Augsb. Confession, G. hesitated no longer; his two brothers followed his example, and in 1534, the whole of Anhalt became Lutheran. Soon afterwards the Reformation found its way into the see of Merseburg; when, therefore, in 1544, its B. died, Maurice Duke of Saxony seized the occasion, as ruler of the country, to establish the proper distinction between the spiritual and secular government, as the *two sides of one see*. On June 24, 1544, George, at the request of Maurice, accepted the office of spiritual coadjutor of the see, whereas its secular administration was entrusted to Augustus, the brother of Maurice. But this was a mere temporary arrangement. As, in 1542, Nich. v. Amsdorf had been ordained by Luther as Bishop of Naumburg, so, in the present case, G. was ordained, Aug. 2, 1545, in the cathedral of Merseburg, by Luther, assisted by Melancthon and other clergymen, as bishop of the see. The secular authority having thus been separated from the episcopate, the latter became once more spiritual; and the two powers entered again upon their just relations, as the two arms of one body. In order to portray G. justly, it must be mentioned that at first he desired episcopal ordination from a bishop of the old kind, and had selected for this purpose Matthias v. Jagow, B. of Brandenburg, who in 1539 already had espoused the Reformation. But M. had died, and the bishops of Prussia were too far off. Under such circumstances he submitted at last, but with full confidence, to receive episcopal ordination from Luther, whom he called a *true* bishop, who truly fed the Church of God. A further consequence of this new arrangement was an evangelical *consistorium*, appointed by the secular administrator, but presided over by the bishop. The latter discharged his spiritual functions faithfully, and as a true priest; for he preached frequently, not only within his own see, but also in the territory of Anhalt. He submitted himself most conscientiously to the church visitations which he had instituted, as also to the synods which he convoked twice each year in his cathedral. Nor was he wanting in earnest exhortations and exhortations to his clergy. He was, besides, a zealous student of theological science, and was thoroughly acquainted with the Hebrew and Greek. He was fond of conversing with divines concerning single passages of the Scriptures, and their meaning, according to the original. At table, also, some portion of the Scriptures was always read aloud. His life accorded with these studies; he never forgot to do good, and to help others (Heb. 13:16). During the Smalcald war, George for a time maintained himself in Merseburg. But after the battle of Mühlberg he was driven out of his office by Michael Helding, or Sidonius, the newly-appointed R. C. bishop. In 1548-9 he attended the conferences of Jüterbog, Torgau, and Grimma, concerning the Augsb. Interim. Like Melancthon, he rejected

; for he preferred an honest, open war, to a elusive peace. He appealed also to the words of Christ: "I came not to send peace, but the word." And yet he was desirous of peace on proper terms, and therefore, with Melancthon, took a leading part in the Leipsic Interim. For this reason he was charged, though too hastily, with papist sympathies. But his days were ended. He died, in the midst of the adiaphoristic controversies, Oct. 17th, 1553, at the palace of Dessau. He had never married. Melancthon and Geo. Mejer preached his funeral discourses. Of his works, *Camerarius* published in 1555 his Synodical addresses in Latin, and Melancthon his German works. In 1741 these had reached the 7th edition. See: *Georg, der frommselige, Fürst zu Anhalt. Eine Charakterchild. aus dem Zeitalt. d. Reform. von JOACH. CAMERARIUS*; publ. in Lat. and Germ., with historical notes and explanations by W. SCHÜTZERT, 1854. BECKMANN'S *Hist. des Fürstenth. Anhalt* (Tom. V., p. 153-170; VI., p. 54-58), gives a full account of this princely bishop. D. I. A. ERHARD, *Ueberliefer. vaterl. Gesch.*, 1827. The letters of Luther to G., given in the Erlangen ed. of Luther's works.

GÖSCHEL. — *Reinecke*.

George v. Polenz was the first ordained Catholic bishop who espoused the evangelical cause. He descended from a noble family of Meissen, and was born in 1478. He studied, and became a licentiate of theology. At Rome he became private secretary of Julius II. He served Emperor Maximilian, also, on important embassies. Having entered the Order of Germ. Knights, he went to Prussia. When, in 1518, the Sambian bishopric became vacant, he was nominated to this see by the Grand Master, Albert, Margrave of Brandenburg, and regularly elected, confirmed, and instituted. His see was the first to adopt universally the Reformation. Already, in 1523, G. Schmidt, one of his canons, publicly preached evangelical doctrines. Soon after, J. Brisemann, a disciple of Luther and former Franciscan, was called from Wittenberg to Prussia; and preached, Sept. 24, 1523, the first evangelical sermon at Königsberg, where the bishop had opened to him his cathedral. The effect was surprising. Before the end of 1523, the bishop came publicly forward in the same sense. The stir was great. Jan. 15, 1524, the bishop issued for all the churches of Prussia the order, that hereafter the preaching and baptisms should be in the native language; and recommended, at the same time, Luther's Bible and writings. He promised, moreover, that thorough instructions should in future be given in the Lithuanian, Old Prussian, and Polish languages (see edict, in Luther's Works, ed. of Jena, IV., 62). Pope Clement IV. issued, Dec. 1, 1524, a mandate against him; whilst Luther wrote, Feb. 1, to the palatin: *Episcopus tandem unus Christo nomen dedit et evangelizat in Prussia, nempe Samiensis*. In 1525 Luther dedicated to him—*vere episcopo Samiensis ecclesie*—his commentary on Deuteronomy.—In 1525, also, after the Grand Master, Albert, had been recognized by the peace of Cracow as hereditary Duke of Prussia, George voluntarily renounced the secular government of his diocese. He was imitated by *Erhard von*

Vol. II.—25

Queiss, B. of Pomosania, the second evangelical Bishop. After this, G. resided at the palace of Balga, and was married. He died April 28, 1550, after a long life of usefulness. Several of his sermons are yet extant in print; others are preserved in MS. in the Archives of Königsberg. For a full account of him and the evangelical bishopric in the Duchy of Prussia, see NICOLOVIVS, *die bishöfl. Würde in Preuss. ev. Kirche*; Dr. J. FR. JACOBSON, *Gesch. der Quellen des ev. K.-Rechts der Prov. Preussen u. Posen*; JOH. VOIGT, *Gesch. Preuss. v. d. ältest. Zeit. bis zum Unterg. der Herrsch. d. deutschen Ritt.-Ord.*, 1827-39. GÖSCHEL.—*Reinecke*.

George, Margrave of Brandenburg, was one of the first confessors of the evangelical truth in the earliest times of the Reformation; whence, also, history has surnamed him the *Confessor*, or the *Pious*. He was the son of Margr. Frederick, the Elder, and was born at Onolzbach, March 4, 1484. As early as 1524 he avowed the Reformation of Luther, with whom he had a conversation in the following year at Wittenberg. In 1529, he attended the Diet of Spire; and boldly signed, April 19, the celebrated protest against the resolution of the majority. In 1530, he attended the Diet of Augsburg; was present, June 25, at the reading of the evangelical confession, which, also, he subscribed. On this occasion, also, he protested against participating in the festival of Corpus Christi, declaring to the emperor that he would rather lose his head, than deny his faith.—G. rendered meritorious services, also, in fully establishing in his country the Ch. constitution published by his brother Casimir in 1526; for, as he said to King Ferdinand, "since the bishops did not satisfy the demands of their office, it was incumbent upon him, as a Christian prince who was responsible for the temporal and eternal welfare of his subjects, to make provision for this interest." Thus originated the Brandenburg-Nuremberg Church constitution, and the liturgy belonging to it.—It is also said of G., that in regard to the name of Lutheran, applied in contempt to the adherents of the Augsburg Confession, he had remarked as follows: "I am not baptized in the name of Luther; I do not believe in him, and shall not be saved by him: in this sense I am not Lutheran. But if I am asked whether I with heart and lips confess the doctrine which God has restored to us by his instrument, Dr. Luther, I have no hesitation or fear to say, I am a Lutheran."—George died at Onolzbach, Dec. 17, 1543. For more extended information concerning his life and labors, see Dr. C. FR. PAULI, *Allgem. Preuss. Staats-Gesch.*, Vol. III., p. 457-476.—Also, BUCHHOLZ, *Gesch. der Kurmark Brandenb.*, Vol. III., pp. 217, 276, 296, 305-309; Luther's letters to him, as given in the Erlangen edition of L.'s works.

GÖSCHEL.—*Reinecke*.

George, Duke of Saxony, born Aug. 4, 1471, is known in the history of the Saxon Reformation as a violent opponent of Luther and the evangelical doctrines. He also oppressed and persecuted his own Protestant subjects. Seckendorf, in his *History of Lutheranism*, has collected many instances in which a confession of Protestantism was punished with imprison-

ment and exile. G. was tenacious of old and established usages; but he esteemed everything as old and established, which in the course of ages had collected around the old. In the restoration of the really ancient truth, which was active in the Reformation, he therefore saw only an innovation; between revolution and reaction he could not distinguish—a difference which is unknown to many of our own age. Of what importance the religious movement of his age was to him, is shown by his zealous interference in it. In 1519 he attended the Leipsic discussion between Dr. Eck and Carlstadt, and afterwards that between Eck and Luther. With this discussion the long-continued quarrel between G. and Luther commenced. We may see from it, how easily sin mixes up with the most righteous struggle. G. often complained against Luther to his cousin, the Elector of Saxony. The letter of Luther to the Elector, John the Constant, written July 29, 1531, is indicative of the position of these three men. Luther writes: "My dear Lord and friend, Dr. Brück, chancellor, has suggested in the name of His Highness, that I should hereafter, as far as conscience and doctrine permits, abstain from sharp words, especially as regards Duke G., in order that peace and concord may not be injured. I do not deny that Duke G. has occasion to complain; but that he may see that I too desire peace, and do not write my wicked books from mere presumption, I will give up and forget all, if Duke G. also hereafter leaves me at peace and furnishes no new offence; with this further condition, that I am free to resist if other papists do not keep peace with me," etc.—The bearing of this letter comes down to our own time and beyond it. Its inmost meaning is, that not the Reformation, but the wrong course of those who would neither themselves follow it, nor allow others to do so, caused the separation; of which, however, those complain most who will not see the still remaining elements of union. This was the position of G. with regard to the Reformation, on which account, partly, he has been unjustly defamed.—G.'s life was often deeply affected by successive deaths in his family, and these belong properly to a just portrayal of his character. Dec. 14, 1510, his brother Frederick died. This loss affected him sorely, as the brothers had loved each other most tenderly. Jan. 27, 1534, he lost his daughter Margaret; and Feb. 15, his beloved wife, Barbara of Poland. From this time he suffered his beard to grow, and is hence called the *Bearded*. Jan. 11, 1537, he lost John, his oldest son. The father comforted the dying son with the merits of Christ, to whom alone he should look; not to his own merits, nor to those of the saints. But when Elizabeth, the wife of John, asked, "My dear father, why do you not suffer this to be preached?" G. replied, "My dear daughter, this comfort must be offered only to the dying; for if the common people knew that we are saved by Christ alone, they would become too wicked, and entirely forgetful of good works." Feb. 26, 1539, he lost Frederick, his second son. George himself died April 17, following. The priest exhorted him to lay hold of Christ by faith alone; his dying words were, "Help me then, thou faithful Saviour, Jesus

Christ; have mercy upon me, and save me by thy bitter sufferings and death!"—With G.'s death, the Papacy also expired in his country; for Henry, his brother and successor, favored the Reformation. In the ducal library at Gotha there is in MS. a life of G. by *Spalatin*. A full account of him is given in "*Sächsische Merkwürdigkeiten*:" Leips., 1724, p. 681–704. See also, *Gottfr. Arnold*, Kirch.-u. Ketz. hist. Th. 2, B. XVI., ch. 7, § 2; ch. 8, § 23, 24; *Ch. G. Heinrich* mit *K. H. L. Pölitz*: Handb. der Sächs. Gesch., 1812 (Vol. II., p. 303–310). Also, Luther's letters to the duke, in the Erlangen ed. of L.'s works. *Göschel*.—*Reinecke*.

Georgius, R. of Laodicea, in Phrygia, born, educated, and admitted to the clergy at Alexandria, took part in the controversy which his Bishop, Alexander of Alexandria, had with the Arians; but shared the fate of all mediators between conflicting views—to be attacked by both parties. Having been excommunicated by Alexander for his leaning to Arianism, he was made Bishop by the Arians of Laodicea. Nor could he long be satisfied with the consequences of Arianism; hence, with Basil, Bishop of Ancyra, he established the party of '*Ὁμοούσιον*, *Semiariani*, who adopted the definitions already used by the Eusebians, that the Son was similar in essence to the Father. These party heads, with other bishops, assembled, about Easter, 358, in synod at Ancyra, published a full dogmatic-polemical writing, with the express design of establishing the essential similarity of the Son with the Father, as the specific Church doctrine concerning the Trinity. They affirm their desire for peace; but since Satan was always instigating innovations in the faith of the Church, they thought it necessary to define more closely the Catholic doctrine of the Holy Trinity, as expounded at Antioch, Sardica, and Sirmium. Since they deduced, from the idea of the Father and Son, and of their relation to each other, the essential similarity of the Son to the Father, they rejected all Arian positions which asserted the similarity to be merely in a moral, not physical sense, and, instead of a similarity, taught the very opposite. But, on the other hand, they set the idea of similarity in opposition with the Nicene homousia, since identity could not be deduced from similarity. They therefore expressly condemn as heretics, those who call the Father father of the Son in virtue of his power and essence, and at the same time say of the Son, that he is '*ὁμοούσιος* and *ταυτοούσιος* with the Father.—The Emp. Constantius was afterwards gained in favor of these resolutions; and at a third Synod of Sirmium (358), the creed of the second Synod was condemned, and the anathemas of Ancyra subscribed. Thus the rupture between Arians and Semiarrians was completed.—Besides minor essays and sermons mentioned by ancient authors, G. wrote a work against the Manichæans, and a life of Eusebius of Emesa.—(See NEANDER, Ch. H., I., 35, 60, 399; GIESLER, Eccl. H., I., § 81; MÜNSCHER, v. Köln, p. 222; BAUR, Trinitätslehre, I., p. 471).

Dr. Pressel.—*Reinecke*.

Gerar, in ancient times, capitol of a Philistine kingdom (Gen. 20 : 2; 26 : 1, 26), and situated on the southern border of Canaan (Gen.

10:19), not far from Kadesh, (Gen. 20:1; see 10:19; 2 Chron. 14:12). A watered valley in the neighborhood (Gen. 26:17) was known to *Sozom.*, *H. E.*, 6, 32; 9, 17, according to whom a very important monastery stood there, and among the signatures of the Council of Chalcedon, 451, p. 6, is found that of a Bishop of Gerar. The place must have been of considerable consequence, as it gave to the whole neighborhood the name of "Geraritica," "Saltus Gerariticus" (*Theodoret. quæst.*, 1, in II., *Paralip.*); *Robinson (Pal. I.*, p. 312; II., p. 647), was not able to find it, and regards the name as lost. Rowland first discovered, ten miles south by south-east from Gaza, in the present Djurf el Gerâr, a wide and deep Wady which runs from the south-east, and about the upper part of Gerar (now Kirbet-el-Gerar) receives the Wady es-Scheria from the west, the name and situation of the ancient town (see *Tuch*, in *l. Zeitschr. d. deutsch-morgenländ. Gesellsch.*, I., p. 175; *Knobel*, *Völkertaf. d. Genes.*, p. 216; *Ritter*, *Erdkunde*, XIV., p. 107, 915, 1084). With this agrees *Euseb.*, who locates Gerar 25 Roman miles from Eleutheropolis, and, to some extent, *Jerome* ad Gen. 22:3—three days' journey from Mount Sion. *Cyrill (Comm. in Ann.*, p. 299) erroneously identifies it with Beer-sheba; and *Synkell. (Chronogr.*, p. 100), and the *Versio Samarit.*, by a still greater mistake with Ascalon. RÜETSCH. — *Ermentrout.*

Gerhard, St., was born about 890 at Staves, diocese of Namur, of rich and noble parents, related to Hagano, Duke of Lower Austrasia. In his youth he served under Berengar, count of Namur. Whilst hunting with the latter, he retired for prayer to the chapel at Brogne, situated upon a rock near the village of St. Gerhard. Being weary, he fell asleep in it, and thought that he saw the apostles around him, and that St. Peter conducted him through the chapel. Having asked what all this meant, Peter told him that on the site of the chapel he should build a larger church in honor of St. Peter and Eugene the martyr, and that he should bring thither the bones of the latter. Gerhard obeyed, and built a church, and near it a monastery (918). Shortly afterwards Berengar sent him on business to Count Robert at Paris. Having accomplished his mission at Paris, he obtained permission from the Count and from Stephan, Bishop of Tongers, to become monk in the abbey of St. Denys. Having, in 928, become presbyter, he returned to Brogne in order to replace the secular clergy with Benedictine monks, of whom he was the superior. He carried with him the relics of Eugene and many other saints, which were given him at St. Denys. Soon the report spread of numerous miracles achieved at Brogne by the relics of St. Eugene, and Gerhard, in order to escape the large crowds of visitors, shut himself up in a cell near the church, in order to close his days here in quiet prayer. But he was often drawn out from this seclusion to reform monasteries. He was sent for to Flanders, to heal Count Arnulph of gravel. Duke Gisbert charged him with the introduction of the rule of Benedict into the degenerated monastery of St. Gislanus. He reformed besides this some eighteen other mo-

nasteries. Having labored in this way for 22 years with untiring diligence and without fear of man, and being held in the highest estimation among the monks, he went to Rome to obtain the papal blessing for his institutions and franchises for Brogne. Having returned, he once more performed a general visitation of his monasteries, appointed competent superiors, and died; accounts say, Oct. 3, 957. Many miracles are reported of his body. He was canonized by Innocent II. — (See *BOLLAND.*, ad 3 Oct.; *MABILL.*, *Acta ss. ord. s. Bened.*, V., p. 248, seq.).

DR. PRESSEL. — *Reinecke.*

Gerhard, John, the most learned among the heroes of Luth. orthodoxy, and, as regards his religious character, the most amiable among learned men, was born in the district of Quedlinburg, Oct. 17, 1582. In his 15th year he was taken with a severe illness, connected with deep melancholy; but he enjoyed at the time the spiritual aid of John Arndt, who induced him to promise that, in case of recovery, he would devote himself to the ministry. In 1599 he visited the univ. of Wittenberg. Being as yet undecided as to the department of science which he should choose, he prosecuted at first the preparatory philosophical course, attending at the same time a few theological lectures. A relative of his, Rauchbar, prochancellor of Saxony, persuaded him to study medicine, which he did for two years; but after the death of the former, he once more returned to the studies of his earlier vows. He now went to Jena, having obtained from his friend Arndt a course of theological studies. Here he made no particular use of the public theological lectures, but privately studied the Scriptures, the Fathers, and the Hebrew. Having obtained the degree of *Mag. Philos.*, he commenced at once to give private lectures on the branches mentioned; and, by special permission of the theological faculty, on theology also. At this time a severe sickness brought him to the verge of the grave; his will, written in 1503, evidences the humble piety which animated him at the time. He next visited Marburg, the theological faculty of which stood pre-eminent at the beginning of the 17th century. Here, it seems, he was first deeply influenced by theological teachers. *Winckelmann* and *Mentzer* were the chief celebrities of the then Lutheran Marburg. Gerhard not only heard their lectures, but enjoyed their hospitality and friendship, especially that of Mentzer. But after Landgrave Maurice had introduced the Reformed doctrines into Hesse-Cassel, and these teachers had removed to Hesse-Darmstadt, he became desirous of visiting another school. He preferred Rostock or Tübingen; but yielding to the wishes of his mother, he went to Jena, where he commenced to give theological lectures with much success. He left Jena reluctantly to accept the superintendency of Heldburg, to which he was urgently invited by Casimir, Duke of Coburg. Thus the great theologian was only in his 24th year, when he was vested with this clerical office, which was regarded as higher and more important than an academical professorship. Before he entered upon it, he also received the D. D. — The gifts which Gerhard had already displayed in his theoretical labors, charac-

terized his more practical ones also. A church-visitation accomplished under his direction is especially praised; a consequence of it was the church-constitution promulged in 1615. And yet he still entertained a lively desire for an academical situation. Two calls to Jena in 1610 and 1611, and one to Wittenberg in 1613, he had declined at the request of Casimir. But when in 1615 the seniorate of the faculty of Jena was once more vacant, the petition of the senate of Jena was so strongly enforced by George I., Elector of Saxony, that Casimir at last consented to dismiss Gerhard, with the expressed condition, however, that the latter should still give aid and council to the Church of Coburg. — Thus the great theologian found himself at last in the position which alone he regarded as his calling; and he devoted himself laboriously and untiringly to the duties of his office. But Gerhard's labors during this period extended also to the Church, and even to the State. The clergy of electoral and ducal Saxony had instituted ecclesiastical conferences, which, it was hoped, would in time become a supreme authoritative tribunal for the Lutheran Church. One of these was held in Jena, 1621; another in Leipsic, 1624; another in 1630. In all these the first voice was conceded to Gerhard. To many princes he was the oracle in matters the most diverse, both ecclesiastical and secular (see *Tholuck*, *Vorgeschichte des Rationalismus*, I., p. 66). His constitution was at the same time rather weak, and was further reduced by his numerous business journeys. He succumbed in the end, Aug. 20, 1637, in his 55th year; after he had accomplished an amount of work, for which in our own age two lives would scarcely suffice. — From his life, works, and correspondence, G. appears as a man of an unaffected, touching simplicity; of a warm affection, and a trust in God unshaken by even the fiercest trials; but also somewhat too cautious and fond of peace, so that at times he purchased peace at the expense of truth, and covered over sores of the Church which demanded the cautery. — As regards his services to theological science, there are, in the department of *doctrine*, two works, which have rendered his name immortal. The first is the "*Confessio catholica*," the design of which is expressed by its title: *Doctrina catholica et evangelica, quam ecclesiæ Augustanæ confessioni addictæ profitentur ex R. C. scriptorum suffragiis confirmata*, 1634, 37; some theologians regard this as Gerhard's best work. The second, and which chiefly established his fame as a theologian, is his "*loci communes theologici*." Some leading points in theology he treated more explicitly in his "*exegesis sive uberior explicatio articulorum*," etc., 1625. The proper position of this work with reference to its predecessors and successors has been pointed out by Gass in his *Gesch. der prot. Dogmat.*, I. p. 261 (see also *Tholuck*, *Geist der Wittenb. Theolog.*, p. 253). Gerhard's advance beyond Chemnitz and Hutter consists not so much in a more systematic arrangement, nor in a deeper speculative basis for his doctrines, or a more subtle formal development of them; as in an *erudite thoroughness*, *transparent clearness* and *comprehensiveness*. His *exegetical expositions* are of special import-

ance. This work gained admirers even among Catholics and Reformed. The latter reprinted it in folio, Geneva, 1639. An excellent, enlarged edition is that of Cotta, Tübing., 1762, in 22 vols. 4to. — But Gerhard's *exegetical services* are also very important. Their special merit consists in their patristic references, doctrinal precision, and generally lengthy exegetical tact. Here must be mentioned his "*Comm. in Harmon. hist. ev. de pass. et resurr. Chr.*," 1617, a continuation of the *Harm. ev.* commenced by M. Chemnitz, and continued by P. Lyser, and undertaken by Gerhard at the request of the clerical convention of Jena in 1621. The three works were then published as one, Hamburg, 1652, 3 vols., fol.; it is up to the present time the only complete commentary to the synoptic gospels. His other commentaries are less known, since they appeared posthumously and are somewhat meagre. In 1637 appeared his *Comm. in Genesis*; in 1658, in *Deuteronomium*; that on the Epistles of Peter (publ. in 1641) is very valuable for its erudition. At the desire of Duke Ernest, the Pious, he edited also the "*Weimar Bibelwerk*," a commentary for the laity, and contributed to it the parts on Genesis, Daniel, and the Apocalypse. — In Isagogics to theology his *methodus stud. theol.*, publ. in 1620, holds an important place. In the prominence which he assigns to the study of the Scriptures, he shows himself yet a disciple of the old theology of the Reformation. He also urges the necessity of a hearty piety, as also the practical nature of theological studies. — Among his devotional works, his *meditationes sacræ*, composed as student in 1606, has gained most favor. It is composed after Augustine, Bernard, and Luther, and has passed through innumerable editions. His sermons are free from the doctrinal subtleties and violations of taste which belong to his times; but are still too didactic and devoid of passion and enthusiasm, to make a lasting impression. — (See *via Joa. Gerhardi*, by Erdm. Rud. Fischer, 1723, a work which, as regards care and the employment of original sources, leaves little to be desired. *Tholuck*. — *Reinecke*.)

Gerhardt, Paul, was born about 1606, or 1607, at Grafenhainichen, in the electorate of Saxony, and died in 1676 as arch-deacon at Lubben, in the same country. We may safely call him the most gifted of all the Christian poets, who have ever been given to the Church; as the one in whom the poetic faculty is not merely one in connection with a number of others; but whose entire calling of the Head of the Church was, to teach the Church to sing the sweetest hymns. In Gerhardt, more than in any one else, all the requisites of this calling are found united; he is firmly rooted in objective Christian truth, the creed of the Church; has a genuine, but undistorted sympathy for everything purely human; depth of Christian feeling and suggestive thoughts; a fresh, healthy poetic glance into the life of nature no less than into the life of spirit; as also beauty of form, of which he is so thoroughly master, that whatever he says and however he says it, seems to every one as the most natural, popular and striking expression of the thought; and im-

resses itself upon the memory, whilst at the same time the laws of art, metre, and rhythm are observed with a fine tact. But though he did not discard recognized rules, he was yet independent and original; and it is due to the fresh fountain of poetry, which poured with original force from his bosom, that he was classed with none of the existing schools of poetry, but has been regarded as the head of a new class of poets, and the originator of an epoch in the history of Church hymns. For with Gerhardts spiritual poetry assumed a more subjective character, which subsequently degenerated into mysticism and rationalism, and became anti-churchly but with him remained in complete and undisturbed harmony with the subjective creed and doctrine of the Church. It is characteristic in this respect, that of his 120 hymns no less than 16 commence with "I;" and that 60 others refer only to God and the individual heart, among which however there are ten, which, as paraphrases of Psalms, are justified in maintaining this subjective tone. Many of his hymns, indeed, are designed to instruct and awaken; but even these turn as often to the human heart, as to the Church, or the world. In Gerhardts hymns, therefore, subjectivism is decidedly prevalent. But their subjectivism is only the concrete form in which the Christian faith, feelings and life express themselves through the individual; which form, however, must be and is common to all Christians in so far as they are a Church of Christ, a people of God. Hence what Gerhardtspeaks flows from his own heart and experience. There is another difference which separates him from both the poets of the Reformation, and from the later mystics and rationalists. Wackernagel finds it in their popular element; we would rather call it, notwithstanding the vagueness of the expression, the *human in general*, for which indeed Luther, like Gerhardts, had the same open, healthy sense; but which he, confining himself to the great deeds of God and the distresses and hopes of the Church, would not serve as poet. For even when Luther writes an infant hymn, his poetry pours from his bosom like the sounds of a trumpet. Gerhardts sings also of summer, harvest, journeys, marriage, the "gifted nightingale," the bees, the deer, the fawn, etc.; his heart and poetic sense embraced all with love and fervor. His views of nature, however, especially in its union with religious life, are thoroughly novel; injustice is done to neither side, and the religious element stands in most beautiful harmony with the natural; whilst the rationalists or semirationalists spoil the one by means of the other.—As regards metre Gerhardts generally adopted such as were already in use in the Church, though he seems also to be the author of several new ones. His versifications of Psalms are of inferior merit. He followed in them the Reformed, who merely reduced the Psalms to metre; whilst Luther made the substance of them his own, and then reproduced them in an entirely new form. Nor did Gerhardts, notwithstanding his fine æsthetic sense, escape entirely the bad taste of his age. Some of his interminable hymns, alliterative repetitions of words, etc., we would ascribe to the

taste of a past generation. The taste of a later age was not satisfied with amending real defects; but with the vandalism of illumination it trod down the most beautiful, delicate and fragrant flowers in Gerhardts garden, and substituted for them—dandelions. Our own age has shown its better historical sense in returning to Gerhardts unadulterated.—We must yet regard Gerhardts as a theologian. He did not, indeed, produce a system of theology; and yet the history of his dismissal from office at Berlin has reference to the theologian, and not to the poet. In the controversies with the Reformed, which occasioned this catastrophe, Gerhardts frequently published theses, rejoinders, etc.; which show him at home in theology, and skilled in answering objections, and in the use of controversial weapons. That these transactions were exceedingly unedifying, was not his fault; but it would seem unaccountable that he, the poet with the rich, pure mind, whose religion did not, like that of many before and after him, consist in doctrinal forms, not only did not abstain from those disputes, but was even one of the most uncompromising enemies of the Reformed. The Elector of Brandenburg had demanded nothing of the clergy, except that they would sign a pledge that they would discontinue their scurrilous attacks upon each other; all controversy was not forbidden, but only moderation and courtesy demanded. But even in this an exception was made in favor of Gerhardts; for it was signified to him merely in words, that it was hoped that he would of his own accord act according to the edicts. Notwithstanding all this, Gerhardts resigned his office, supposing that by observing even this slight restriction he would violate his conscience. To us in our day it seems that the edicts restricted Gerhardts freedom of preaching no more than was already done by the natural decorum of the pulpit. It is clear that it was with G. an extreme conscientiousness, which made him tremble at every mere seeming approach towards the Reformed system. His age did not yet understand that in order to judge the position of others correctly, we must place ourselves upon it; this would have been regarded as indifferentism, if not a surrender of positive truth. But in his hymns Gerhardts held himself quite aloof from these matters; whence they had been received in the Reformed Church also with the greatest favor. There is only a single hymn in which one verse merely touches the doctrine of the Lord's Supper.

Of his personal career otherwise, we can only mention that in consequence of the wars he received his first appointment as late as 1651, his 45th year, as minister at Mittenwalde. In this year also he was married. In 1657 he was called to the church of St. Nicolai, at Berlin. In 1667 he was dismissed; and though this dismissal was taken back, he could not, on account of the above-mentioned demand of the Elector, make up his mind to return. He remained for a year at Berlin without employment; was then called as arch-deacon to Lübben, where he died in his 70th year. For other facts we must refer to his biographies.—Gerhardts published no complete edition of his

hymns. After 1649 they gradually found their way into Protestant hymn books. *J. G. Ebeling*, music-director in Gerhardt's church at Berlin, published them in 1667 with music composed by himself. Other editions followed by *B. Förtsch*: Berlin, 1676; *Feuerlein*: Nuremberg, 1682; *Feustking*: Zerbst, 1707; *Treuner*: Augsb., 1708. After this there were no complete editions published until 1821, by *Olshausen*, in Erlangen with *Lancizolle* in Berlin. They underwent many changes. A critically restored text has been published by *Schulz* and *Langbecker*, and lately by *Wackernagel* (Stuttg., 1843, '49, '55).—(See *ROTH*, *P. Gerhardt*, etc.: Lpz., 1829; *LANGBECKER*, *Leb. u. Lied. von P. G.*; Berl., 1841; *OTTO SCHULZ*, *P. G.'s geistl. Andachten*, etc.). *PALMER*.—*Reinecke*.

Gerhoch.—Born in Polling, near Weilheim, in the western part of Old Bavaria, towards the close of 11th cent.; studied at Polling, Mosburg, and Freysing; is said to have spent three years in finishing his education at Hildesheim, where, mixing in the controversy between Henry V. and Paschal II., he imbibed ultra-montane views. Leaving Augsburg, where Bishop Herrmann had made him cath. canon and teacher, on account of what he supposed to be simony and schism on the part of the Bishop, he retired to a cloister of Augustine canons in Raitenbuch. Peace concluded between Henry V. and Calixtus II., 1122, he again became in Augsburg *Magister scholarum* and *Doctor juvenum*. Desirous of leading a canonical life, and finding no place to practise it in, he paid a visit to Pope Honorius II., 1125 or 1126, to induce him to force those of Raitenbuch to observe the rules of Augustine. Bishop Kuno, of Regensburg, himself inclined to asceticism, elevated him to the priesthood, and placed him over the parish Cham. His enemies, however, frustrated his plans in this district; and his friend, the Archbishop Conrad I., of Salzburg, made him (1132) provost of the prebend St. Michael, in Reichersberg. Here he remained to the day of his death, nearly 38 years. His ultra-montanism, rigorism, and orthodoxy, brought him into perpetual collisions. He laid great stress on the *Vita canonica clericorum*; and deeply lamented that, through schismatic priests, consciences were disturbed, and honest souls deceived. In his opinion, such could not effectively dispense nor administer the Holy Communion. Theological controversies, however, called his energies into more active play. Educated in the post-carolinian mode of thought—that of Greg. the Great—he had no sympathy with Aristotle, and grieved to find himself surrounded with young men who were infected with the itch of disputation, ridiculed tradition, and were unwilling to rest on the authority of the Fathers. Fortified with the condemnation pronounced by the Church against Peter Abelard and Gilbert de la Porrée, he was bold enough to accuse of heresy the *Magister Sententiarum*. In his opposition to Adoptianism and Nestorianism, which sought to insinuate their poison into Rome and the Bavarian dioceses, he went so far as to affirm, in a Eutychian sense, the oneness and identity of the two natures in Christ, and to utter expressions such as: *in vero agno caput cum pedibus, Divi-*

nitas videlicet cum tota humanitate voratur. His enemies increased from day to day; but when the Pope issued a decree, 1164, against the neology of France, Gerhoch may be said to have achieved a triumph. He was a welcome visitor at the Papal court, which regarded him as a pillar to the Papal, orthodox party in southern Germany. Most celebrated is his reply to St. Bernard's work, *de consideratione*. To Eugene III. he dedicated an exposition of Ps. 64. Died 1169.—His writings, mentioned in the pref. to his Comment. on Psalms, pub. by B. Pez, as fifth part of *Thesaurus Anecdotorum*, 1728.

ALBRECHT VOGEL.—*Ermentrout*.

Gerizim (גֵּרִיזִים), the name of the highest peak (Jos., *Ant.*, 11, 8, 2) of the mountains of Ephraim. It rises perpendicularly about 800 feet out of the valley of Sichem, opposite to Mt. Ebal, between which two, in a valley about 1600 feet wide, lies the town of Sichem, the present Nâbulus (see the Art.; comp. Judges 9: 7; Jos., *Ant.*, 11, 8, 6). Gerizim, according to *Shubert* (*Reise in's Morgenld.*, III., p. 146) 2500, more exactly according to *Lynch* (*Expedition to the Jordan*, etc.) 2398 feet above the Mediterranean Sea, became important in the history of Israel, because, according to the arrangement, Deut. 11: 29, sq.; 27: 11–13, the blessing was pronounced upon the people from it, after the entrance into the promised land; whilst from the opposite, Ebal, the curse was thundered against all transgressors (Josh. 8: 30, sq.; Jos., *Ant.*, 4, 8, 44). The reason why the blessing and the curse were thus distributed, is scarcely to be found in the superior natural advantages which Gerizim had above Ebal (*Hamelveld*, *Bibl. Geogr.*, I., p. 371, sq.); for, according to the testimony of Robinson (*Pales.*, II., 275–80), both mountains are naked and unfruitful (comp. also *Maundrell's Travels*, p. 82). The reason of that arrangement lay rather in the condition of the camp, and the position of the 10 tribes at this time: at Ebal a copy of the law (Deut. 4–26), engraved on limestone tables, was erected in the valley, and an altar raised to commemorate the renewal of the covenant between Jehovah and Israel, and to receive the first thank-offering for the occupation of the land of promise; the priests stood at the altar, with their faces towards the East (Jos., *Ant.*, 4, 8, 44); on the left of these, at Ebal, six of the tribes; on the right, at Gerizim, the other six, and these evidently the most important and favored; these last, as standing on the favored *right* side of the altar, responded to the blessings spoken from the altar with amen, whilst the first six tribes answered and affirmed the curses (comp. *Keil*, *Comm. on Joshua*, p. 150, sq.). That a greater holiness did not at this time already attach to Gerizim above Ebal, is evident from this, that the altar was erected at Ebal (Deut. 27: 4, sq.), and not at Gerizim; and the curse was not pronounced upon the mountain, or upon those standing upon it, but upon transgressors of the law. But after the exile the Samaritans built a temple upon Gerizim, and established there a peculiar worship, for which they appealed to the ancient position of Sichem (see the Art.), especially to Deut. 11: 29; 27: 4, in which last pas-

age their version of the Pentateuch, through undeniable corruption, confounds Ebal with Jerizim, see *Gesenius, de Pentat. Samarit.*, p. 61. It may be, that already earlier a certain religious importance was attached to this mountain by the popular faith, which occasioned its selection by the Samaritans, even before they received the Pentateuch from the Jews at Jerusalem, which they then conformed to their faith and their customs (see 2 Macc. 6 : 2; Jos., *Ant.*, 11, 1, 2; 12, 5, 5; 13, 3, 4. Meanwhile, before 300 years passed away, this temple was destroyed by John Hyrcan, A. C. 129 (Jos., *Ant.*, 13, 9, 1; 9. J., 1, 2, 6); however, the mountain remained afterwards as before the holy place of worship for the Samaritans (John 4 : 20; Jos., *Ant.*, 18, 1, 1; B. J., 3, 7, 32); and still at the present day, the few remnants of this sect still living at Nâbulus, visit the holy mountain at the 4 yearly festivals, when not prevented by Turkish fanaticism. Robinson, who among others ascended his mountain, now called Djebel-el-Zôr, found the ruins of an enormous building, which the present Samaritans call el-Kûlah, the castle. Robinson ascribes these ruins to the Emperor Justinian.

Comp. the Art. *Samaritans*; *Reland*, dissert. miscell., I., no. 3; *Lightfoot*, *disquis. chorogr. ante ev. John*, cap. IV., § 3; v. *Lengerke*, *Kanaan*, p. 38, 641, sq.; *Ewald*, *Gesch. Isr.*, III., 2, p. 243, sq.; *Ritter's*, *Erdkunde*, XVI., p. 638 sq.

RÜETSCH.—Beck.

Gerlach, Otto Von.—Born 1801, in Berlin, of a noble Reformed family; having finished the study of law, he returned to his native city (1820), where, making the acquaintance of a circle of pious friends, his early religious impressions bloomed forth into rich fruit, and he again began his academic pursuits with the view of devoting himself to the Church. His practical bent not allowing him to rest satisfied as private tutor in Berlin—a situation the earnest solicitations of his friends induced him to accept (1828)—he became Pastor of the small church of St. Elizabeth. Here he devoted himself to the saving of souls with an energy so comprehensive, and a love so inventive in the art of doing good, that he deserves to be held forth a model for all preachers. Under his fostering care sprang into life missions in the family and in the Church, pastoral visits and prayers with the members, distribution of books, institutions for women and workingmen, service for children, private confession. In the midst of all these labors, he found time to participate in the Berlin mission. institutes for the heathen and other societies, in the interpretation of Scripture, and in literary enterprises.—G. nourished his soul by the perusal of Zinzendorf's and Spangenberg's lives, and the devotional works of Count Lynar and v. Bretschneider—books which at this period were in the hands of everybody. His early acquaintance, also, with English literature, added strength to his naturally active, practical spirit, and he may justly be called the *Wesley of the Berlin Church*. His first theological work was a translation of Wesley's sermon on "Awake, thou that sleepest, and Christ shall give thee light." He also had Richard Baxter's works published in German, and paid great at-

tention to missionary operations. Inheriting from his father a love of history, he took interest in every portion of the Church, and every phenomenon that befell her. *Church government*, also, enlisted his intensest energies, as is proved by his essay in *Tholuck's liter. Anzeiger*, 1832, "die Bearbeit. des K.-R. in der ev. K. mit besond. Rücks. auf K. F. Eichhorn's Grunds. des K.-R.," and a treatise, "K.-Rechtl. Unters. der Frage: Welches ist die Lehre u. das Recht der evang. K. in Bezug auf Ehescheid. Erl., 1839."—The great work of his life was *the increase of the means of grace by which the Church is first brought to the people*. To effect his object, the plans projected by the English and Scotch Churches offered him valuable auxiliaries; and he was sent to England by the reigning monarch, in the year 1842, to investigate them. This journey formed an epoch in his life. On his return, he published the "amtliche Bericht über die Entstehung u. Einricht. vieler neuer Kirch-und Pfarrsysteme in England mit Rücks. auf unsere kirchl. Zustände," "der amtl. Bericht über den Zustand der anglikan. K. in ihren verschiedenen Gliederungen im Jahre 1842," and the exceedingly practical and valuable treatise, "die Kirchliche Armenpflege," from the English of Dr. Chalmers, 1847.

Ger. had to endure the opposition of a spiritual bureaucracy, which regarded every deviation from ecclesiastical routine as a blow at Church order. One of the chief causes of offence was his refusal to marry such as had been illegally divorced.—His merit, hitherto obscured, was recognized by the present monarch. He was made a member of the Council in 1847, court and cathedral preacher, and *Prof. honorarius*. His days, however, were numbered. On his return from a tour for his health to Silesia, 1849, he ascended the pulpit contrary to the advice of his physician, and died three days after, Oct. 29, in the 49th year of his age.

Outside of Berlin, Ger. is best known by his "vollständige Auswahl der Hauptschriften Luthers mit histor. Anmerk., Einleitungen u. Register," 2. A. 24 Bände. 1848; and by his "h. S. nach Luther's Übersetz. mit Einleit. u. erklärend. Anmerk." Neue A. 6 B., 1847–53. The last work, the 4 vols. of Old Test. by Dr. Schmieder, in Wittenberg, is intended for the use of educated persons. In a work of such solid value, one cannot but regret that the style is not more animated, and better adapted to the capacity of the people—a fault, indeed, which the modest author acknowledges in his preface.

Sources: *Evang. K.-Zeit.*, 1849, nro. 101; *Schmieder in der Forts. des Bibelwerks* 4. Bd. 1. Abth.; *Seegemund*, *Vorrede zu den Predigten von O. v. Gerlach*, 1850.

THOLUCK.—*Ermentrout*.

Germain St. en Laye, the place where was concluded, August 8, 1570, the third religious peace with the Huguenots. Though they had sustained a defeat at the bloody battle near Moncontour (Oct. 3, 1569), the king determined on peace. The "eternal and irrevocable" decree of St. Germain contains the following Art.: "The Reformed shall enjoy perfect religious freedom, and have two places for Divine service

in each government, which is forbidden, however, at the court and six miles from it, at the *Prévôté* of Paris, and thirty miles round about this city. Nobles, to whom jurisdiction belongs, may have Reformed worship in their castles, with their families and subjects. The Hug. shall be eligible to office, nor burdened more heavily with taxes than the Catholics, and shall have, as places of refuge, the four towns La Rochelle, Montauban, Cognac and La Charité." To say that this peace was concluded only that at some future time the Hug. might be the more thoroughly annihilated, would be doing injustice to the parties concerned; though, when we take into consideration the hatred, the blood-thirstiness, and faithlessness of the king and queen, we cannot find fault with those evangelicals who distrusted it. Two years after, and the massacre of St. Bartholomew astonished the world (Aug. 24, 1572).—Comp. *Soldan*, *Gesch. des Prot. in Frankr.* II., p. 395; *Raumer*, *Gesch. Europ.*, Vol. II.; *Capefigue*, *la réforme et la ligue* (Paris, 1843), p. 308–313.

DR. PRESSEL.—*Ermentrout*.

Germanus, St., von Auxerre, born of a noble family, 380, at Auxerre, in Roman Gaul, studied law and rhetoric, and became a military commander-in-chief. The people and clergy selected him as successor of Bishop Amator, and he was consecrated July 7, 418. He now led a strictly ascetic life: rye bread was his food, and ashes, which he also sprinkled over the board of his bed. By his sermons, debates, and miracles, he achieved a victory over the Pelagians, who had infested the orthodox Church of England, while his military genius, aided by the Hallelujah of the Britons, repelled an invasion of the Picts and Scots. Having restored a dead person to life in Ravenna, he died in this city July 31, 448. His faith in relics was glorified by the great veneration paid his body, which was taken to Auxerre. The Church celebrates his memory July 26. From the tower of the very old church St. Germain l'Auxerrois, in Paris, which was profaned by a mob, 1831, was given the signal of Bartholomew's night.

REUCHLIN.—*Ermentrout*.

Germanus, St., of Paris, born about 496, near Autun, in Upper Burgundy, at first Abbot in this place, then Bishop of Paris. His asceticism of life was only equalled by his hospitality towards the poor, and his zeal in wresting from slavery prisoners taken in war. Distinguished also for his gift of prophecy. Aided by King Childebert, whom he miraculously delivered from a severe sickness, and by a Council at Paris, 557, he enforced strict discipline in the country, and extirpated many remains of heathenism. Against Charibert, the Frankish coregent in Paris, who had rejected his wife, and, during her life, married again, Germ. issued a bull of excommunication. He died May 28, 576, and was buried in St. Vincent's Church, which, re-consecrated (1163) after having been burnt by the Normans, and became celebrated under the name St. Germain des Pres. The cloister founded by him exercised civil authority till 17th cent., over that district of Paris called St. Germain.

REUCHLIN.—*Ermentrout*.

Gerrhenians (Γερρηνοί), mentioned in 2 Macc. 13 : 24, as residing opposite Ptolemais, yet as near as not to be very remote from it. With this corresponds the situation of Γέρρα, in Arabia Felix, on the Persian Sea; also that of a Γέρρα which Ptol. (5, 15, 26) locates in Batanæa. More correct, however, the *τὰ Γέρρα* (*Strabo* 16, 1760) of Grotius and Winer, between Pelusium and Rhinocolura. According to *Diod. Sic.*, 3, 42; *Strabo*, 16, 766, it was built by Babylonian exiles.

PRESSEL.—*Ermentrout*.

Gerson, Jean Charlier, called Gerson from his birth-place, a village in the diocese of Rheims, was born Dec. 14, 1363. His parents, who seem to have been wealthy country-people, gave their children a pious education. Four of his sisters and three of his brothers entered the service of the Church. He, the eldest, destined for the priesthood was sent, in 1377, to Paris, to the famous College of Navarre. After becoming a licentiate of arts in 1381, he pursued the study of theology for ten years under Peter d'Ailly and Gillas Deschamps. The great papal schism had already begun in 1378, and the general excitement extended to the younger clergy. While yet in his 19th year, he is said to have delivered a discourse on spiritual jurisdiction, in order to prove that he who exercised his office to the injury of those under his care, should be compelled to lay it down (*De jurisdict. spirituali*, 1382, Vol. II., P. II., p. 261, ed. of Dupin). In 1383 and 1384 Gerson was procurator of the Gallic nation at the University. His knowledge and talent had gained him so much respect, that, in 1387, he was added, although only a bachelor of theology, to the embassy, which the University sent to Avignon, in order to procure from Clement VII. a decision against John of Montson, who, because he rejected the dogma of the immaculate conception had been condemned by the Parisian doctors, and now appealed to the Pope. What Gerson saw at the papal court strengthened the deep impression, which the protracted confusion in the Church, and especially the wretched state of things in France, had made upon him; he gave free utterance to his sorrow in discourses delivered before the University after his return to Paris. In 1392 he was made Doctor of Theology, and succeeded d'Ailly as Chancellor of the Parisian University and Church. Soon after he obtained, through the favor of the Duke of Burgundy, the diaconate of Bruges in Flanders.

One main object of his life seems to have been the reformation of theology and morals. Preferring the mystic to the scholastic system in a Baccalaureate, 1388 (Vol. III., p. 1029), he insisted on an abandonment of the fine-spun theories of the latter, and, April 1, 1400 (Vol. I. pt. I., p. 120), inscribed to d'Ailly a circular, *de reformatione theologiae*, in which he lamented the degeneracy of the clergy and the lax discipline among the students whose morals were corrupted by the foul novels of the day (see his *Tractatus contra romantium de rosa*, May, 1402, Vol. III., p. 297). To the students of the college of Navarre he directed two letters on the best method of studying theology, on the choice of authors, and the worthlessness of scholastic disputations (Vol. I., pt. I., p. 106), and, 1402,

delivered several lectures against *vana curiositas in negotio fidei*. Although a nominalist and belonging rather to those who affirmed the *Universalia in re* than to those who placed them *post rem*, he sought to effect a reconciliation between the two parties. His system of mysticism was intended to supplant the dry book-knowledge of his time. Neither identifying the intelligence with the absolute Spirit, nor revelling in fanatical feelings, he never overstepped the boundary that divides the uncreated from the finite, and made use of the understanding to work into a scientific theory the experiences of the soul. Scholasticism was to be thus the form of mysticism, the object being, to use his own language, "*concordare theologiam mysticam cum nostra scholastica*." His system consists of two parts, the one, *de mystica theologia speculativa*, having to do with the capacities of the spirit in its relation to the mystic states, the other *de mystica theologia practica*, with the means to elevate oneself to contemplation. The first principle of his psychology was the nominalist maxim that the powers of the soul are simply different names of one and the same substance, distinct *non re sed nomine*, and may be reduced to two original capabilities, the *vis cognitiva* and the *vis affectiva*, the former of which divides itself into 1) *intelligentia simplex*, which receives immediately from God a certain, natural light and, by intuition, perceives as true the original principles; 2) *ratio*, the understanding in the modern sense; 3) *vis cognitiva sensualis*, the knowledge of senses, and the latter into 1) *Synæresis*, a natural, God-given impulse to the good; 2) *appetitus, rationalis*, will, freedom, desire, passion; 3) *appetitus sensualis*, excited by appeals, or representations to the senses. Sin has destroyed the harmony that originally obtained among all these powers; the object of mystic theology is to restore it. After the manner of Richard of St. Victor (*de contemplatione*) Gerson distinguishes three stages in the operation of the two capabilities above-mentioned: in the *vis cognitiva*, 1) the *cogitatio*, spontaneous direction of the soul to sensual objects; 2) *meditatio*, designed to attempt to investigate truth; 3) *contemplatio*, free gaze upon divine things; in the *vis affectiva*, 1) *libido*, desire; 2) *devotio*, piety; 3) *dilectio, ecstasica* and *anagogica*, love that aspires upward. In this contemplation of love consists mystical theology. Love is "*experimentalis Dei perceptio*," through it the eternal word is born in the soul and union with God effected. Gerson made it an essential point never to identify the Creator and the creature, and stood opposed to the Pantheism of Ambrich of Bena and his school, and of Ruysbrök (*Epistola ad Fr. Bartholomæum Carthusianum, super tertia parte libri J. Ruysbr. de ornatu spirit. nupt.*). The means for attaining to *dilectio* are ascetic. He laid little stress on visions. He wrote several treatises on the criteria of the ecstatic state: *de distinctione verarum visionum a falsis* (1398, Vol. I., Pt. I., p. 43), *de probatione spirituum* (1415, Vol. I., Pt. I., p. 37). Also, on the mystic life and contemplation, one of the most important, *de monte contemplationis* (Vol. III., Pt. II., p. 541). — He took as much interest in the improvement of ecclesiastical

order as in that of theology, as his conduct during the schism attests. Though at first disposed to regard as premature the action of the French National Synod, 1398, against Benedict XIII., he at last coincided with it; for, in his *protestatio super statum ecclesiæ* (about 1395), and *de modo habendi se tempore schismatis* (Vol. II., Pt. I., p. 1), he declared it better to resist both Popes than by excommunication to force the people to submit to one or the other (so, also, *de schismate*, 1396, and *de subtractione schismatis*, Vol. II., Pt. I., p. 7). The solicitations of friends restrained him from resigning his chancellorship (see *causæ propter quas cancellariam dimittere volebat*, Vol. IV., Pt. II., p. 725). After the flight of Benedict (March, 1403), he published *de schismate* (Vol. II., Pt. I., p. 17), and *de concilio generali unius obedientiæ*, in which he tried to prove that such a council had no authority to judge Benedict (Vol. II., Pt. I., p. 24; also *considerationes de restitutione obedientiæ Benedicto*, *ib.* p. 32). Benedict was again recognised by France, May, 1403. In the year 1407, he was appointed to the embassy to the two Popes, the object of which was to effect a reconciliation between them. Meanwhile he published several smaller treatises in which he called upon the clergy to be true to their duties, and advocated the necessity of an Œcumenical Council.—Appointed March, 1408, pastor of *S. Jean en Grève*, in Paris, he exercised his eminent eloquence and Christian charity in the delivery of sermons full of evangelical truth and devotion. Nor did he spare the vices of the court, but called upon the King to practise righteousness. At the Provincial Synod of Rheims, 1407, he enforced upon the clergy their duties, and upon bishops the necessity of frequent visitations (Vol. II., Pt. IV., 542).

On March 25, 1409, the Council of Pisa opened its sessions. Gerson and D'Ailly were the most important members of the commission sent by the University. G. had two months previously, in his *de unitate ecclesiæ*, stated his views touching the supremacy of Councils (B. II., Th. I., p. 113). The true head of the Church is Christ; the Pope is His vicar only in so far as he worthily represents the Church; the proper representative of the Church is a general Council, which, independent of the Pope, can depose him when unity demands such action. The Council, in fact, had to depose them both. The result was three Popes.—On his return to Paris he came into collision with the Mendicant monks, who had been favored with a Bull by Alexander V., and, at the same time, published several treatises on morals and psychology, of which may be mentioned *de vita spirituali animæ* (Vol. III., Pt. I., p. 1), *de passionibus animæ* (*ib.*, p. 128), *definitiones terminorum ad theologiam moralem pertinentium* (*ib.*, p. 107). Worthy of special notice is his *de modis uniendi ac reformandi Ecclesiam in concilio generali*, 1410, in the way of reply to *de difficultate reformationis in concilio universali*, by d'Ailly. In this treatise he places the Church above the Pope; in the former he distinguishes a general, spiritual Church, of which Christ is the sole head, and in which a person can be saved who holds neither of the contending Popes to be the true

one, and the latter, being a *peccator et peccabilis*, subject to the Divine law as any other Christian. Remarkable are these words: "*papatus non est sanctitas, nec facit hominem sanctum; locus non sanctificat hominem, sed homo locum; nec ornamenta papalia eum sanctum faciunt; imo tanto magis eum vituperant, quanto ejus vita mala apud homines est magis nota. . . . Ridiculum enim est dicere, quod unus homo mortalis dicat se potestatem habere in cælo et in terra ligandi et solvendi a peccatis, et quod ille sit filius perditionis, simoniacus, avarus, exactor, mendax, fornicator, superbus, pomposus, et peior quam diabolus.*" He suggested three methods for healing the schism: *via cessionis et renunciationis, via ejectionis et privationis, via coercionis*. If the three Popes yield not to the two first, "*tunc dolis, fraudibus, armis, violentia, potentia, promissionibus, donis et pecuniis, tandem carceribus, mortibus convenit sanctissimam unionem Ecclesiæ et conjunctionem quomodolibet procurare.*" In this tract is not only defended the older Gallican system, but a thorough reform urged upon the next Council.

The Council at length convened at Constance, Nov. 5, 1414. Its history is not in place here. Nothing special to record of the numerous speeches he delivered. We direct attention to his *de auferibilitate papæ ab Ecclesia*, in which G. shows that, though the idea of the Church as a hierarchy forbids the annihilation of the Papacy, a general Council can depose a Pope, and that it is the duty of every Christian to resist him when his commands contravene sound doctrine and justice, and to his *de potestate ecclesiastica et de origine juris et legum* (Feb. 6, 1417), and to *tractatus quomodo et an liceat in causis fidei a summo Pontifice appellare seu ejus judicium declinare* (1418), in which is affirmed that, as the Pope is not infallible, an appeal can be made, in matters of faith, to a general Council. —He protested against doctrines which came into conflict with the orthodox faith, as well as against immoral teachings. In several treatises denied the right of interpreting Scripture when not called to it by the Church; to which, indeed, he assigns the sole privilege of defining its meaning: *propositiones de sensu literalis sacre Scripturæ et de causis errantium*, 1413, *Tractatus de protestatione circa materiam fidei contra hæreses, diversas, Veritates quæ credendæ sint de necessitate salutis*, and the twelve *signa pertinaciæ hæreticæ*. In his *contra hæresim de communione laicorum sub utraque specie* (Aug. 20, 1417), he justifies the exclusion of the laity from the cup, and summons the civil authorities against all innovators. To the Council he submitted 19 articles, extracted from *de ecclesia* of Huss, which he declared *hæretici et ut tales judicialiter condemnandi*. Although a Catholic, G. condemned many abuses of mediæval piety, such as the frequent canonization of saints (*de probat. spirituum*, Vol. I., Pt. I., p. 37), the fanaticism of the Flagellantes (*contra sectam Flagell.*, etc., and *Epist. ad Vinc.*, Fer. Vol. II., Pt. IV., p. 658). During his exile, occasioned by the hatred of the Duke of Burgundy, G. composed four books, *de consolatione theologiæ* (Vol. I., Pt. I., p. 125), which discuss the four-fold comfort theology affords: "*per spem in contemplatione*

divini judicii, per scripturam in revelatione regiminis mundi, per patientiam in zeli moderatione, per doctrinam in conscientie serenatione," a sort of Evang. Harmony, *Monotessaron sive unum ex quatuor Evangeliiis*, Meditat. on passages from Mk, the poem *Josephinus*, in honor of St. Joseph (Vol. IV., Pt. II., p. 743). In order to spread more widely the festival of Joseph, he wrote several treatises concerning it (1413, 1416; *ib.*, p. 729).—After the assassination of the Duke of Burgundy (Sept. 10, 1419), G. returned to France, and settled in Lyons, where his brother officiated as Prior of the Celestines. The number of his writings, during his residence here, attests both his erudition and piety. Not necessary to mention all of them. Among the most important of his last works are those in which he recommends to the monks literary labors (Vol. III., Pt. V., p. 693), *Dialogus sophiæ et naturæ super celibatu sine castitate ecclesiasticorum* (Vol. II., Pt. IV., p. 617), *de concordia metaphysicæ cum logica* (1426, Vol. IV., Pt. II., p. 821), *Collectorium super Magnificat* (1427, Vol. IV., Pt. I., p. 231), an allegory on the Song of Solomon (1429, Vol. IV., Pt. I., p. 27), and *de parvulis ad Christum trahendis*.—At St. Paul's cloister, where the venerable chancellor spent his last days, he frequently assembled little children to instruct them in Christian doctrine and morals. At the approach of death, he gathered them around him once more, that they might pray with him: God of compassion, have pity on thy poor servant. He died July 12, 1429, in the 66th year of his age. So great was the veneration in which he was held, that the people dreamed of miracles done at his grave, and the French literati called him *Doctor Christianissimus*.

Editions of G.'s works: Cologne, 1483, 4 vols. fol.; Strasburg, 1488, 3 vols. fol., and 1489, 4to., by Geiler of Kaisersberg; a 4th vol., cont. sermons, added by Wimpfeling, 1502; the three first vol., also Basle, 1494, fol. These edit. very incomplete; also, that of Paris, 1521. Better that by E. Richer, Paris, 1606, 3 vols. fol. The most complete by Dupin, Antwerp, 1706, 5 vols. fol. On Gerson see: *Vita Gersonii*, in first vol. of Dupin's ed.—*Gersonis Vita*, in *Hardt's Hist. Conc. Const.*, Vol. I., Pt. IV., p. 26; *de Joh. Gersono*, von Launoi, in his *Hist. Gymn. Navarre*, Vol. IV. of his works, p. 514; *Ant. Pereira*, *Compendio da Vida de J. Gerson*: Lisbon, 1769, 2 vols. 12mo.; *Lécuy*, *Essai sur la vie de Gerson*: Paris, 1835, 2 vols. 8vo.; *Prosper Faugère*, *Eloge de Gerson*: Paris, 1838, 8vo.; *C. Schmidt*, *Essai sur Gerson*: Strasburg, 1839, 8vo.; *Thomassy*, *Jean Gerson*: Paris, 1843, 12mo.—On his mysticism: *Engelhardt, de Gersonio mystico*, 2 Pt.: Erlangen, 1823, 4to.; *Hundeshausen*, in *der Zeits. für hist. Theol.*, 1834, p. 79; *Liebnér*, in *den Studien u. Krit.*, 1835, p. 277; *Jourdain*, *Doctrina Gersonii de theol. myst.*: Paris, 1838, 8vo. C. SCHMIDT.—*Ermentrout*.

Geshuri, the name of three countries mentioned in the Old Test. 1) A province situated towards Egypt (Josh. 13 : 2), connected with Philistia; in 1 Sam. 27 : 8, with Amalekites. 2) A province in the country east of the Jordan (see Deut. 3 : 14; Josh. 13 : 11), in the time of the Romans called Isurea, in our day *Dschedur* in northern Persia and, according to *Burckhard*,

a part of that table-land which spreads from the base of the most southern part of the Dchebel el Scheikh and includes *Gaulanitis* and *Auranitis*. 3) A province in Syria, whose king gave a daughter in marriage to David (2 Sam. 3 : 3 ; 13 : 37 ; 15 : 8). **PRESSEL.** — *Ermentrout*.

Gethsemane (the best MSS. read Γεθσημανε'), near the Mount of Olives (Matt. 26 : 30 ; Luke 22 : 39), where our Lord prayed and was taken captive (Matt. 26 : 36 ; Mark 14 : 32). The

name, most probably, means *oil-press*, גֶּתְשֶׁמַנִּי (the Chaldaic from נִמְשָׁן, usually given on account of the ending נ, being incorrect, as the former word is not Aramaic). For other derivations, see *Reland*, p. 857. A tradition which reaches back to the time of Helena (mentioned by *Robinson*, I., 234) locates it on the west side of Olives, where, near the first bridge crossing the Cedron on the way from Stephen's-gate to the mountain, is an almost square piece of land enclosed by a common, low stone wall, within which stand eight very old olive-trees. In the south-eastern corner of the garden is still shown the stone at which Judas kissed our Saviour (see *Tischendorf*, *Reise*, II., p. 76). It is certain that in this neighborhood our Lord underwent his passion.

ARNOLD. — *Ermentrout*.

Gezer, a Canaanitish royal city (Josh. 10 : 33 ; 12 : 12), between Bethoron and the Mediterranean (16 : 3), on the south-western border of the tribe of Ephraim (1 Chron. 7 : 28), where the Canaanites maintained for a long time an independent kingdom between Israel and the Philistines (Josh. 16 : 10 ; Judges 1 : 29 ; *Studer*, p. 50 ; 1 Kings 9 : 16 ; 2 Sam. 5 : 25 ; comp. *Ewald*, *Gesch. Isr.*, II., 1, pp. 322, 561). Solomon, on obtaining possession of it through his Egyptian wife, whose father had burned it, rebuilt it, and, as its situation made it a principal fortress of the land (Jos. *Ant.*, 8, 6, 1 ; 1 Kings 9 : 15-17), fortified it. Named by Jos. *Ant.*, 5, 1, 22, in the Aramaic form, Γάζα, 8, 6, 1 ; 7, 4, 1 ; 7, 12, 2, Γάζα. According to *Ensebius* it lay about four Roman miles from Nikopolis, — Emmaus — modern Amwās (see *Article Emmaus* ; *Robinson*, II., 30, 232, and on Gezer, *Reland*, *Pal.*, p. 492, 809), about six miles northwest from Gibeon. — It must not be confounded with *Yazûr* (*Robinson*, II., 34) situated three miles east of Joppa, which is called Γάζα in *Macc.* (1 Macc. 4 : 17 ; 7 : 45) ; mentioned (1 Macc. 14 : 34 ; 15 : 28, 35) with Joppa, and located by *Strabo*, 16, p. 759, near the Mediterranean, between Joppa and Jamnia. Bakchides fortified it (1 Macc. 9 : 52), John Hyrcanus resided there (13 : 53). Simon, after having conquered it and cleansed from heathenism (14 : 7 ; 15 : 28 ; 16 : 1 ; 13 : 43 ; where, with Jos. *Ant.*, 13, 6, 7, Γάζα is to be read in place of Γάζα ; see *Ewald*, *Gesch. Isr.*, III., 2, p. 385 ; *GRIMM*, ad 1 Macc. p. 203, and ad 1 Macc. 4 : 15). Judas Macc. is said to have stormed it after a four days' siege (2 Macc. 10 : 32). — (See *RELAND*, *Paläst.*, p. 778, 867 ; *ROBINSON* ; and *RITTER*, *Erdk.* XVI., p. 127, who, however, is wrong in identifying it with 'Aṣṣ). **RÜETSCHI.** — *Ermentrout*.

Gibeah.—1) A town in the tribe of Benjamin (Judges 19 : 14 ; Hosea 5 : 8), birth-place and residence of Saul (1 Sam. 10 : 26 ; 15 : 34 ; 23 : 19 ; 26 : 1) ; according to Jos. *Ant.*, V., 2, 8, or *B. J.*, VI., 2, 1, twenty or thirty stadia from Jerusalem, and burnt on occasion of being attacked by the other tribes (Judges 20 : 40). The hill near Gibeah a holy place, because of an altar (1 Sam. 10 : 5 ; comp. 2 Sam. 21 : 6). 2) A town in the tribe of Judah (Josh. 15 : 57).

HERZOG. — *Ermentrout*.

Gibeon, one of the most important places inhabited by the Hivites (Josh. 9 : 7 ; 10 : 2 ; 11 : 19 ; see *Lengerke*, *Canaan*, I., p. 193), and head of a confederacy composed of four cities (Gibeon, Chephirah, Beeroth, and Kirjathjearim). For having obtained through craft a league with Israel (Josh. 9 : 1 ; c. 10 and 11), its inhabitants were condemned to be hewers of wood and drawers of water. As they may have been mingled with others belonging to the temple, no further mention is made of them (1 Chron. 9 : 2 ; Ezra 2 : 70 ; 8 : 17, 20 ; Neh. 7 : 73, 60 ; comp. 1 Kings 9 : 20 ; *Movers*, *Phönikier*, II., 1, p. 517). Five Amorite kings having undertaken to chastise them for their defection from the common cause, they met with a defeat at the hands of Joshua (Josh. c. 10). Later, out of zeal for national purity Saul enacted a massacre among them (Deut. 7 : 2, 24 ; Numb. 35 : 31), in atonement for which David had to hand over seven sons and uncles of Saul for crucifixion (2 Sam. 21 : 1). Near a ditch (Jer. 41 : 12) in the neighborhood of Gibeon took place a battle between David and Ishbosheth that resulted in the route of the latter (2 Sam. 2 : 12). For some time Gibeon, situate in the tribe of Benjamin (1 Chron. 8 : 29 ; Josh. 21 : 17), was the principal seat of worship where, even in David's time (1 Chron. 16 : 39 ; 21 : 29), were found the holy tabernacle and the altar of burnt-offering, and where the ark of the covenant had been transferred (*Thenius* on 1 Kings 1 : 33 ; *Bertheau* on 1 Chron. 5 : 30 ; 16 : 39).—According to *Robinson*, I., 454-7, it is identical with the modern village el Djib, about eight miles northwest from Jerusalem. There, too, is the ditch above-mentioned, 120 feet long and 100 broad. (See *BOHÄDDIN*, *Vita Salad.*, p. 243.) Though the ancient accounts do not exactly harmonize, yet there is little doubt of this being the Gibeon of the Old Test. — (See *RELAND*, *Pal.*, pp. 345, 491, 502, 446, 618, 811 ; *RITTER's Erdk.*, XVI., p. 104 ; XV., 1, p. 112 ; *EWALD*, *Gesch. Isr.* I., 281 ; II., p. 251 ; v. *LENGERKE*, *Ken.* I., p. 642).

RÜETSCHI. — *Ermentrout*.

Gideon, son of Joash of Ophrah, of the tribe of Manasseh (Judges 6 : 11, 24 ; comp. 34), was one of the most distinguished judges Israel possessed. The great lesson taught by his history is that God makes use of the humblest instruments for the welfare of his people to the end that the glory and grace of the work may be ascribed to him alone. A miraculous sign overcame the modesty of Gideon, who was chosen to be the deliverer of Israel (Judges 6 : 25 ; comp. Lev. 9 : 24). In remembrance of this event, he built an altar, and, in obedience to the divine command, overthrew that of Baal. For the

name Jerubbaal, as connected with that of G. (see Judges 6:32: 1 Sam. 12:11). On *Rochar's* (Opp. tom. 1, p. 774) combination of this word with ἱερόμπαλος (EUSEB., *præp. evang.*, I., 9) see HENGSTENBERG, *Beitr.*, II., p. 213; MOYER'S *Phönicien*, I., p. 128. — In opposition to the Midianites who again encamped in the plain Jesreel, in number, according to Judges 8:10, 135,000 men there gathered around Gideon his own family, his whole tribe Manasseh, and Asser, Sebulon, and Naphtali. For the meaning of the miracle which assured Gideon, see EWALD, *Gesch. Isr.*, II., p. 387, first edition. In order to show forth the power of God but 300 men were selected for the fight, who, breaking in upon the camp of the Midianites with trumpets and lights in pitchers (7:16), inflicted upon them a defeat (comp. 2 Chron. 20:23; Hagg. 2:22). (A monograph on Judges 7:16–20, — *exercitatio philol. theol. de artibus, quibus Gideon in debellandis hostibus est usus*, by J. G. Michaelis, in *Symb. litt. Brem.*, III., p. 249.) Two of the Midianite kings were slain, and the rest taken captive. — Touching the subsequent forty years of Gideon's judgeship, we have only a brief account. The royal dignity offered him by the people he declined, but established in Ophra a particular cultus which became a snare to his family and people. By the ephod, which Gideon made, is meant a sacerdotal gown (HENGSTENBERG, *Beitr.*, III., p. 97, and BERTHEAU, p. 133), adorned with much gold (Exod. 28:6; 39:2). Whether worn by Gideon, or merely exhibited for veneration, not known, probably the former. His sin consisted in having thus paved the way for an apostasy from the lawful sanctuary and worship, and for the breaking up of the theocratic unity which, after his death, facilitated a return to the idolatry of Baal (8:33). It was revenged on his own house by the strangulation of his sons by their step-brother, Abimelech (Judges c. 9; comp. BERTHEAU, p. 106 and 136; see also Art. *Abimelech*).

OEHLEK. — *Ermentrout*.

Gieseler, John Charles Ludwig, one of the fathers of modern Protestant Church history, and of our *Theol. Encyclop.*, was born, March 3, 1793, at Petershagen, near Minden; in 10th year of his age enjoyed the tuition of Chancellor Niemeyer (see Art.), in the orphan-asylum of Halle. The war, in which he enlisted, Oct. 1813, having been concluded by the peace of 1815, he resumed the office of teacher at Halle; in 1817 was honored as Doctor of Phil. and Co-rector of the Gymnasium at Minden; in 1818, Director of Gymnasium at Cleve, and, after having been made, in April of the year following, *Theol. Doct.*, Professor Ordinarius in the newly-established University of Bonn; from whence, after a service of 12 years, he removed to Göttingen, where he died, July 8, 1854. From his father—a man endowed with a mind of singular peculiarity—he acquired the habit of independent research and self-reliance. No mere book-worm, he applied himself with commendable diligence to the practical interests of life. As proof of this, it is only necessary to state that, together with Lücke, he superintended the theological Ephorate, and was a member of the Acad. of Sciences, and Curator of the orphan-house

at Göttingen, where he established an asylum for released criminals.—His lectures and works on Church history have secured him a lasting fame. His first labors were expended on the Apostolic period: *A historico-critical treatise on the rise and earliest fortunes of the written Gospels*, in which he utterly annihilated the theory of a Proto-Gospel, and several essays in second volume of Rosenmüller's *Repertorium*. The age immediately succeeding the Apostles next claimed his attention: On the Nazarenes and Ebionites in Stäudlin and Tschirner's *Archive*, Vol. 4, Pt. 2, and a Review of Neander's genetic development of Gnosticism, in the *Literaturzeitung* of Halle, 1823. Passionately fond of the Greek Church, he published a valuable programme of the doctrines of the Alexandrian teachers, Clemens and Origen, concerning the body of the Lord and Monophysitism. His treatises on the Paulicians, and the Manichæans by Petrus Siculus, and the 23 Titles of Panoplia by Euthymius Zygadenus, increased his merits. The last of his minor works in this department, is a review of Herzog's treatise on the Romanic Waldenses in the *Anzeigen* of Göttingen (April, 1854). His essays on the prophecy of Lehnin, and his *Irenæus* on the Cologne affair, his work (pub. 1840) on the disturbances in the Church of the Netherlands, and in 1848 the book by Mäder on Hist. of Prot. Church of France, from 1787–1846—these afford a fair exhibition of the impartiality and comprehensiveness of judgment which he passed upon the phenomena of his own age. In his *General Church History*, the reader will find displayed the same healthy historical taste, independent research, and ingenious power of combination, which characterizes the compositions above mentioned. The chief merit of this gigantic product of German industry, consists in the collection of sources and archives of literature it contains. Whilst we may regret the brevity of the text itself, to deny to it all value would be an error. Though not represented with the plastic talent of a Hase, it has nevertheless some striking characteristics. In affirming the superiority of its representation of the first age of Catholicism over that by Neander—who, strange to say, throws no light upon the origin of the Catholic Church—we do not intend to disparage the merit of this historian, whose greatness cannot be diminished by partial defects. More apt in grouping, Gieseler, obedient to the law of objectiveness in delineating history, allows his divisions to grow out of the particular character of the period treated of, whilst Neander subjects all ages alike to the same general rubrics (*Spread, Government, Doctrine, &c.*), without giving due preference to the main-spring, in each period, of the facts that distinguish it. G.'s manner of depicting the Middle Age is worthy of commendation. The poetical halo which had been thrown around some of its facts disappears, and the sad, naked truth, is seen. The history of the sects engaged his special attention, upon the obscure factions of which he has shed a clear light. Exceedingly rich is the description of the age preceding that of the Reformation, giving in minute detail an account of the growing corruption on the one hand, and on the other, of the growing opposi-

ion against Rome. Of more than ordinary excellency is the 2d Part of Vol. III., which develops the progress of doctrines in the Ref. period, down to the peace of Westphalia. The history of the Modern Period, from 1814 to the present, confirms the remark of the author himself, p. 1, that to write a correct and impartial account of a contemporaneous period, is an exceedingly difficult task. His theological bias sometimes exercised an unhappy influence on his judgment of historical facts. See on this whole work the *Protest. Kirchenzeitung*, 1854, No. 30. We append a synopsis of what has been published: Vol. I., Div. 1, to the year 324, 4 ed., 1844; Vol. I., Div. 2, 324-726, 4 ed., 1845; Vol. II., Div. 1, 726-1073, 4 ed., 1846; Vol. II., Div. 2, 1073-1305, 4 ed., 1848; Vol. II., Div. 3, 1305-1409, 2 ed., 1849; Vol. II., Div. 4, 1409-1517, 1835; Vol. III., 1517-1648, Div. 1, 1840; Div. 2, 1853; Vol. V., 1814 to the present time. Of his literary remains published by Redepenning, 1855, Vol. VI. of *Dog. Hist.*, 1856. Vol. IV., containing Church History, 1648-1814, appeared in 1856. The whole has been pub. in Bonn. See particularly G.'s Life and Works, by Redepenning, in Vol. V. of Church History.

HERZOG.—*Ermentrout*.

Gihon, LXX Γέων, Vulg. Gehon, in Genesis 2: 13; on the contrary, LXX Γών and Γέων, Vulg. Gihon, in 1 Kings 1: 33, 38, 45; 2 Chron. 32: 30; 33: 14, both, however, from גִּיּוֹן.

to break forth (comp. Job 40: 23), hence denoting water that bursts forth from subterranean passages, or from defiles, and so prefixed to several Asiatic streams, as Dschichun el Ras, Aroxes; Dsch. Kank, Ganges; Dsch. Atel, Volga, and Dschichun without any addition for two streams: the Oxus and the valley-fountain on the west side of Jerusalem. In the above quoted passages of Scripture, Gihon is used to denote the second river of Paradise, and this valley-fountain, of which we shall now treat.

1) According to 1 Kings and 2 Chron., Solomon was anointed king at Gihon; here, too, Hezekiah constructed a strong aqueduct, and Manasseh buildings for a strong wall around Jerusalem. The valley was situate in the western part of the city. In the Old Test., it is designated Hinnom (see *Gehenna*), the name of its lower half. Only in our day is Gihon used to mark the ridge of the hill that slightly overtops the city, and separates the valley from Jerusalem. Beginning with a depression in the middle part of this hill, the valley runs east by southeast towards the gate of Jaffa, declines thence southward and towards the southwestern side of Sion (Valley of Hinnom), and then eastward, until it unites itself with Cedron. Between the first depression of the valley and its decline near the Jaffa gate, lies the so-called Upper Pool, now Birket el Mamilla; from west to southeast it is 316 feet long, 200 broad, 18-20 deep; its walls of small mortared stones (comp. Robinson, I., 239-345; Tobler, im Ausl., 1849, nr. 20, p. 78). Troilo (p. 354) tells us of a well before the city, the broken pipes of which may still be seen, that in all probability conducted the water into the Upper Pool. Tobler also discovered an aqueduct of the canal which carried

the water from the upper pool into the city, first by the Jaffa gate, then southward into Jerusalem. This does not justify the opinion of Quaresmius (II., 717), that the pond situate within the Jaffa gate, formerly called *Piscina sancti sepulcri*, now Birket Hammam el Batrak, is the one made by Hezekiah to deprive Sennacherib of water. Though Ritter ignores every connection between the Upper and Lower Pools and the old and new Gihon-pool of Hezekiah, we believe it not an impossibility to discover a point of union with the so-called Lower Gihon-pool of our day, situated below the Jaffa gate (comp. Robinson, Krafft, Topogr., p. 185), and called by the natives Birket es Sultan. The lower pool is larger than the upper, its walls being for the most part the rocks of the valley, the upper one of which is crossed by an arched stone bridge, the lower, by the street from Bethlehem (comp. Wilson, Lands of the Bible; Tobler, im Ausl., 1848, nr. 19, p. 73). If we dare assume that the city wall, which Manasseh built, was the completion of the one begun by his father for a defence against Sennacherib, traces of which are still found at the farthest northwest end, where a wall terminates the ditches between them and the inner wall (Ritter, p. 376), and where may also be seen remains of an aqueduct leading from the north southward into the city, this lower pool must have been within the city. If we connect it with this aqueduct, then this last must have been conducted between "those two walls" for the benefit of the western half of the city, the eastern drawing its supplies from the wells of Tyropæon. The Gihon of Kings 1, this being, on our supposition, the lower pool, was situated within the bounds of Zion; while the great aqueduct bridge of Solomon, which crossed it, was no doubt included by Hezekiah in the city wall.

2) Concerning the Gihon of Paradise the principal views are a) that it is the Nile; so Josephus (*Ant.* 1, 1, 3), some Church Fathers,¹ and Mohammedans (*Fundgruben des Orients*, I., 304). Besides, the Septuagint has Γέων for the Hebrew name of the Nile (Jer. 2: 18), and places Γέων in parallelism with the Nile (Sir. 24: 27). In modern times, Schulthess (*Parad.* 70) and Gesenius (*Thesaur.*, 1, 282), favor the same view. b) According to the *usus loquendi* of the East, Gihon or Dschichum is the Grecian and Roman Oxus.² So, J. D. Michaelis, Lassen (*Jüdische Alterthumskunde*, I., 528). Knobel (*Genes.*, p. 27, and *Völkert.*, p. 248, 270); also Hammer (*Wiener Jahrb. d. Lit.*, 1820, IX., 21), who finds Paradise on the Bactrian table-land, the Pischon in the Sihon or Jaxartes, and expresses the felicitous thought that Gihon might

¹ Most original the view of Ephrem, the Syrian, who thus solves the difficulty of a common origin of the four נָחַר from one נָחַר: "*Paradies procul in editissimo loco situs est. Inde ergo delapsi circa ipsum paradisum cuniculis recepti se conduunt continuoque cursu velut e sublimi scatebra mare emeuntes perque ejus fundum transvecti distinctis fontibus tandem prociunt Chyson primus ad occasum (Danube, in his opinion), alter Geon ad austrum (Nile) et boream versus Euphrates et Tigris.*"

² In the middle ages by Oxus was understood Pischon: 1307, *Haithon* in *Hist. Or.*, c. 7, p. 11.

be identified with Hinducush, *Hartmann* (Aufkl. über Asien, I., 249) who locates Paradise in the valley of Cashmire; *Rosenmüller* (Alterth., I., 1, 184), and the master of geography *Ritter* (Th. II., der 1. Ausg., vorzügl. p. 542). *V. Rau-*mer, also, incidentally mentions the Oxus as Gihon (im Anhang zu Palästina). *d)* According to *Ewald* (Israel. Gesch., I., 331, 1. Ausg.) and *Buttmann* (Aelt. Erdkunde des Morgenlands: Berlin, 1803, also in his Mythologus, I., 63), Gihon was the modern Ganges. *e)* By Gihon is to be understood that side-stream of the Kur, called by *Xenophon* (*Anab.* IV., c. 6, p. 233), and many ancients, *Phasis*, by *Herodotus* and *Strabo*, *Araxes* (see *Ritter*, II., 1. Ausg., p. 807), but in our day *Aras*. This view is espoused by *Re-*land (*Diss. misc.*, I., 1, also in *Ugolini thes.* VII.) and by *Calmet*. *e)* *Link* (Urwelt, I., 307, 1. Aufl.) supposes Cush to be the land around Caucasus, and that the Kur is Gihon, and the table-land of Armenia and Georgia, Paradise. *f)* *Verbrugge*, who also seeks for Paradise in Armenia, but for Gihon in *Gyndes* (*Herod.* 1, 189) which, as he supposes, formed the boundary between Armenia and Matiana. *g)* *Clericus* (*ad Gen.* 2), understood by Cush Cassiotis in Syria (*Mons Casius* near Seleucia, *Strab.*, 16, 750), and by Gihon the *Orontes*, Eden being in Syria (see Art. *Eden*). Thus, *G. Kohlreif* (Üb. Damascus: Lüb., 1737) and *Lukenmacher* who supposed the Pischon to be Jordan (*Observ. philol.*, V., 195). *h)* *Calvin* (*Comm.* in *Gen.*), *Huetius* (*de situ Parad. terr.* in *Ugolini thes.* VII.), *Bochart* (*Opp.*, II., 29), *Steph. Morinus*, *J. Vorst* (*Ug. th.* VII.), supposed the division of one river into four to be the flowing of two northward and two southward, Pischon and Gihon being the two main mouths of the *Schat el Arab*; the former, the western, the latter, the eastern; Kusch being the modern Persian Chusistan, Chavila, in adjacent Arabia, and Eden in the neighborhood of Kornn (31° 0', 28'' N. Lat. 47° 29', 18'' 6, L. from Greenwich). This is a very unnatural interpretation of Scripture. So, too, *i)* that of *Hopkinson* (*descr. Parad.*: Leyden, 1593) who, instead of two mouths calls in to his aid the two canals of the Euphrates; the eastern — *Nahar Malca* — being the Pischon, the western — *Nahar Maarsares* — the Gihon; Kusch being located in Arabia, and Susianna made to be Chavila. *j)* *Harduin* (*de situ Par. terr. exc.*, on *Pliny* II. Nat., lib. 6, Tom. I., p. 359) found Paradise in Galilee, the main river in the Jordan, the Gihon in the *flumen salsum*, the Pischon in *flumen Achena* (*Achanum* *Plin.*, 6. 32) in Arabia. *k)* *Sickler* (in *Augusti*, theol. Monatschrift, I., p. 1, 75) regards the Caspian sea as an immense stream from the East, supposes the Pischon as having surrounded the entire of the then known earth from the East to the Nile, the Gihon to be the Phasis, Black, Mediterranean and Atlantic seas, surrounding the earth from the West to the Nile, and the Euphrates and Tigris to be put with these ocean streams! We conclude *l)* with the words of *Herder* (*Ideen zur Philos. der Menschheit*, II., B., p. 333): "As an impartial glance at the map of the world teaches us that nowhere on earth could the Euphrates with three other streams issue from one source, it is utterly useless to put to the rack the

names of the streams. This tradition, however, has basis in physics, as, without mountains our earth would have no water, and, as the map shows, all the streams of Asia flow from these. *The account, which we are explaining, rejecting everything fabulous, makes mention of four of the most widely known streams which run down from the mountains of Asia.* They do not, indeed, issue from one source, and the modern compiler of these traditions must be satisfied with using them to designate the original abode of man in some part of the Orient."

PRESSEL. — *Ermentrout*.

Gilbert, de la Porrée (*Porreianus*), born at Poitiers, a student of Bernhard, of Chartres, in philosophy, teacher of theol. and philosophy at Chartres, Paris, and Poitiers, where he became Bishop, 1142; though practising an ascetic life he was mild and courteous towards others. The obscurity of his explanations of Plato, Aristotle, and Boethius induced Prior Walther of St. Victor to class him among the four labyrinths of France; Abelard, Peter of Poitiers, and Petrus Lombardus, being the other three. His commentary — the most important of his works in our possession — on *Boethius de trinitate* (edition of B.'s work, Basel, 1570), occasioned charges of heresy against him by two of his clergy, which were investigated before two Councils, one in Paris (1147), the other at Rheims, (1148). These were embodied in four propositions: — 1) The substance of God is not God, the divine nature or Godhead is other than God, being the form in God, through which God is, but which is not God; 2) When it is said of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, that they are one, it is only meant that they are one in virtue of the one Divinity, it being impossible to affirm that Father, Son and Holy Ghost are one God, one substance, or something that is one; 3) That what constitutes the three persons three, is three onenesses, three particular properties, not the persons themselves numerically distinct from each other and from the divine substance; 4) The Divine nature did not become flesh, nor did it assume human nature. Bernhard of Clairvaux, the head of the party that opposed Gilbert, thought it to be his duty to defend the Christian interests supposed to be endangered in this controversy. At Rheims, the vote was divided, some of the cardinals espousing the side of Gilbert. The four propositions which Bernhard vindicated against the errors of Gilbert, though approved by the Pope, were not confirmed by a special decree. Gilbert, though subscribing the papal judgment, returned to his See with his honors unturned, whilst Pope Eugenius merely pronounced the general decision, that in theology, nature, and person, God and Godhead were not to be sundered. His patience conquered his enemies, and he lived in peace till death overtook him, 1154. — (*Comp. Neander*, Ch. Hist.; *Baur*, Lehre v. d. Dreieinig., II., p. 509–519; *Ritter*, Gesch. d. Philos., VII., p. 437–74. DR. PRESSEL. — *Ermentrout*.

Gilboa, a mountain belonging to the original domain of Issachar, or rather the series of hills which cross from Zer'in, the southeastern part of the level Jisrael. They are neither interesting nor high; but little pasturage, no agricul-

are, nor woods; in the time of Joshua a forest, in which the Canaanites maintained their position, the Israelites only succeeding in making them tributaries (comp. Judges 1: 27; Josh. 7: 11). Here Israel encamped (1 Sam. 28: 4). And, when beaten on the plain by the Philistines, retreated to it (31: 1); here Saul and his sons were slain (2 Sam. 1: 6, 21; 21: 12). Several villages may be found on this mountain and its heights: Fukû'a and Djelbôn. Its name, signifying etymologically "gushing well," seems to have been derived from a well at its northern base, the situation of which admirably qualified it for encampments of armies. — (See *Ireland*, Paläst., p. 344. *Schubert*, Reise. III., p. 164. *Robinson*, I., 316–17, 325. *Wilson*, Lands of the Bible, II., p. 85. *Ritter*, Erdk., IV., 1, p. 408, 416; XVI., p. 691.

RÜETSCH. — *Ermentrout*.

Gildas Cormac, born 516, was student of the British Abbot Illut and monk of Bangor. His principal work, *Liber querulus de excidio Britanniae* (560), to which must be added an epistle, 47, full of complaints over the moral and ecclesiastical corruption of his native country and his age: both to be found in *GALE*, *script. hist. rit.* (Oxoniae, 1691), and in *BERTRAMI*, *brit. sentium script.* (Havniæ, 1758). Galfried of Monmouth mentions a larger historical work, of which we know nothing. Lappenberg (*Gesch. England*, I., 135) thus characterizes him: Gildas must certainly be regarded as one of the most distinguished men of his age. Though his style be bombastic, and his representation of history indefinite and unmarked by dates, he is nevertheless a very learned authority for the facts of his time which, without the light shed upon them by him, would be still more obscure than they now are. We may safely regard him as the representative of the more earnest Britons of his day, and of their Christian-British-Roman culture. Gildas viewed the invasion of the Anglo-Saxons in the light of a Divine judgment, whom he called "*nefandi nominis Saxonia, leo hominibusque invisus*."

DR. PRESSEL. — *Ermentrout*.

Gilgal (Sept. גלגל = a circle). — 1) A place between the Jordan and Jericho, where the Israelites encamped (Josh. 4: 19), opposite Ab el Schittim (Jos. *Ant.*, 5, 10), 50 stadia from Jordan, and 10 from Jericho. When it is said in Josh. 5: 9, that its name was derived from the reproach of the Egyptians having been rolled away, it is to be understood as a play on words. From thence were directed the campaigns against the Canaanites (Josh. 9: 6; 10: 6); here, too, was the tabernacle with the sacrificial services, after the conquest removed to Shiloh (Josh. 8: 1). It was regarded as a holy place in consequence of this first abode of the people and the keeping of the twelve stones of the Jordan. Here Samuel made offerings, &c. (1 Sam. 10: 8; 1: 14; 15: 21, 33; 1 Sam. 7: 16). If we suppose that the tabernacle abode at Gibeon during the latter days of David's reign (1 Chron. 17: 39; 2: 29), and the time of Solomon (2 Chron. 3: 3; 1 Kings 3: 4), it may be presumed that it was taken by Samuel to Gilgal, and by David first to the neighborhood of the capital, Gihon being only 50 stadia or 1½ geog. miles from

Jerusalem. — Touching the question whether this Gilgal became in after times the chief seat of the idolatrous worship of the ten tribes, if we reflect on the ancient holiness of the place, we might be tempted, with *Ewald* (*Isr. Gesch.* II., 243, 254, 261), to answer affirmatively, or, with *Winer*, to incline towards that opinion. But we do not know whether Gilgal situated in the south of Benjamin's home, belonged to the ten tribes. There was, however, 2) another Gilgal in the tribe of Ephraim (2 Kings 2: 2), to which men journeyed from Bethel. Robinson discovered (II., 266) a village, Jijûleh, west from Bethel, and *Schwarz* (*Paläst.*, p. 64) speaks of a village of this name, 10 miles northeast from Jaffa, evidently the same, and according to the site of 2 Kings 2: 1, 2. Now, it may have happened that after Jeroboam's time the holiness of southern Gilgal was transferred to the northern one. The passages (Hos. 4: 15; 9: 15; 12: 12; Amos 4: 4; 5: 5) refer to this upper Gilgal, unquestionably also designated in Deut. 11: 30, as situated near the mountains Gerizim and Ebal. There is a third Gilgal mentioned, a Canaanitish royal city (Josh. 12: 23), six miles north from Antipatris in Galgula, in Robinson II., Jijûleh. If it be presumed that there גלגל = גלגל we would then have the first mention of the Galilee of the Gentiles (Isaiah 8: 23), and the origin of this name. Light would also be thrown on 1 Mac. 9: 2, Michaelis having already decided in favor of the version of Josephus (*Ant.*, 12, 11, 1), Γαλαλία. It is still possible, however, that this Canaanitish king had his abode in the Gilgal bordering on or belonging to Galilee.

VAHINGER. — *Ermentrout*.

Giraldus (Silvester) of *Cambria*, Archdeacon of Brechene, Bishop elect of Menevia, was born, 1146, near Pembroch in Cambria, of noble family, and finished his education at Paris. Appointed, 1175, by Archb. Richard of Canterbury, archiepisc. legate for Wales, soon after archd. of Brech., and, in the following year, B. of Menevia, but not acknowledged by Henry II. He returned to Paris to study civil and canon law, where, according to his "*de rebus a se gestis*," he was esteemed the first jurist in the city; in 1184, called by Henry to be one of his court-preachers, and, 1188, accompanied Archbishop Baldwin of Canterbury through Wales, many of whose inhabitants his eloquence persuaded to bear the cross. King Richard I. made him legate over Wales. He was again elected B. of Men., but not confirmed. The year of his death unknown. He was a prolific author; his writings, however, betray great vanity and much superstition. These are: 1) *Topographia Hiberniae*, and 2) *Expugnatio Hiberniae*; 3) *Itinerarium Cambriae*; 4) *Descriptio Cambriae*; 5) *Descriptio Walliae*; 6) *De rebus a se gestis libri tres*; 7) *De vita Galfredi Eboracensis archiepiscopi Legenda Sti. Remigii*, *Legenda Sti. Aethelberti*, *orientalium Saxonum regis*; 8) *De jure et statu Menevensis ecclesiae*; 9) *Gemma ecclesiastica*, in which are treated *de Sacramentis magis necessarius*, and *de clericali honestate et continentia*; 10) *Speculum ecclesiae sive de monasticis ordinibus*; 11) *Symbolum Electorum, seu episto-*

lae variae a semet ipso collectae; 12) *De principis instructione*.—(Comp. WHARTON, *Anglia Sacra*, II., 374, 457; OUDINI, *comment. de script. eccles.*, II., 1631-1645. DR. PRESSEL.—*Ermentrout*.)

Girdle, among the Hebrews. Of great value, as may be seen by reference to 2 Sam. 18 : 11; Prov. 31 : 24. Of various kinds: poor, pious people, and ascetic prophets, wore one of leather, about 6 inches in breadth (2 Kings 1 : 8; Matt. 3 : 4); the rich and the noble, one of linen (Jer. 13 : 1), only four fingers wide, ornamented with gold, precious stones, &c. (Dan. 10 : 5; comp. *Xenoph.*, *Anab.*, 1, 49. A principal article of female luxury (Jer. 2 : 32; Isa. 2 : 24; 49, 18; comp. *Hartmann*, *die Hebräerin am Putztische*, II., p. 299; *Niebuhr*, *Reisebeschr.*, II., p. 184; *Taf.* 27, p. 326; *Taf.* 64), worn by them long and loose, that of the men being clasped round the loins (1 Kings 2 : 5; 18 : 46; Jer. 13 : 11), and of the priests (Exod. 28 : 39; Levit. 16 : 4) higher up, towards the breast (Jos., *Ant.*, 3, 7, 2; comp. Apoc. 1 : 13; 15 : 6).—It served not only to bind together the under-dress, but to keep it from separating so as to impede walking (2 Sam. 6 : 14); and, the under-dress drawn under and over it, a sort of purse (*πολυκος*) was made for money (Matt. 10 : 9; *ibique* *Lightfoot*; Mark 6, 8; comp. *Horat. Epp.*, II., 2, 40); also for carrying a sword (2 Sam. 20 : 8; 25 : 13; Judges 3 : 16), and writing materials (Ezek. 9 : 2). Easy to understand now why it should have been considered a token of friendship (1 Sam. 18 : 4), and sign of appointment to office (Isai. 22 : 21). With the girdles must not be confounded the *clasps* (*ἡ κόρπη*) which fastened the upper-dress to the breast or to the shoulder (see 1 Macc. 10 : 89; 11 : 58; 14 : 44); distributed as rewards of valor (*cf.* *Liv.*, 39, 31; comp. *Cavieuz*, *merkwürd. Nachr.*, III., p. 241; *Shaw*, *Travels*, p. 99; *Jahn*, *biibl. Archäol.*, I., 2, p. 82; *Winer*, *R. W. B.*; *Planck*, in *Pauly's Realencykl.*, VI., 2, p. 2881. RÜETSCHL.—*Ermentrout*.)

Girgasites (Sept. Γεργασαῖοι), a Canaanite tribe (Gen. 10 : 16; see also Gen. 15 : 21; Deut. 7 : 1; Josh. 3 : 10; Neh. 9 : 8); according to Josh. 24 : 11, they dwelt this side of Jordan. The use of the name in the time of Jesus (Matt. 8 : 28), even though, according to Luke 8 : 26; Mark 5 : 1, to be read Gadarenes, proves that they had their earlier abode around the Sea of Tiberias, which, in this event, must be sought for not on this, but the other side of Jordan. On a second consideration of the passage in Joshua, it might be inferred that a portion of these people were tolerated by Israel in the country on the other side of Jordan, whither they had taken refuge, settled here and gave this name to it. *Ewald*, *Isr. Gesch.*, I., 278, places them this side of Jordan; but as, according to *Euseb.*, *Onom.*, Γεργασα was a locality on a mountain near the Sea of Galilee, he had in his mind the Canaanitan Chassor, capital of Girgasites. VAHINGER.—*Ermentrout*.)

Girzites.—Only mentioned along with the Geshurites and Amalekites, in 1 Sam. 27 : 8. As David never fought against the confederates of his people, we cannot think, with *Winer*, of the Levite town Geser, whence came descendants to settle here. We may suppose with *Ewald*, *Isr. Geschichte*, II., 561; III., 19, that, as the

Seventy omit in their translation this name, Γεσπὶ rather seeming to them the corresponding term for גִּרְזִי, both refer to the small Canaanitish Gaser or Geschur, or that the Seventy did not translate it, because it was not known.

VAHINGER.—*Ermentrout*.)

Glareanus (Henry Loriti), humanist, poet, musician, and scholar, the friend of Erasmus and Zwingli, born June, 1488, in Mollis, in the Swiss canton Glarus; taught the rudiments by Michael *Rubellus*, who trained his Latin style and musical talent; continued his studies at Cologne, receiving the title Magist. Philos. 1510, he applied himself to theology; crowned with laurel by the hands of Maximilian I., to whom he had dedicated a poem, he now paid almost exclusive court to the Muse; entered into correspondence with Zwingli, and, after having espoused the cause of Reuchlin in the contest with the "Obscurantists," a change of views induced him to quit the high-school of Cologne, and to go to *Basel* (1514), where he became a friend to Erasmus, and where the young Swiss, charmed by his bold opposition to the pedantry of the schools, soon gathered round him.¹ He visited Italy in the spring of 1515, and in 1517, with recommendations from Erasmus, Paris. There, environed by young scholars, he devoted himself almost wholly to the classics (particularly *Cæsar*, *de bello gallico*, *Livy* and *Homer*), and attempted to restore the very forms of antiquity. He studied Greek with John Lascaris, and gave himself also to mathematics and music. His ambition was wounded by Erasmus, who took the glory of certain literary services which he claimed for himself. This cooled their friendship, and he transferred his affections to *Myconius*, with whom and Zwingli he carried on a lively correspondence.² At first inclined to the Reformation, he soon espoused the cause of its opponents. In 1522, married the daughter of Herrmann Offenburger, a citizen of Basel, renewed his friendship with Erasmus, with whose position touching the Reformation he sympathized, though at first he favored Zwingli, and expected great good from the conference at Zurich, 1523. His antagonism to the Ref. became very decided, and the persecution of the English Protestants by Mary he welcomed as a cheering omen. He died March 28, 1563, aged 75 years.—(Comp. *Monog.*, by *Dr. Henry Schreiber*: Freiburg, 1837, 4to.; on p. viii. the sources of his biography, and p. 118 a complete catalogue of his works.)

HAGENBACH.—*Ermentrout*.)

Glassius, *Salomo*, one of those theologians who mediated the transition to the Spenerian system, was born in Sondershausen, 1593; in his early days enjoyed the tuition of the distinguished teacher Andreas Wilke, and, after having spent 3 years at Jena in the study of philosophy, went to Wittenberg, where he became a student of Hutter, Baldwin, Franz, and Meisner; from thence back to Jena, where he studied

¹ Glareanus, on being refused a seat with the professors at the academic celebrations, rode into the hall seated on an ass.

² Comp. the very interesting letters of G. to Zwingli from Paris (Opp. VII., ed. Schulth.).

ive years under the celebrated Gerhard. In 1619, he was nominated Adjunct Prof. of Phil.; and the chair of Hebrew being vacant, was elevated to it. On becoming Superintendent in Sonnershausen, 1625, the Doctorate, which his great modesty had previously declined, was conferred on him; and after the death of Gerhard, who recommended him as his successor, was elected to fill his place. His services in this capacity were of short duration. Duke Ernst needed a man to aid him in introducing and carrying out the ecclesiastical changes he designed to make, and G. removed from Jena, 1640, to be his counsellor. Glassius thus speaks of this prince, the most distinguished of all the Lutheran rulers of his day: "How he thanked God for having thought him worthy of serving his Church under Ernst, who not only himself worshipped God in holy sincerity, but, like another Josiah and Josaphat, sought to establish Divine service, to perpetuate the truth of Heaven, and to bring salvation to his subjects." Under his direction were made a visitation of the University of Jena, and three general visitations of the whole country. He zealously undertook catechetical and academic instructions, and personally taught religion to the higher classes of the Gotha'schen Gymnasium. To him was confided the directorship of the Weimar Bible work, in which are explained by him the poetical books of the Old Testament. Died 1653, aged 63.

His *philologia sacra*, 1625, constitutes the chief claim G. has upon the veneration of posterity. The first and second books treat of *philolog. in specie, de integritate et de stylo S. Scr.*; the third and fourth, of *grammatica*; the fifth, of *rhetorica sacra*, to which was added, 1705, from MSS. by Olearius of Arnstadt, a *logica sacra*. *Nullum usquam scrupulum*, says Mich. Walther, *cum aliqua difficultate conjunctum et scripturis utriusque instrumenti moveri et ostendi posse autumo, cui averruncando et e medio auferendo non præclare satis fuerit factum*. Even to modern times it has preserved its standard character. In 1776, Dathe published the *grammatica* and *rhetorica* in an *editio his temporibus accommodata*; to which Lorenz Bauer added a *critica* N. T., 1795, and a *hermeneutica sacra*, 1797. The work certainly evidences a thorough acquaintance with Hebrew, Rabbinical, and scriptural literature, and contains a valuable collection of examples, and many delicate observations on language; but its critico-biblical views belong to the illiberal stand-point of his age; the rhetorical are for the most part formalistic; the explanations of language are based not so much on the genius of language, as on mechanically logical and often arbitrary theories.—(Sources: M. WALTHER, a *Trenologia de artu, vita, studiis scriptis, obitu Glassii*, in *Wittem's memoria theologorum decas*, IX. A biog. in the "Unschuldigen Nachrichten, 1720.")

THEOLUCK.—*Ermentrout*.

Glosses (biblical), the word derived from the Greek, in which, *γλῶσσα* means not only tongue and language, but particular words and modes of speech which needed to be explained, as obsolete expressions, provincialisms, foreign words. For *γλῶσσαι* were also used *γλωσσήματα*, *λίξεις*, *γλωσσηματισαί*, interpreted by Quintilian (I., 8,

p. 63) by *voces minus usitatae*. For particulars, see Bleek's Abh. on *γλ. λαλῶν*, Studien u. Kr., 1829, p. 32.—As, in the ancient Greek sense, each word was a gloss, the study of this subject first assumed the form of lexicography. It must be observed that the ancients did not arrange their matter alphabetically, but confined themselves to categories of glosses; whilst the mediæval authors of dictionaries gathered it not so much from language in *abstracto*, as from desultory reading, so that their lexicons were collections of interpretations of a greater or lesser number of valuable works, combined with historical, geographical, and such like notices, and without any mention of the derivation and forms of words. To the labor of gathering the glosses and scholia on the Greek Bible, by the Glossographers of the Middle Ages, the Dutch philol. of 18th cent., J. Alberti, L. Casp. Valckenner, &c.; the German, J. Ch. Gli. Ernesti, who published an ed. of "*Glossis sacris*" from Hesychius, Suidas, Phavorinus: Lps., 1785, 2 Pt.; J. F. Schleusner, in 4 programmas, 1809; F. W. Sturz, from Zonaras, 1818, devoted themselves. For partic., see *Fabricii, bibl. græca*, IV., 540, in *Rosenmüller's hist. interpr.*, IV., 356, and *Reuss, Gesch. d. N. T.*, § 530. These *Glossæ Sacræ* are valuable, because they chiefly contain excerpts from the more ancient theological writers, some of whose compositions have been lost.—While the Greeks meant by *γλῶσσα* the word to be explained, the Latins meant the exegesis given. In this latter sense, the Christian Middle Ages and modern criticism recognise glosses of various kinds. Only Biblical Glosses are to be considered in this article.—As the Bible was most frequently read by persons who either needed instruction, or thought themselves qualified to give it, the ancient practice of writing notes on the margin of books was very often exercised upon it. Margin-glosses of a very early date are to be found in Bible MSS; in ancient times, they were very short, often but a single word; very seldom an entire sentence. That such Gl. were appended to the Hebrew text of the Old Test., is an undoubted fact. Thus, *kri* is, in many instances, a gloss for *ketib*. So frequent were they in the LXX, that the ancients thought of revising it, e.g. Origen, Lucian, Hesychius (see Art. *Bible-text*). As later transcribers joined together the margin-gl. and the text-gl., they seemed to be, in some cases, a double translation. Jerome (*Ep. ad Suniam Opp.*, III., 58 *Francf.*) complained of this mistake: *Si quid pro studio ex latere additum est non debet poni in corpore*. So, too, with the Greek N. T.; so that one chief duty of criticism has been to separate the real text from additions by the copyist, who either incorporated with it the marginal interpretations, or superseded the genuine reading by putting in its place an exegetical version. There are more of the former than the latter, as may be seen by a reference to Griesbach and Tischendorf. For examples in unpublished text-documents, see editions of New Test. with complete critical apparatus; in pub., *Reuss, N. T.*, 3 ed., § 399; *Theoretic Monograph*, § 359.—As it was supposed that the text contained a meaning underneath that upon its surface, the necessity for explanations seemed to be more indis-

pensable. But the means for writing becoming more expensive, the liberty of independent investigation more contracted, and the veneration for more ancient exegetists more unlimited, it became customary in the middle ages to write manuscripts laden with explanatory remarks on the margin; and these, though very far beyond mere expositions of words, were called glosses, and a collection of them, a gloss. Not commentaries, in our sense; scholia rather, in character mystical, historical, scholastic. The most celebrated collection of these *Glossæ Marginales*, in the 9th cent., by Walafriid (Strabus), Abbot of Reichenau; the *vade mecum* of succeeding generations. Of the *Glossæ interlineares*—having to do merely with single words—there were two kinds: the theologico-mystical, which arranged the best devotional exegeses of the times in alphabetic order, e. g. the gloss of Anselm of Laon, beginning of the 12th century, and the purely philosophical, which, as the Latin language began to be less studied, had to do with unknown words. These last-mentioned glosses are only important as they serve to indicate the science of the age; though, in modern times, the attention of German theology has been arrested by the fact that, in the Carolingian period, glosses in German were appended to the Latin Bible. The libraries of St. Gall, Munich, Vienna, &c., possess not a few of such MSS. See *Rud. v. Raumer's Werk*, Einwirk. d. Christenth. auf d. althochdeut. Sprache, p. 81.

From this time onward, *glossa* was the standing expression both for the exegesis of single texts, and a collection of such exeg. on a particular book, e. g. the Bible. Owing to this close connection between the gloss and the text, it often happened that a section of the latter was made to follow the former, without a note of distinction or transition. So, too, with translations into the vernacular, which were executed in this way, in France, to 1523. In modern times, also, mention is sometimes made of glossed Bibles, e. g. the old Weimar Bible, often published from 1641 onward. Still the name has been dropped, though the thing itself remained still a necessity.

ED. REUSS.—*Ermentrout*.

Glosses and Glossarists of Roman and Canonical Law. The law-school at Bologna, founded towards the close of the 11th, or about the 12th cent., by Irnerius, became the centre of the newly-awakened study of Roman jurisprudence. Its teachers were called *Glossarists*, because they added to the *Corpus juris*, glosses which consisted in part of brief explanations of single words or expressions, and, in part, of more minute expositions, written sometimes between the lines, sometimes on the margin. They composed besides, *summæ*, summaries of the contents of a book, *casus*, true or supposed law-cases for the elucidation of single passages in connection with *quæstiones* and *distinctiones*; also, *brocarda*, or *brocardica* (see Art.), etc. Comp. *Savigny*, *Gesch. des Röm. R. im Mittelalter*, Bd. 3, p. 537–574, 2 Ausg. They occasioned the establishment of a school of Canonists, Decretists.—Gratian, author of the *Decretum*, the first part of the *Corpus juris canonici*, delivered lectures on it in the cloister St. Felix,

at Bologna. Several of his students, after the manner of the Glossarists, arranged this *Decretum*; the oldest of these, *Paucopalea*, *Omni-bonus* († 1185). Sicardus of Cremona, who composed his *summa canonum*, 1160, at Mayence (comp. *Phillips*, *K.-Recht.*, vol. 4, p. 168, 169). Besides these, Ansaldo, Ursio, Anselmus, and Butirus. Of the 12th and 13th cent., to be mentioned Rufinus—author of a *summa de Decretis*—John Faventinus, John and Peter Hispanus, Hugo or Hugucio of Pisa, *Johannes de Deo*, Benincasa Senensis, Laurentius Hispanus, etc.—John Teutonicus composed, about 1212, from the glosses of his predecessors, a continuous commentary on the *Decretum*, which, improved, 1236, by Bartholomæus of Brescia, became the *Glossa ordinaria* used by the school.—Glosses and apparatus to the collect. of Decret. by Greg. IX., were written by Vincentius Hispanus (about 1240), Goffredus Tranensis († 1245), and Sinibaldus Fliscus, who became Pope Innocent IV., 1243–54. From these, Bernard de Botone, of Parma († 1266), composed an Apparatus, used as *Glossa ordinaria*. As Glossarists of *Liber Sextus* (see *Canon Law*). *Johannes Monachus* († 1313), *Guido de Baysio*, and *Johannes Andreæ* († 1348), deserve naming. That of the last mentioned, improved and enlarged, became the *Glossa ordinaria* in MSS. and printed. He also comp. the first Gl. to the Clementines (see *Canon Law*); used as *Glossa ordinaria*. Besides him, as Glossar. of this collect.: Tenzelinus de Cassanis, John de Lignano, Petrus de Ancharano, Franciscus Taberella († 1417), &c. The *extraraganti* were partly glossed by *Johannes Monachus*, partly by *Guilelmus de monte Lauduno*; those of Pope John XXII., by Tenzelinus de Cassanis.—Of importance for history of literature, even in our day, is the gloss. On history of Glossarists, comp. particularly *Sarti*, *De claris archigymnasii Bonon. professoribus*, T. I., Pt. I., II., Bonon., 1769, fol.

WASSERSCHLEBEN.—*Ermentrout*.

Gnosis, Gnosticism, Gnostics.—The great object of Christianity is the recovery of man from his fallen condition to a state of reconciliation with God. The Christian revelation took place accordingly, not as a form of knowledge, but as the fact of an actual redemption. By the reception of this fact into consciousness, the life of religion and morality assumed in its fundamental relations to God a new character, and out of such right posture of immediate feeling was gradually unfolded an intellectual apprehension of the constituents of the fact singly considered and their inward connection. Even the Apostles themselves advanced only by degrees in the deeper knowledge of Christ and his work, and much more still was this the case with the Christian congregations. For having been gathered mainly out of the more uncultivated orders of society, they had but small preparation or need comparatively for theoretical exposition, and it was slow work with them, therefore, to develop the germs of apostolic doctrine. All deeper insight into the truths of revelation was named, by a term borrowed from the usage of the time, *Gnosis* (γνῶσις), and its capacity for it was considered to be one of the extraordinary gifts of the Spirit (1 Cor. 13 : 2)

Afterwards, however, this term was employed also to designate a style of religious speculation, which it was intended at the same time to censure as false and wrong. The tendency embraced a number of parties and systems, which betrayed their heathenish spirit at once in the fact, that they placed the essence of Christianity on knowledge, and made no account of its general practical ground. With their large infusion of heathen ideas, indeed, they are to be regarded as mongrel or mixed systems, holding on the confines of Christianity and Paganism, just as the Ebionites characterize the same sort of border life on the side toward Judaism; while between these two extremes, the proper life of the Church is seen to pursue its onward course, bearing along with it the purer and better doctrine of the Apostles as something intrinsically different from both.

As the significance of Christianity came increasingly into view, it drew upon itself more and more the attention of philosophically educated men. From different heathen and Jewish regions they approached the new revelation, and propounded to it questions of religious speculation, partly such as had exercised their minds before, and partly new ones to which they were led by Christianity itself. They were touched by Christianity, attracted toward it, but not brought always under its full power. Such a posture was favored by the eclectic character which distinguished the prevailing knowledge of the time. These transitional thinkers did not construct their systems from the distinguishing principles of Christianity; their place was rather to combine Christian and foreign elements, in all manner of variations and proportions.

If we look then to the different constituents that were thus joined with Christian ideas, we find among the philosophical systems of Greece the influence of Platonism especially prominent—sometimes in its older character, and then again more in those later eclectic, mystical, pantheistic forms which belong to new Platonism. The conception of a God whom only a small elect number are able to know—of a God, hidden in himself, who proceeds from abstract undistinguishable unity into revelation by the intervention of the *Nus*; the conception of *Hyle*, and its variously sketched dualistic relations to God; the imagination of an ideal world in the higher sphere, which mirrors itself in the phenomenal world; that of the fall of rational beings from the divine sphere into the sphere of matter and sense; the derivation of sin from the material element; such are the leading views which passed from Platonism over into Gnosticism. It borrowed something besides from the physics and ethics of Stoicism, and from the doctrine of numbers in the Pythagorean system raised again to new life, but to such less extent; single ideas also, as of a God, who, himself unmoved, moves all, may have been derived from the Peripatetic school. But it was not only the Grecian systems of philosophy that contributed to the formation of this Gnosis; it owed much likewise to the Oriental systems, which in this period of religious interest were quickened into new action, and by the grandeur of their forms, by the reach of their

aspirations, and by their dualism especially, carried with them a strong attraction for inquiring minds. We may see this influence in the mystical and fanciful character of the Gnostic speculation, to which for this reason the name theosophy has been applied. For the representations of the Gnosis move less in conceptional and dialectic forms, after the Greek order, than in the poetical description of persons and actions. It is a philosophizing mythology—a collection of poems, which embrace the history of God and creation, set forth in the full luxuriance of Oriental fancy. To the East belongs also especially the view, that the rational world proceeds by emanation from the divine source, as we find it adopted in most of the Gnostic systems. Parsism developed in distinct form the idea that the essence of God is light, and offered thus to Gnosticism that apprehension of the divine substance, which by its position between the material and the spiritual it was specially fitted to receive. The dualism of God and the world was rendered still more sharp here, by the conception of an aggressive force in matter threatening the divine light. In its most decided form, this opposition between the principle of good and the power of darkness, both left to themselves, might be considered the strongest expression of a consciousness, which felt itself in irreconcilable variance with God. Along with these theoretic influences was mingled the power of a positively monistic theosophy, Buddhism, which had made its way unquestionably, even in the time of Christ, as far as Western Asia. The distinctionless unity of the divine essence from which it draws its scheme of development, is much of one sort with the unity which new Platonism places at the beginning; and it is often hard to say from which side a Gnostic system may have derived its full abstract conception of the nature of God. The earthly lower sphere has sprung, according to Buddhism, from the breaking of the original unity, and its being made to fall asunder thus into multiplicity of existence. As the unity in this view is the essential and divine, which stands behind appearances, the present world is turned by it into mere shadow and show, birth becomes sin, and life puts on the form of a penance, the perfection of which is the utmost possible abstraction from matter, by ascetic discipline and the sinking of the soul through contemplation into the unity of the absolute. We find much in Gnosticism which is of one sound with this, especially where it has to do with the ascetic interest. The working not only of Parsism, but of Buddhism also (as *Dr. Baur* has shown in his work on the subject), comes most clearly into view in the Manichaean system.

With philosophical ideas the Gnostic thinkers combined also elements taken from the popular mythology. They pursued, however, in the application of them, the usual manner of the Platonic and Stoic philosophers, who converted the mythological figures into symbols of their ideas. The Gnostics find in their own dreams the true sense of the heathen myths.

The speculative spirit of Gnosticism is foreign from Judaism in its original practical character, and there appears everywhere a certain opposi-

tion between them, more or less marked. But notwithstanding this, the Gnosis took in a large amount also of Jewish material; for which the way was opened by those forms of theological speculation which were employed among the Jews themselves, to clothe their doctrines with a philosophical sense. In Palestine, a very old mixture of Jewish and Oriental heathen elements prevailed in the form of Essenism. The first beginnings of the cabbala also reach perhaps back into the Gnostic period. The Christian Gnosis found its most distinct anticipation, however, in the Jewish religious philosophy of Alexandria, of which we have the fullest exposition in the writings of Philo. This combination of Old Testament truths with heathen philosophical ideas, passing over into the sphere of Christian development, might either root itself in the essential ground of Christianity — in which form it led to the religious philosophy of the Alexandrian Church Fathers; or else it yielded the preponderance to the influences of heathen speculation, and gave rise thus to particular phases of the heretical Gnosis. The most important affinities of Philo with Gnosticism are brought together by *Neander*, in the introduction to his *Genetic Development of the principal Gnostic Systems*, 1818. They are, in connection with the common idealism pervading both, the supposition of an abstract divine unity, the hidden being of God, and the revelation of God in distinction from this in the Logos, who brings into opposition the divine ideas; the doctrine of angels, formed after the Jewish and general Oriental pattern, and then made to flow together again with Plato's theory of ideas; the particular notion moreover, that the angelic revelations of the Old Testament took place in appearance only, and not in real bodily forms and actions, in which we have a trace of Docetism; the distinction made between such as cleave to outward form and letter, the *νῶι τοῦ λόγου*, and those who raise themselves to the spiritual standpoint where they see God himself, the *νῶι τοῦ ὁυτος*; finally, the allegorical method of interpreting the Scriptures, which employed itself in referring the literal text always to a higher speculative sense.

A comparison of the Philonian ideas with those that come up regularly in the Gnostic systems, shows clearly that certain modes of thinking which prevailed before Christianity were drawn into their service. The views ascribed to the followers of John the Baptist, as they were called, go also to confirm this. The heathen speculations furnished in like manner their methods and schemes. Especially thus in places where Christianity came into more active contact with the Jewish and heathen forms of thought, and where the existing culture was favorable to speculation, these older forces were sure to make themselves felt, bringing in Gnostic medleys in profusion. So in Syria, Alexandria, and Asia Minor. Rome, a new world in itself, had representations of all parties.

The first traces of the heretical Gnosis appear in the New Testament period itself. It is characteristic that we meet with a *Simon Magus* in Samaria, whom for this very reason we have the less cause to suspect of being a myth. On this soil,

open to Jewish, Pagan, and Christian elements, Gnostic speculation first appeared in connection with Christianity. For what is related of Simon, that he pretended to be the manifestation of the highest power proceeding from God, refers with certainty to views of the Gnostic order. *Irenæus* (*adv. hæc.*, I., 23), and more fully though confusedly *Hippolytus* (*ἐκτελεστος*, VI., 1), and others after them, mention a sect of Simonians, which in all probability stands historically connected with Simon, although the document *ἀποκάλυψις* is ascribed to it by them falsely. The next kindred movement meets us at *Colosse*, in the time of St. Paul. His opponents there appear to have sprung from an Essenian or Alexandrian degenerated Judaism, having adopted as their ascetic notions simply dualistic views, and holding that God reveals himself through a series of angelic natures. The idealism and angelology of Gnosticism, in its incipient stage, are referred to also in the *Epistles to Timothy*. The first Epistle of *St. John* rebukes the docetic tendency which denied the reality of Christ's appearance in the flesh. The *Nicolaitans* of the Apocalypse, and the false teachers mentioned in the Epistle of St. Jude, seem to have deduced an immoral antinomianism from Gnostic speculations; the last, by referring the Jewish law to a revelation of bad angels. At the close of the age *Cerinthus* became active within the circle of St. John's labors in Lesser Asia; a Jewish Christian, who unfolded somewhat further the Gnostic ideas, but always still in narrow compass, and probably with no small amount of inconsistency (in regard to him consult especially *Hippolyt.*, 7, 33). On into the first part of the 2d century, a strong barrier to the spread of such Gnosis was created, partly by the influence of the Apostles, and partly by the predominant, even indeed one-sided, practical posture of the Church itself, whose whole force was directed toward the extension of Christianity in the form of actual life. Then came, however, the confessed need of theoretical knowledge, and along with this grew the number and influence of the Gnostics. A younger cotemporary of Cerinthus was *Basilides* (*Hippol.*, 7, 20, sq.), who lived in Alexandria, and according to some sprang from Syria, and whose son *Isidorus* made a name for himself afterwards in his school. To the same period belong *Carpocrates*, from Egypt (*Iren.*, I., 25; *Clem. Alexand.*, *Strom.*, IV., p. 428-430, ed. Cologne), and his son *Epiphaneus*; also the Syrian *Saturninus* (*Iren.*, I., 24). Even among the Gnostics of this generation, with whom the productive period of the Gnosis begins, great discrepancies appear, which increase more still in the period following. In *Valentinus* (*Iren.*, I.; *Hippol.*, VI., 21, sq.), who betook himself from Egypt to Rome, the speculative culture and poetical power of the Gnosis attained their highest point. His school, falling into two branches, an Eastern (*ἀνατολική*) and an Italian, included many able men: *Heracleon* (comp. *Origen's* Commentary on the Gospel of St. John directed against him); *Plotinus* (against whom *Irenæus* in his polemical work, Vol. I., and *Epiphanius*, *hæc.* 33 contend); *Marcus* (*Iren.*, I., 8, sq.; *Hippol.*, 6, 39; *Epiph.*, I., 34); *Bardesanes*, an Armenian, who lived for

long time in Edessa (*Hippol.*, 7, 31; *Euseb.*, *Cræp. evang.*, 6, 10). The hymns of Ephr. Syrus., Moses Choreneus, Hist. of Armenia, II., 6: Ven. 1843. Schaharistani, translated by Jarbrücker. A. Hahn, Bardesanes gnosticus (yr. princ. hymnology, 1819). Cotemporary with Valentinus, taught the Syrian *Cerdon* (*Hippol.*, 7, 37), and his disciple *Marcion*, of Sinope, in Pontus, one of the most Christian-minded Gnostics, who with all his vagaries stood near to Protestantism (*Tertul. adv. Marc. ren.*, I., 27; *Hipp.*, 7, 29; *Epiph.*, h., 42; *Hahn's Gosp. of Marcion*, 1823); whose disciples a part came still nearer the true Christian standpoint, as is shown by *Apelles* (*Euseb.*, *H. E.*, 5, 13; *Hipp.*, 7, 38), and others later *Pseudo-Origenes dial. de recta in Deum fide*). To this time belongs also the restless *Tatian*, whose various religious changes landed him finally in Gnosticism (*Daniel*, *Tatian der Apog.*, 1837). Some relationship to these severe ascetics, at single points, appears among the cotemporary *Encratites*. The many-branched sect of the *Ophites* is also to be placed in the second century, although nothing further is known of its author or origin. Hippolytus throws some light on its various shades. Here are to be reckoned the *Ophites of Irenæus* (I., 10, 2, 34) the *Naassenes* (Ophites) of Hippolytus, the *Sethites*, the *Cainites*, the *Peratics*, and a certain *Justin* with his followers (comp. *Mosheim*, *Gench. d. Schlangenbrüder*). To this century belongs also unquestionably the Arabian Gnostic, *Monoïmos* (Menahem), mentioned by Hippolytus. The Gnostic parties were affected in their inward development, of course, by their conflicts with the Catholic Church; it may have been owing to this opposition, that the dualistic principle seemed to gather strength generally with their progress. They wrought upon one another also among themselves. But such outward influences must not be put too high, over against the arbitrariness and conceit of their different schools. There was no such regularity here, by any means, as in the formation of the doctrinal system of the Church, or in the carrying out of systems even in the Grecian philosophy. We have, accordingly, but few sure traces of the relations of the Gnostics among themselves. The hard dualism of Marcion was resisted on the part of the Valentinians; Bardesanes contended with the Marcionite *Prepon* on the same subject, as also on the question of separation from the Church. The disciples of Valentinus himself had much controversy with one another on their different apprehensions of Christ's person. In the third century, Gnosticism relaxed its activity; the Church gradually triumphed over it, by means of its far more sound and satisfying views. The Manichæan system, toward the close of the third century, was the last great product of the Gnostic tendency. Its after-workings, however, more particularly in Marcionitism and Manichæan shape, continue through the following centuries deep into the middle ages, and form through the *Paulicians* a connection with the dualistic sects of the 12th and 13th centuries.

It is very difficult to arrange the Gnostic systems into classes. Their visionary, arbitrary

character seems to defy any general principle of division. *Gieseler's* classification (*Kirchengesch.*, I., p. 179, sq., 4th ed.) has found much favor. He divides them into Alexandrian, in which Platonism and the emanation doctrine prevail; and Syrian, bearing the stamp of Parsism and dualism. Dualism and emanation are indeed important features in the construction of the systems; but still they do not answer fully for a ground of division. Both belong especially to the Orient; so that the emanation scheme, in its wider form, does not belong with inward necessity by any means to the Platonizing systems, but is for them rather something accidental. We find with the Syrian Saturninus strong dualism and a long series of intermediate beings; so, too, with the later Basilidians, who had their origin from Alexandria; among the grossly dualistic Sethite all divine creation was conceived of under the form of a genetic emanation; Carpocrates joins with the probably Platonistic ground of his scheme, as it would appear, no emanation theory; and that Marcion does not suit his rule here, is allowed by Gieseler himself. There would remain thus as a mark of distinction only Platonism and Parsism, a difference which is not sufficient for the classification. *Hase*, in his Church History, divides the Gnostics into Oriental, Hellenistic, Christian, and Jewish. These very general titles, which leave out of view all peculiarity of structure, are the less reliable for the purposes of division, as it is often hard to say, from the mixture of elements, which form of them is to be considered predominant. The term "Christian" may be used rightly enough in the case, as aside from Christianity altogether there could be no room to speak of a Gnosis at all in the strict sense; but just for this reason it is not suited to designate a distinction within the Gnosis itself, over against Hellenic, Oriental, and Jewish systems. Even the qualification "mainly Christian" is not found to hold properly. The system of Valentinus contains as many Christian elements as that of Bardesanes; and yet they are sundered in spite of their many affinities, while Bardesanes is joined with Marcion, to whom he bears no resemblance whatever. The division of *Neander* works better, based on the relation which the systems make Christianity, the revelation of the supreme God, bear to nature and previous history. The characteristic form here is simply the figure of the demiurge, or maker of the world, as it returns upon us in all the Gnostic systems, who is at the same time the God of the Jews, determining their relation to the rest of mankind. He represents the constitution of nature and the sense of previous history, showing their relation to the supreme God. Where a system is concerned to maintain a correspondence between Christianity and what went before it, the dualism between God and nature falls with it also more into the background; in this case, the demiurge is indeed deficient in power and knowledge, but still not hostile to God, and being made acquainted with the divine purposes in the work of redemption, he serves them willingly. Where, on the other hand, stress is laid on the ungodly character of what went before Christianity, Judaism, being

in nearest relation to it, is rejected as wholly or almost wholly opposed to God: and so the demiurge, here also, becomes a being at war with God, who is forced to serve him against his own will. Hence the dualism between God and the creation comes out also more sharply defined. As the relation of Judaism to Christianity forms the main distinction, the two classes are designated briefly as judaistic and anti-judaistic Gnostics. To the first class belong Cerinthus, Basilides, Valentinus and his school, Bardesanes. In the second class the relation to Christianity is made a subordinate ground of distinction, which in connection with the other division may be here allowed. For it is of weight certainly, whether Judaism be sundered from Christianity out of a one-sided regard to the Christian interest itself as such, or be pronounced ungodly through the force of heathen views hostile to the one, and subversive of the other. The anti-judaistic Gnostics fall thus into two classes. First, such as lean toward heathenism: the Ophites, Pseudo-Basilidians, Cainites, Sethites, Carpocratæ, the Nicolaitans, the Simonians, and some others of smaller influence. Secondly, such as allow to Christianity its proper independence: Saturninus, Tatian, the Encratites, Marcion. It might be better indeed, on the whole, according to what we have before said, if those systems in which all specifically Christian ideas lose themselves in pantheism, dualism, and their results, and where consequently we have only the matter of heathenism itself under abused Christian terms and forms, were distinguished from the Gnosis proper, and placed in a separate category, as Gnosticizing Paganism, on the outmost border of the Christian schemes. We should then have fully within the heathen sphere Plotinus, for example, an opponent of the Gnostics, and yet a continuation in fact of their false thinking. In the case of Manichæism, such exclusion is owned on all sides to be right. Why such bodies as the Carpocratians, Cainites, Pseudo-Basilidians, and Nicolaitans, should be considered more within the Christian sphere, either theoretically or practically, it is not easy certainly to see. *Niedner's* somewhat complicated method of division leads to nearly the same result with that of Neander. That of *Baur*, which has gained much credit, will be noticed farther on.

We give now a sketch of the principal thoughts that entered into these systems. The hidden first ground of all spiritual existence is the eternal divine Light-Essence, infinitely exalted above all that belongs to earth, incomprehensible and shut up in its own nature. In one view it stands unapproachably far off from the finite, in another it is the last ground of all laws in the finite world. Between these two conceptions, the representation varies. Basilides does not venture to affirm even existence of God, the Unutterable, but styles him the Non-existent; the Valentinians and Ophites allow their fancy more play, and make him the archetype of the human nature. He is called by them Bythos, as being the depth of all perfection. In this character they assign to him the predicates grace and love, under which he is apprehended also especially by Marcion, who names him on this

account the Good. Over against the divine nature stands the un-divine but equally eternal hyle or matter. The dualism thus constituted runs through all gradations. Hellenistic and biblical influences, with Basilides and many of the Valentinians, reduced it to almost nothing. Here matter is the formless, with Basilides the confusion of a yet undeveloped state, with the Valentinians an undigested mass, which still cleaves to the spiritual world and is to be separated from it, or it may be the dark void simply that bounds the divine kingdom of light. With the Ophites and Marcion, the hyle becomes more substantial and active; while it comes nearest to Parsism, and reaches its most aggressive form, in Manes. Under all manifestations, however, and especially where the ethical interest comes in, it is looked upon as the kingdom of Satan and his demons.

In order now to explain the mixture of higher and lower life in the present world, as also to hold God pure from contact with matter, the Gnostics bring in commonly a series of intermediate beings, whom they are accustomed to denominate æons, eternities, that is, spirits of the eternal, super-terrestrial kingdom. Only Marcion, who acknowledges no divine factor in the life of the world before Christ, discards the idea of all such serial mediation; and contents himself with placing the Son in a subordinate connection with God, which he leaves without further explanation. The origin of the æons is referred in some systems to the process of physical necessity; so with the consistent pantheists; to which Manichæism adds the view, that the kingdom of light needed to have its defenders against the assaults of darkness; the highest conception is that of Valentinus, according to whom God created the spirits out of condescending love, limiting his own infinitude in order to confer on them an independent existence. Basilides derives the beginning of things, according to biblical precedent, from the creative word of God. Fastening on the conception of a spoken word, others also, especially Marcus, represent the series of æons as a succession of sounds, dying away in the distance with varied force and sense. Everywhere, with the exception of Basilides, the higher spirits are held to proceed from the divine nature, and from one another, by an emanation which is often conceived of in a very physical way. Hence the widely-diffused analogy of generation, with sexual relations ascribed to the æons, and their arrangement into syzygies or couples. Frequently astronomical numbers are brought in as a regulating law for the process. As emanation favors the idea of a descending scale of being, the lower orders are looked upon as being weaker reflections always of the higher. So the laws grounded in God work down into this lower world. The æons collectively, made at times to be innumerable, form the kingdom of light, called by the Valentinians *pleroma*, the fulness of divine life, which stands opposed the dark, waste kingdom of matter, the *kenoma*. Of these beings of light now, in which the divine fulness is revealed a part, in some way, fall under the power of matter. It is an apostasy, in which Valentinus recognizes something of free act, but which to a

certain extent even with him, and still more with others, rests on the impotence of the weakened life which is the subject of it. With Valentinus it is a passionate, inordinate effort of the part of the æons, Sophia, to comprehend the infinite, which includes in itself the fall. This *causa*, foreign from the divine rest, something material in its nature, is sundered from her, and continues its existence afterwards as the lower Sophia or Achamoth (Wisdom), on the outside of the pleroma. In another view, a portion of the light-nature wells over and mixes itself with the ocean of matter; so according to the Ophites. Or else, as in Manichæism, the powers of darkness capture it by force. Or finally, the lower angels form a world, and in it the figure of a humanity, which God then, out of compassion, endows with the light of reason—the representation of Saturninus. The problem then is to free the light, thus bound and oppressed by matter, and to restore it to the heavenly kingdom. In general the creation of this world is itself the commencement of redemption, inasmuch as law and organization begin to prevail, and the light is brought in the human consciousness, the summit of the whole process, to its greatest concentration, preparing it to ascend to the higher sphere. The immediate cause of the creation is a being, the demiurge, whose existence is drawn mainly from the Old Testament, which it serves at the same time to disparage. The impression of newness and greatness made by Christianity was so powerful, that the God of the Old Testament appeared to be not only different from the God revealed in the New, but much inferior, imperfect being.

He is not of divine race, not of pneumatic constitution, but his nature corresponds with the lower soul; he is from beneath, psychic. He has therefore neither divine knowledge nor divine love. High-minded narrowness, by which, not knowing himself, he holds himself to be the supreme God, and rigorous, severe justice, form his character. Here now comes in the difference already noted, that he either yields himself with increasing voluntariness to the divine plan—attracted first unconsciously by its latent glory, then with fuller insight hailing it in its true character; or that, being of Satanic spirit, he continues perseveringly hostile to God, and must therefore be brought under by force. Such is the Jaldabaoth (son of chaos) of the Ophites, and the demiurge of Marcion, whom he opposes as a mercilessly just and bloodthirsty ruler to the God of love, in the coarsest style. Under the demiurge stand always the sidereal spirits. He reigns in the planetary heaven, and receives from above, without knowing it, the impulses that govern his demiurgic work. Basilides has the notion of a higher and a lower archon or ruler of this sphere. To the province of the demiurge, as conducting the affairs of the world, belong the influences usually attributed to astrology; he is lord of the time and the hour, but is also only under higher supervision. Only with Marcion he moves independently of God both in creating and ruling, as being in his own domain; for he has formed both the world and man with the help of matter alone. Hence God breaks in upon his work in the end suddenly.

To the position of man in the general system of the universe, the Gnostics assign high significance. He stands in the centre of it, binding together the higher region and the earthly, as image of God and as microcosm. This holds indeed, however, only of the highest of the three classes into which the race is divided—the pneumatic. In the pneumatic man alone is the spark of divine light and life, by which he rises above all that is earthly. He is capable of divine knowledge and a holy life. This is the nature which distinguishes the Gnostic from the psychic and the hylic classes. The psychic man has the outward forms of righteousness, but without any higher inward impulse. His consciousness binds him down to the letter and the external regularities of a legal, practical life; for the speculative knowledge of divine mysteries he has no spiritual organ. In this distinction the aristocratic intellectualism of the Gnosis, derived from heathenism, comes into view. It holds itself, with its gift of speculation, so high above the stand-point of the common Christian and Jewish multitude, who are possessed only of faith and law, that these are considered by it to be lower natures, beyond the pale of redemption and salvation in the full sense. It is easy to see how much the opposition established in Paganism and Judaism between the lower and higher orders, favored the rise of Gnosticism. The lowest division included the hylic or cholic class, fleshly men ruled by blind passion, in whom matter and animal feeling have reached human form, and who are destined to share the fate of matter in the end. The heathen masses, led by sensuality, and serving idols considered frequently to be demons, are regarded especially as of this order. The psychic class before the time of Christ are particularly the Jews; who for this reason have been chosen by the psychic demiurge, are provided by him with a law of promises and threatenings, and have the hope that he will send them a Messiah who is to secure for them the supremacy over the heathen world. Still there are among the heathen psychic men, and among the Jews hylic men; the Judaistic Gnostics allow the existence also of pneumatic men among both the heathen and the Jews. The Ophites limit this sometimes to very few cases, and sometimes again, with heathenish feeling, make it reach in the world of heathenism very far. Some, as the Cainites, hold as pneumatic in their sense those whom the Scriptures have branded as transgressors of the divine law, such as Cain and Judas. Marcion, on the other hand, set aside the distinction of natures, allowed only that of will to hold even in the time before Christ, and denied to this all participation of divine life, whether natural or of grace. The Gnostics of more historical feeling recognized the utterances of a pneumatic life before Christ, in the prophets both of Judaism and heathenism. They distinguish in them predictions that came to them from the demiurge; and others, of more spiritual import, which they receive from the pleroma. We have here the germs of a free theory of inspiration. By the revelations of the prophets, the pneumatic men are stirred to presentiments of their higher destination, longing is awakened in their

breasts, the creature groans after redemption. The insufficiency of the state before Christ, involved as it was in nature, sin, and error, was by the nobler spirits among the Gnostics well understood. They describe it as the ban of the demiurge and the planetary powers, lying as a dull, heavy weight upon the soul. Or as the sighing of Achamoth, made to wail beneath the burden of matter. The hymns of the Ophites and Valentinians were filled with this feeling, and with such images. The book *Pistis Sophia* (that is, Sophia fallen from the state of vision into that of faith), recently made known, and in the interest mainly of the Valentinians, contains their penitential and plaintive songs, compiled out of passages from the Psalms (*Pistis Sophia, opus gnosticum e cod. coptico descriptum lat. vertit M. G. Schwarze, ed. J. H. Petermann, 1853; comp. Kæstlin on the P. S. in the Theol. Jahrb. of Baur and Zeller, 1854*).

The redemption of the pneumatic class cannot be accomplished through a Messiah sent by the demiurge. Their deliverance, however, is the grand need. Hence the most perfect of the æons descends through the series of heavens, draws off everywhere from the sidereal powers the pneuma which they hold in their possession, and appears for the same purpose also upon the earth. As he may not come into contact with the material nature of the human body, the Redeemer is scarcely ever conceived of as fully human; the dualistic, idealistic way of thinking brings in docetism, but this of very various shades, in the apprehension of Christ's person. An exception is found in the Messiah of Basilides, in whom all human constituents are joined with the powers of the ethereal pneuma. The outward nature of the connection between the heavenly and the earthly in Christ expresses itself in this also, that many make the æon descend upon the human person first at his baptism. Valentinus brought forward the Messiah of the demiurge in the first place; but even he was too exalted for matter, and bore a body of psychic character, which imitated the appearance of one in the flesh. With this Messiah, then, the highest æon joined itself in the act of baptism. The bodily appearance is resolved wholly into show by Marcion, as he introduces the Son of God into the world also without any sort of human intervention or preparation. Still less can the heavenly æon take part in the passion. It is either all show, as the outward in Christ generally, or else the æon quits the human person at this point. The passion thus can have no great significance in the process of redemption. With Valentinus it is a symbol; Marcion attaches much weight to it, but he does so inconsistently; according to Basilides every man suffers, and Christ also, for his own sins. With this, indeed, cosmical references are often joined. The elements of the all are brought together in Christ, and by his death are dissolved. The redemption works from this out as a world-arranging force, bringing everything to its place. The process begins in creation, and reaches its last result in redemption, called by Basilides *apokatastasis*. The main thing in the redemptive life of Christ, is the communication of the Gnosis to a narrow, qualified circle, from

which it passes onward among the initiated. It is easily seen how much this idealism generalizes the specific value of redemption, and how much the intellectualism narrows at the same time its efficiency. Few set aside the necessity of the coming of Christ altogether. It was required, to waken the pneuma to a sense of its destination, and to show it how this was to be reached. With the Valentinians, even the better sort of psychic men were provided with an inferior sort of salvation. The demiurge was in this case also rewarded, as having aided the work of redemption according to his ability. Where he strives against it throughout, his power over the pneuma is forever taken away; either matter is annihilated, or it remains in its pristine state, only impotent against the light, and given over to chaotic discord within itself.

The ethics of the Gnostics depended partly on the existing amount of moral earnestness among them, and partly on their dualistic assumptions. These lead to the idea of a strife against matter; it must be conquered, that the soul may give itself without hindrance to Gnostic contemplation. With the first Gnostics this took place by asceticism, which was milder or more rigid according to the dualism. Basilides and Isidorus enjoined battle against the demoniacal workings of the lower life still cleaving to the spirit; but marriage was allowed. The Valentinians also did not carry their asceticism to the highest point; marriage here was even a law for the spiritual. In the severe schemes of Saturninus, Marcion, Manes, it was rejected altogether. The Manichæans of the higher class might not partake of anything out of the animal kingdom, nor so much as wound a plant. They lived on fruits, which others plucked for their use. With another class of gross, heathen-minded dualists, however, this war with matter took just an opposite course. They pretended to conquer it by turning it as far as possible to their own use. They asserted their freedom by transgressing all the restraints of law. The ocean of pneumatic virtue which was in them, they said, could not be rendered impure by any drops of matter (*D. Erdmann, de notionibus ethicis gnosticorum, Berol., 1847*).

The Gnostics differed materially from the Catholic Church in their authorities and sources of knowledge. Their highest rule was tradition; not the common ecclesiastical tradition, however, which they left to the multitude as poor and unphilosophical; but a secret system handed down among such as themselves. Marcion, who placed the essence of Christianity in faith, held the doctrine of his sect open for all. He, and the other decided anti-judaists, Saturninus and Manes, rejected the Old Testament altogether as a source of divine knowledge; its more moderate opposers, Basilides, the Valentinians, and among them particularly Ptolomæus, made a distinction between the pneumatic, psychic, and hylic parts of it. In the New Testament also, they gave some writings a preference over others. Marcion allowed the authority of an apostle to Paul only; and held his writings and the gospel of Luke for normative, after expunging all Jewish references (*Hahn, Ev. des Marcion. Ritschl, on the contrary, held Luke's*

gospel to be the later work). They had besides commonly particular, often apocryphal documents, from which they drew; Basilides, for instance, the predictions of a pretended prophet Barkoph; the Gnostic Justin, a book of Baruch. For the Manichæans, the writings of Manes, especially his book *Erteng*, were the highest authority. Others carried the use of heathen poets and philosophers to a great length. As the allegorical method of interpretation was in full force among them, it was easy for them to find their own ideas everywhere. Not only the Old and New Testaments, not only poets like Homer, were construed in this fantastic style; the Ophites, whom Hippolytus calls Naassenes, found even in the drinking songs of Anacreon unutterable Gnostic mysteries. Among all the Gnostics, Marcion alone made use of literal interpretation. All the rest hold it for a defect, belonging to the psychic stand-point, or that of faith.

Of the worship of the Gnostics little is known, since they made it an interest to keep the most important part of it secret. We may perceive a two-fold consequence of their idealism. Some require the highest simplicity, that the spirit may not be disturbed by outward things. Marcion demanded a return to apostolical plainness, which seemed to him to be disappearing from the Church. The most of them, however, were disposed by their fancy to a pompous worship. They multiplied symbols for their ideas. This is known of the followers of Marcus, and may be inferred in the case of others from their hymns. The Basilidians celebrated, even in the 2d cent., the festival of Epiphany. The Manichæans had a special festival in honor of the martyrdom of their founder. Of the Simonians and Carpocratians, it is known that they used images of their religious heroes in their worship, with heathenish mystical rites and ceremonies (comp. *Neander*, Ch. Hist., I., 476-478, on the cultus of the Gnostics).

Many Gnostics gave themselves to magic. They imitated in this the countless impostors and philosophers of their time, who pretended to possess not only divine knowledge, but also higher powers, exhibiting in proof their magical arts. Hippolytus, in the fourth book of his *κρυπτός*, gives many examples of these heathen and Gnostic deceptions. They were introduced by some into their worship, as by the Marcionians in the Eucharist. The later Basilidians also lay under this charge.

Considering the talent of many of the Gnostics, and the religious depth of single persons among them, and looking at the vast commotion they caused in the Church for more than a century, it is not to be doubted but that by their errors and truths, negatively and positively, they exercised a very great influence on the course of Christianity. When the Church was in danger of losing herself in form and letter, and falling into a Jewish spirit, their idealistic speculation gave her an impulse to spiritual reflection and doctrinal investigation. General and particular movements were powerfully affected by this. It was not without reference to the rationalizing tendency, that Montanism assumed its realistic, practical, and supernatural shape, and won influence accordingly. The

Alexandrian Christian theology stands, through opposition and affinity, still more directly under the influence of the Gnosis. The distinctive principles of Christianity came to be better understood, its relations to Paganism and Judaism more thoroughly explored. Marcion called to mind its original form, which was beginning at many points to be darkened. A multitude of doctrinal problems were brought before the Church; in some of their solutions the Gnostics were in advance of their time; most of them were successfully controverted; but all contributed to a clearer and fuller development of Church doctrine. The apologetic interest made new progress. Greater attention was given to exegesis. The higher art which the Gnostics applied to worship, their poetry in particular, was not without its effect. In all these relations, however, the Church was only led to feel and affirm more and more her own distinction, as the true and only proper bearer of the life which had come down to her from the Apostles. She would own no common interest with the Gnostics whatever.

It may not be presumed, therefore, that the Church teachers who stood in immediate conflict with the Gnosis, were able to do full justice to a phenomenon which, by its strange, fantastic forms, and confused mass of meaning, has been found so very difficult of comprehension in all times. They saw in it, for the most part, nothing but error and folly, proceeding from enmity toward the Church, and conditioned by other immoral interests. This appears in the first traces of controversy which we find in the Epistles of *Ignatius* and the writings of *Justin*, but more especially in the earliest full disputation which has come down to us, the *κρυπτός τῆς ψευδοπίστεως* of *Irenæus*. Neither with him, nor with later polemics and historians down to modern times, do we find any attempt at inward classification; all goes by outward, more or less accidental, relations and distinctions. *Hippolytus*, in his *κρυπτός κατὰ πασῶν αἰρέσεων* (published as a work of Origen by Miller, Oxf., 1851), followed in the footsteps of his teacher Irenæus, but carried out thoroughly the notion that the heresies sprang from an imitation of the heathen philosophy. The knowledge of which they boasted was there, he maintained, in a better form. To confute the Gnostic tenets, he thinks it sufficient to refer them back thus to their philosophical source. His method, for this reason, is the less mixed with his own thinking; and as he generally gives original extracts, he is particularly important for the knowledge of his opponents. *Tertullian* carried on the controversy with still more passion, especially against Marcion. With the *Alexandrians* we find more acknowledgment of the speculative need which is involved in the Gnosis, also more frequent attempts to separate between the true and the false in their theorems; still, opposition is by far the most predominant here also. *Origen* holds Basilides, Valentinus, and Marcion for the "gates of hell," which seek to swallow up the Church. *Eusebius* in his *Church History*, *Epiphanius* in his principal controversial work, *Theodoret* in his book against the fables of the heretics, are valuable as additional sources

of knowledge, but show themselves no less exclusive in their ecclesiastical stand-point. The middle ages inherit from these fathers their severe judgment, with less knowledge of the party condemned. Even the Reformation did not lead at once to any better understanding of the case. Later interests first led here to more exact inquiry, and finally to more just opinion. *Gottfried Arnold*, who had himself suffered much villification from the dominant Church party, entered the more readily thus into fellowship with the old oppressed sects. If he did not understand the nature of the Gnosis, he yet hesitated to accept the judgment of their opponents. Their reports were uncertain, they had not conferred with the obnoxious parties themselves, it had been the fashion to denounce them in the popular interest. Arnold's so-called "Impartial History" has the merit in general, of having turned more attention to the heretical sects. The Gnostics came thus, among others, to be more thoroughly studied. *Buddeus* investigated the Valentinian system, and derived it from the Cabbala, on the ground of many real coincidences discovered by him—which, however, show rather the derivation of both from a common source. *Massuet*, in opposition to *Buddeus*, resolved all into Platonism. Both failed, in looking at the Gnosis only under its Valentinian form. *Beausobre*, on the other hand, in his History of Manichæism, was led from this system into an inquiry concerning the older Gnostics, which in addition to its great learning, is distinguished for the view that the main source of the Gnosis is to be found in Oriental ideas. The great point with him is the dualistic doctrine, which, in Gnostic form, had found adherents even before the time of Christ, and by Simon Magus—as portrayed in the Clementine Recognitions—was introduced into the Church. These vague surmises were by *Mosheim* (*commentarii de reb. Chr. ante Const. Mag.*, p. 333) brought into more definite shape. Having, with sure tact, discerned the Oriental nature of the Gnosis, he undertook to point out the elements themselves which it had borrowed from the East. But as he also was but imperfectly acquainted with the Asiatic religions, he could only employ the circle of abstracting what was common to the Gnostic systems, and making this then to be the supposed Oriental Philosophy from which the Gnosis sprang (comp. *H. Rosset's* critical history of the investigations concerning Gnosticism, from the Reformation to *Mosheim*, in his theol. Schriften: Berl., 1847, p. 177). The hint furnished by *Mosheim*, so suggestive in spite of its own shortcomings, with its particular specimens of unprejudiced, purely historical investigation, contributed materially to more thorough views of the whole subject. Still, we do not find with him a proper insight into the constitution of the Gnostic systems, or an acknowledgment of their relative historical justification. This required wider general developments in theology and philosophy, and the waking of a more active sense for the different forms of Christian life, and for the manifold wants or needs which lie at the ground of them, especially the demand for a speculative knowledge of the truth. It is the grand merit of *Neander's* work, "Genetic

Sketches of the principal Gnostic Systems: 1818," that, coming to the subject with such qualification, it sought out the different sources and precedents of the Gnosis, distributed it into a circle of kindred groups, distinguished the systems according to their inward character, and so by a happy division proceeding from the most essential points brought light into the chaos, while it unfolded the Christian and philosophical wants which proclaimed themselves in the strange phenomena, by referring them to more general and familiar forms. When once the peculiar signification of these ideas, the depth of spiritual meaning which lay involved in such great errors, had been thus disclosed, it became easier to understand also the influence they had exerted for so long a period, as well as to estimate the period itself in its proper light. At the same time appeared the Prolegomena to a work on the Gnostics by *Lewald* (*de doctrina gnostica*: 1818), which the modest author himself, however, held to be superfluous after the performance of *Neander*. *Möhler*, in his Essay on the Rise of Gnosticism, excludes Platonism altogether as a source, and derives it from Paganism, under the influence more particularly of the gross dualism of the East. The proper principle of it, however, he finds to be a mistaken Christian interest. Taking up again the notion of the ancients, that the Gnosis sprang from an inquiry into the origin of evil, he thinks that there lay at the bottom of it an overstrained sense of sin, which led to a diabolization of nature. In this view, limited to a single aspect of the subject only, it is sought to make Gnosticism a forerunner of Protestantism, in which the author tries to prove the presence of a like principle. *J. Matter's* *histoire critique du gnosticisme*: 1828, 2d ed., 1843, is an elegantly written work, which goes with extensive knowledge into the origin of Gnosticism and its several systems, but labors under the fault of having no adequate principle of division. The highly intellectual and learned work of *Baur*, on the Christian Gnosis, 1835, opens a new view of the whole subject. He considers it a philosophy of religion, representing the conception of the absolute religion in the different moving forces of its progressive development. Religion and its forces are apprehended by it, however, not according to abstract idea, but under the concrete figures and positive forms in which they had made themselves historically objective, at the time when Christianity appeared. It follows the development, accordingly, in the relations of Heathenism, Judaism, and Christianity, which are represented in hyle, the demiurge, and Christ—or under an anthropological view, in the hyleic, psychic, and pneumatic classes of men. Hence the division of the systems into, 1st, such as join Christianity with Heathenism and Judaism (*Basilides*, *Valentinus*, the *Ophites*); 2d, such as oppose Christianity to Judaism and Heathenism (*Marcion*); 3d, such as identify Christianity with Judaism, in opposition to Heathenism. Here *Baur*, as *Hase* likewise, reckons the Clementine homilies, which ought rather to be characterized, however, as Ebionitism, with a mixture of Gnostic elements. *Baur* hopes to render the conception of the

Gnosis more clearly definite in this way. But these sharp distinctions would seem to wrong its actual historical constitution, which was notoriously of a somewhat flowing character. The representation is too much a matter of reflection, its forms are too modern, it is in too close analogy with the problem and terms of the recent comparative philosophy of religion. What is observable at other points, that single aspects of Gnostic thinking are made to pass for the whole idea, holds true at once of the ground hypothesis—the comparison of religions. The problem of the relation which Christianity sustains to previous history, is indeed one of the questions—one, too, of wide influence—with which the Gnostic systems are employed; but it is going quite too far, to think of deriving from this all their other ideas. The Gnosis is an eclectic religious philosophy, in which the comparison of religions takes an important place; but it is no comparative philosophy of religion. The work of *Rossel*, already mentioned, handles single inquiries, in a fragmentary manner, with great force and effect. *Ritter's* History of Philosophy also, in its own province, has some instructive disquisitions on the principal Gnostic systems (comp. *Articles Basilides, Valentinus, Ophites, Marcion*).

JACOBI.—*Nevin*.

Goar, St., a *Romanian hermit*, from Aquinania, who settled in the 6th cent. on the left bank of the Rhine, at a place called after him, St. Goar, between Bingen and Coblenz, in the Prussian Rhine province. Here, though not connected with any cloister or bishopric, he lived the life of a hermit, and, by self-denial and preaching of the Gospel, labored for the spread of Christianity. His lonely cell, situate in the most lovely valley of the Rhine, became thus a new refuge for our holy religion. When he lived and died cannot be definitely determined. From an inscription on the Church of St. Goar, he died 611. During his journey to the Bishop Justicus of Trier, who distrusted his evangelical freedom and independence, he performed such miracles that the Bishop grew ashamed of himself, and the people venerated him as a *confessor*. An arch was soon made to surmount his grave, upon which was built the cloister-church, which was constructed in its present form, 1444–1469, and remodelled, 1843.—At the diet in Lippsprunge, 782, Charlemagne declared the property of the empire, and gave it to the abbacy of Prüm.—*St. Goar* was the first town on the Rhine, and on its left bank, where was introduced, by order of Landgrave Philip of Hesse, the Reformation; and that, too, after the *vangel. Reformed* style. The Reformed faith maintained its ground, although later (since 1626) a Lutheran Church was instituted, and in 1629 a Roman Catholic, the altar of which was sacked by the sword of Gustavus Adolphus (1631), who re-established the evangelical worship. The transition of the Landgrave Ernst of Hesse-Rheinfels to the Catholic Church (1652), though it occasioned (1654) the founding of a Catholic congregation in the town, did not annihilate the evangelical doctrine (comp. *Gesch. St. Goar*, by *A. Grebel*: St. Goar, 1848, though it betrays partiality to Rome; so also the K.-G.

Deutschl. by *Retberg*: Göttingen, 1846, I., § 80–84).

M. GÜBEL.—*Ermentrout*.

Goch, John von, properly *John Pupper*, born the beginning of the 15th century, belonged to that class of contemplative men who, dissatisfied with the Church of Rome, desired a reformation, insisted on a *free use of the Scriptures*, and unfurled the banner of *Christian freedom*. We have very little certain knowledge of his external life. In the year 1451, he established an Order of Canonesses in *Mechlin*, and endeavored to reform the cloisters of this place. For 24 years he acted as Rector, or Father-Confessor, of his house of deaconesses at Thabor. Died March 28, 1475.—Ullmann thus characterizes him: "Goch was a man of great depth and acuteness, of living piety, combined with convincing logic. Though more inclined to quiet meditation than to outward activity, the freely out-spoken results of his thinking operated powerfully on practical life. Not so learned and comprehensive, less active and reformatory than his friend *Wessel*, he was more profound and inward. Though not so mystical as Thomas à Kempis, he was more logical and scientific, better versed in theology, and more decided in his zeal for the direct reformation of religion and the Church."—(Comp. *Dr. C. Ullmann's* Reformatoren vor der Reformation, Vol. I., p. 17–174).

K. SUDHOFF.—*Ermentrout*.

God is—*God*. Theology might rest satisfied with this definition, as against the unwarranted demands of science, were it not still necessary to give account to itself of the reasons of such a sublime tautology. Accordingly, it must express itself concerning *the capability of knowing*, concerning *the idea* and concerning *the attributes of God*, upon the basis of the Scriptures.

I. *The capability of knowing God*.—The above applied tautology secures this much, that although it is impossible to comprehend, it is not absolutely impossible to know God. Even Atheology must be able to say what we are to understand by the *something* which exists in the understanding and in language. Or at least, to say that God cannot be known involves His unreality; because if it is admitted or proven that God is, it cannot remain absolutely unknown *what* or *how* He is. The knowledge of existence and the form of existence mutually condition each other. All the proofs for the existence of God have their point of departure, contents, and end, in some divine form of existence (power, wisdom, justice, goodness). See *Nitzsch's* system der christl. Lehre, 1851, p. 16; *Ritter*, über die Erkenntnis Gottes in der Welt, 1856, p. 232.

With regard to the invisibility, inexpressibility, incapacity of knowing, inscrutability, and incomprehensibility of God, it is to be remarked first of all, that not each of these negatives involves every other, especially that incomprehensibility does not involve incapacity of knowing; and then, that none of them are used in the service of unbelief or of doubt, but in order to give more room to the claims of revelation or to the rights of faith. The latter is the case especially in the passages John 1:18, "No man hath seen God at any time;" 1 John 4:12, and 1 Tim. 6:16. God is only revealed in Christ,

viz.: to faith and through love, which is his essence, or generally only in his works. The Lord has certainly given *manifestations* of his glory, but these only through a *mediation*, by means of a reflection (Ex. 33 : 20). Faith, not sight, belongs to the present stage of existence and of knowledge (2 Cor. 5 : 7 ; 1 Cor. 13 : 12). Therefore, *God is to be known, but only in so far as he makes himself known, and in so far as the passive or active human receptivity extends.* Literally to see God would be fatal to a created, sinful being (Judges 6 : 22 ; Isaiah 6 : 5). On the other hand, in contrast with the dead and perverted knowledge of God (Rom. 1 : 21 ; 3 John 11 ; James 2 : 19), a *seeing, beholding*, is allowed to living knowledge, with which are connected the ways of knowing God opened by *mystic theology*. Science also trusts in the innate laws of the understanding as instruments to attain to knowledge of the truth. To know the truth, the reason, and object of phenomena in their connection, in their unity, is a process which leads from every point to the knowledge of the perfect and real being. Every science which perceives something true and good in the world, in nature and reason, perceives thereby a power of wisdom and goodness, and, as this is not to be viewed abstractly, God from eternity (*Ritter, l. c.*, p. 472 sq. ; *Suabedissen, Metaphysic*, 1836, p. 143). But it is religion which decides and defines everything for men, and therefore it is that which is immediately felt and known before all reflection and speculation. The mind is able to anticipate the knowledge of God from without. Knowledge and will, intention and impulse, are so rooted in the mind, that the one conditions the other. Sin is therefore repugnance to the truth, and knowledge is a moral act. God can alone be rightly taught, named, and comprehended in Christ; but the contents of revelation do not become ours when we have merely appropriated the dead letter by faith. The receptivity for divine illumination first begins after the perfected introversion of man. The man, emptied of himself by spiritual discipline and denial of the world, perceives the light and love of God more and more, until he is transformed to the divine image, and wills and thinks of God by God. The original and typical lowly life and sufferings of Christ must repeat themselves in him who comes to God by Him, and in whom God is to reveal Himself. But as the way of science leads to excess, so also the way of mysticism. By the former, the thinker imagines that the more he has separated himself from historical and moral conditions, and depends upon himself alone, the more certainly he is able to attain to absolute knowledge of the absolute, of God; by the latter, the created life is mingled, as a drop in the sea of theopantism. Only the *faith of the Church* moderates both tendencies, compels them mutually to test each other, and insisted from the beginning to the present time on this, that there is only, *κατὰ τὸ ἐπειρόν*, a real and objective knowledge of God through his revelation. The incomprehensibility of the divine Being is not only a fixed postulate, but also this, that every advancement in the knowledge of God is also an advancement in the knowledge of the incompre-

hensibility of God. The religion or monotheistic fanaticism (in Judaism and Islamism) has, according to experience, provoked the most crass pantheism, whilst all the imperfections and dangers connected with the worship of the extra and supramundane God, were overcome by the apparent tritheism of Christianity.—(Compare *Nitzsch's Syst. d. christl. Lehre*, 1851, p. 188.)

II. *The idea of God and the divine name.*—God can certainly be named and distinguished by language from every other object; still, the name, which absolutely expresses his essence, is not to be found, and is a deep mystery. Further, we are certainly able to determine in thought the essence and life of God known to us, over against our consciousness of the world, of nature, or of self; but we are not able adequately and correctly to define the contents of the conception, God. Christian theologians, from the time of Clemens Alexandrinus (*Strom. V. Pott.*, p. 251 sq.) to the Protestant scholastics, agree in these negations and affirmations. (See *Twisten, Vorlesungen über die Dogmatik*. 2 Bd., 1 Abth., p. 7, and the works on Christian dogmatics by *Bretschneider, Klein, Hase, and Schmid.*) The same is meant when the distinction is made, in this case, between definition and description, real and nominal definition. *Clement* already gave the reasons for the impossibility of a more perfect definition, in a manner similar to, but more complete than *ex. gr. Gerhard*: "How is it possible to express or explain in words, what is neither species, nor member of an antithesis, nor quality, nor atom, nor number, and is also nothing contingent nor subject to accident. Also, the all would not be a proper designation, for God is the father of the all. Just as little is He a part, for the unit is indivisible and again eternal, because it can neither be penetrated nor limited." Notwithstanding we apply the category of *being* or *essence* as that which, in a measure, is most common and simple to the Deity and the creature, in order to make a beginning in describing the contents of the idea of God, *ex. gr. ens, essentia, substantia (vita?)*, well knowing that all this said concerning God is valid in a different sense than when said concerning the world. This is so to such an extent, that philosophers and theologians have not been wanting, who, in view of the finite, contingent, and mutable existence of things, have not hesitated to begin with the non-existence of God as the rudimental germ of the idea. Or, it is said, God is *super-substantial*. Meanwhile, however, the language of the schools has always returned to the *being* as the first position; and even the ancient metaphysical usage of the terms, the *first, first essence* (*Holluz*), *first mover*, have not been rejected, because it is not possible at present to think of God otherwise than *in ordine ad res creatas*. And yet the so-called *ens primum* cannot be established in this way, because, on account of the reference to the creature, the question is not at all concerning mere number or order, but concerning absolute causality, and concerning the perfection of the being; therefore concerning the self-dependent, infinite, but all-embracing essence. This also does not consist altogether in this, that it causes and effects something, for

it is an *εἰς αὐτὸν, ἔξ αὐτοῦ, ἀπὸ αὐτοῦ*. And hence it is, that in Protestant confessions of faith, the definition is immediately connected with a predicate of being or essence, as *infinitum, necessarium*. Lately the predicate *absolutum* is used instead of every other. If, now, we were to add the *ἔξ αὐτοῦ* and *εἰς αὐτόν* to the idea of causality and final end as embraced in the *ens absolutum*, this idea, as such, would either comprehend love and personality, or contain these as implied elements. Hence, the complete conception of being requires that *Spirit* and *Personality*—*spiritualis, intelligens*—be combined with the definition of absolute existence (*Rothe: Natur, Geist, Persönlichkeit Gottes; s. theol. Ethik, in der Grundlegung*). In proportion as Pantheism began to be dangerous, was greater stress laid on the idea of Personality (*Fichte, Idee der Persönl.; Fischer, Idee der Gottheit*). Thus were elaborated logico-metaphysical triads, which sometimes approximated, sometimes receded from the dogma of the Trinity. Though the affirmation of the Divine Personality occasioned the ascription of it by some (as by Swedenborg) to God only as in the Son, or only to the Father, whilst it was denied the Holy Ghost, yet, as the idea itself does not forbid that of three subsistences, modern speculative theology has not hesitated to base it on the analogical explanation of the Trinitarian doctrine (see *Twesten, II. Abth., s. 194–216*); nor could it perplex those who, pretending to be unable to distinguish Personality from individuality, regarded absolute Personality as a direct contradiction in terms. Through Personality, the subject is separated within itself into thought, knowledge, and will, whilst the relation is still preserved between the Divine life and the human. Though Person and Personality are conceptions not directly expressed in Scriptures, they are contained in such words as *Father, Lord, Saviour*, etc. The idea of God as love, necessitates that of Personality; we are thus fully justified in connecting the divine perfection in love with that of life (*God is spirit*), and, in order properly to express the biblical doctrine of the Divine essence, to coin the *His Personality* by the idea of love (*Syst. christl. Lehre, § 61*). “*Determined* is the divine being which *determines* all,” but to fix and condition everything is to be absolutely good and free; hence, as there cannot be any higher principle of the endless, these constitute the simplest elements of the idea of *God*. With this accord passages of Scripture, such as: *God is a Spirit, love, the Lord*.

Before we can decide the question whether God can be named or not (*ἀνωρόματος, ἀπρητος*), we must reflect on the *idea* of a name. A name is a designation by means of language of anything that may be thought and represented,—*ὄνομα, ἐνδεικτικόν*. All languages have, in some sense, the name of God, which does not claim to express absolutely the being of Divinity, but *positione*. Even Polytheism has a name for the abstract of all its gods which sets forth the ideas of might, power, causality. Philosophic Monotheism aims at the reduction of polytheistic *plurality* to a concrete *unity* which, even when fully accomplished, cannot surmount the incomprehensibility of God. In the sphere

of *Revelation*, the only true God names himself. The idea of a name, designating essence and person, now obtains a wider meaning. The *entire contents* of the self-revelation of God, His Word, together with all memorials and customs, offices and transactions appertaining to it, give God a name, presentiate his existence, mediate his glory, and demand obedience, faith, holiness, and worship. Thus, it is the *name of the Lord* in the angel accompanying the Israelitish army (Exod. 23); he is blessed that cometh in the name of the Lord (Ps. 118); the name of the Lord is to be hallowed (Matt. 6:9). Jesus alone is the full name of God, the Father (Phil. 2; Col. 3:17). A *peculiar* (Exod. 3:14; 6:3) name is *God of Revelation*, which expresses not so much a predicate as the eternal essence of God revealing himself and his kingdom in time (*Beck, chr. Lehrwissensch.*). For, though the name Jehovah designates in its root being (*Seyn*), it goes beyond the philosophical idea of absolute existence, and denotes also the *progressive revelation* of God. He is the First and the Last (Rev. 1:8). The names *Father* and *Saviour* (Isa. 63:16; 64:8), set forth new phases of the Divine being, referring, as they do, to the grace and love of God toward his people (*Hengstenberg, die Gottesnamen des Pentateuch*).

III. *The Attributes of God*.—Theology never allows these to be regarded as something different from the Divine essence. Appropriately termed by *Suabedissen, l. c., p. 150, Conceptions of the idea of God in His relation to the world*. In considering them, care must be taken that no single one be separated from the Divine being as a unity, but looked at as always subsisting therein. It must always be borne in mind that no attribute expresses anything of God different or new. The chief question is not how to attain a knowledge of them, whether in the way of negation, climax, or causality; for the knowledge of the Divine essence is the root of that of His attributes, and a mechanical putting together of ideis will not lead to an acquaintanceship with His being. Of as little service, in this respect, is the Gnostic *primum ens*, which is without predicate. Nor is speculation about the Absolute, the One, the source of the doctrine of the attributes. This is to be found in the fact that the living God is believed and acknowledged according to the degrees in which He reveals himself to our experience, which, as the case requires, must go hand-in-hand with the pious reception of Divine truth. Consequently, what is essential to the doctrine of God must be sought for where the religious life has manifested itself in its original fulness and purity, viz.: in its written records, or in the historical and practical life of Revelation. Theology, therefore, must pay respect to the phenomena of the Bible, to their development as contained in both Testaments, to the qualifying expressions that denote the special way in which, at any particular time, God has made himself known, to the continuity of and connection between His principal works and designs, and to the method of representation by grouping and pairing. Love, Spirit, Life, Light, designate essence or being, following which are *Glory* and *Holiness*; in like order, *Power* and

Wisdom, Power and Goodness, Goodness and Wisdom. The ethical character of the Christian doctrine of God requires special attention to be paid to the *modis* of holy Love — *Justice and Truthfulness, Truthfulness and Goodness*, finally, to the frequent grouping of *Gracious, Merciful, Long-Suffering, Grace and Truth or Faithfulness.* Theology has not yet succeeded in the attempt satisfactorily to classify the attributes. For a long time it was content with dividing them into negative and affirmative, active and passive, absolute and relative, natural and moral, communicable and incommunicable. But there seemed to be something deficient about these divisions, *e. g.*, properly speaking, it could not be said that a divine attribute was incommunicable, as, according to the promise, 2 Pet. 1, man was to be made partaker of the Divine nature. The dualism which existed in these was not obviated by the Wolffian theory (*e. g. Gruner*), which deduced the attributes from the idea of a *perfect Spirit*, nor by that of *Oetinger*, who started with God as the absolute unity of natural and spiritual life, nor by that of *Henke's infinite goodness.* *Tieftrunk* (*Censur des prot. Lehrbegriffes*) and *Bretschneider* (*Dogm.*) avoided the mixture of the religious element with mere philosophy, by distinguishing in the attributes those which belong to the Divine essence, and those which do not. An advance was made by the Rationalist *Böhme* (*Lehre v. d. göttl. Eigensch.* 1821) who distinguished between the Divine perfections belonging to the world in *general*, and to the *moral world* in particular. According to *Schleiermacher*, as our religious feelings have to do either with the *special* Christian consciousness which is filled with the ideas of redemption, sin, and grace, or with the *universal* sense of dependence on God, to this latter can be referred the Omnipotence, the Omniscience, the Omnipresence of God; to the former, his Holiness, Justice, Love, and Wisdom. Dissatisfied still, theologians returned to the old scholastic method of division, man being the type, into *Being* (*Leben*). *Power, Knowledge, Will.* As *Feeling* also became the basis of a division (*Hahn, Hase, Lange*), it became necessary to point out, *e. g.*, the difference that obtained between the repentance of God and that of man. *Hollaz: quæcunque a creaturis transferuntur ad Deum, repurganda sunt prius et tum demum attribuenda.* On Anthropopathism, see *Augustin's Confess.*, 4.

An essential improvement on this doctrine was made by *Elvert*, *Tüb. Ztschr.*, 1830, and particularly by *Twisten*, *Vorles.* II., 1, p. 44, who, selecting as the principal attributes *Power and Love*, ranged the rest beneath them; the former being distinguished as absolute, *ruling*, from the *ruled* and from *Omnipresence*, the latter, in distinction from virtue and happiness, as *Holiness and Goodness*, from freedom and sin, as *Justice and Grace.* Similar to this in some points, in others different, the plan pursued by *Nitzsch* in his *System d. Chr. Lehre*, who, on the theory that ontological definitions have nothing to do with axiomatic doctrine, affirms that the theologian has only to discover the manifold relation it sustains to the world. A two-fold distinction must now be drawn. On the one hand, the re-

lation to finite being in general, and to finite personality in particular, gives rise to different conceptions of God complementary of each other; whilst, on the other, the Biblical doctrine of God presents two views, one of which places Him beyond the reach of human knowledge and human contingency, the other brings Him into the closest possible proximity to His creatures. This double distinction corresponds in part with the division into natural and moral attributes, and in part with that into unlimited and causal. The unlimited for the cosmical sphere are Eternity and Immensity, the causal, Almightyness, Omniscience, Omnipresence; the unlimited for the ethical, Holiness, Wisdom, Happiness, the causal, Justice and Faithfulness (comp. upon this point, *Bruch, Lehre von den göttl. Eigensch.* — Though this doctrine has made great progress since the time of the older Theolog., it is still involved in unexplained difficulties which grow out of the metaphysics of time and space, and the effort to conceive of a self-limitation on the part of God which does not detract from His absoluteness. Sound religious feeling, and a deeper insight into Holy Scripture, will enable us to solve all the difficulties that may be inherent in the subject, or be started by speculation. Herein are displayed the *Glory and Holiness of His Love*, and the idea of *Justification by faith*, that God, in entering into fellowship with man, should still remain God (*System d. christl. Lehre*, 6. Ausg., p. 178; *Weisse, die Christolog. Luthers und die christol. Aufgabe der Evangel. Theol.*, 1852 u. 1855). An essential improvement of this doctrine might be made by representing the attributes not only *per se*, but in their *organic connection with the entire dogma of God* (his *Essence, Persons, Works, and Decrees*). The attempt of *Thomasius* in this direction has not yet been carried forward to a successful result. K. J. NITZSCH.—Beck.

God, Friends of. — This name occurs frequently in the mystical writings of South Germany and Switzerland, during the second half of the 14th century. In the sermons of Tauler, and in some tracts by Suso and others, it very often designates in a general way persons who, in the then existing political and ecclesiastical confusion, and under the calamities with which the nations were visited, found comfort and peace in the love of God, and who called themselves, according to John 15: 15, the Friends of God. Such Friends of God were found in the monasteries, in the castles of the nobility, and among the citizens of the towns. In different places they united together and formed associations, which were connected with each other. Priests and monks preached in these associations, or they preserved and promoted the piety of the members by circulating German writings. To these laborers belongs, among others, *Henry von Nördlingen*, who labored for a time in Bavaria, Swabia, Switzerland, and Alsace.

But latterly it has appeared that the name was used then in a narrower sense. There existed, namely, a secret league, which, although it did not separate from the Church to connect with the sects (although the Waldenses are sometimes called Friends of God), had, nevertheless, other ends in view, besides securing to

members the possibility of a contemplative life. The originator and head of this league was a man whose remarkable character is not sufficiently known. In the manuscript documents which speak of his labors, he is for the most part only designated as "the illuminated man," or "the great friend of God from the highlands;" we believe that we have found his real name only in two places—in the sentence against the friend of God, Martin of Mayence, burned at Cologne, 1393 (according to a Strasburg MS. printed as appendix to the life of Tauler, Hamburg, 1841, p. 239), and in Nider's *Formicarius* (Strasburg, 1517, 4to., fol. 40); in both places he is called Nicholas of Basle. His story is dark, and mixed with legends, from which it is not easy always to distinguish the truth. He was the son of a rich merchant, with whom he early made long journeys. Educated in the imaginative piety of the Middle Ages, he was accustomed from childhood daily to meditate upon the sufferings of Christ, and the pains of Mary. This, however, did not prevent him, while yet a youth, from connecting himself with the son of a knight, and, after the death of his parents, who left him a large inheritance, from abandoning trade, in order that he might visit castles and tournaments with his knightly friend. He won the love of a noble maiden; but before the day of the betrothal he had a vision, in which he was commanded to abandon his bride and the world. From this time he devoted himself exclusively to mystical contemplation, read German treatises on the lives of the saints, subjected himself to physical penances, until he considered himself able to persevere in divine love without external mortifications. A fanatical desire after direct communion with God, a faith in visions, a constant confounding of imaginations with real objects,—these are the most prominent traits of his character. He held, that absolute internal self-denial led more directly to friendship with God than external abstinence and poverty; that all things are to be viewed only in God, and are indifferent in themselves, but all good in God; that suffering is also a virtue; that the friend of God should not contend against attacks of doubts and unbelief, or even unchaste desires; but rather patiently endure them to the end, for they proceed from grace, with which one ought to be satisfied. Further, renunciation of the world does not consist in withdrawing from it; the friend of God should much rather labor to spread piety more and more; the guardians of the Church have become blind and careless; every one that possesses the spirit of God, be he priest or layman, should therefore take an interest in Christendom, in order to develop in it, by repentance, a new life. Nicholas, filled with these views, early sought to attract to himself persons of the same mind. There are four prominent persons who were successively drawn to him: the knight who was the friend of his youth, a wealthy canon and jurist, a Jew, who after his baptism received the name John; concerning the fourth, little more is known than that his life was an alternating series of "suffering" temptations and "bright" ecstasies. Nicholas lived together with these friends for a long time in a town "of

the highlands," which, being about ninety miles from Strasburg, could be no other than Basle. About 1340 he came to Strasburg to instruct Tauler concerning the perfect life, who, after long internal resistance, submitted to Nicholas as to a person in God's stead. He also seems to have influenced other preachers and laymen; the most remarkable among the latter was Rulman Merswin, merchant in Strasburg, whom Nicholas persuaded to buy an old monastery, to convert it into a "house of refuge" for laymen, and finally to give it to the Order of Malta, with the members of which in Strasburg, Nicholas, through the mediation of Merswin, remained in constant correspondence. In 1356, after the earthquake at Basle, he addressed an epistle to all Christians, to move them to repentance, a copy of which he sent to Tauler, whom five years later he once more visited, and saw die.

In 1367, Nicholas and his four associates discovered that it was no longer "comfortable" for them to live in a large city. We pass by the vision and wonders which led them to remove to, and build a house and church upon a mountain in Switzerland, within the province of the Duke of Austria. The period of the most active labors of the Friends of God, began ten years later. After the return of Gregory XI. to Rome from Avignon, they resolved (1377) that Nicholas and the jurist should go to him, to represent to him the condition and the defects of the Church. They went; the Pope at first listened to them with suspicion, then wondered and believed; and dismissed them, after having granted them certain privileges for their house. After the occurrence of the schism, the Friends of God felt themselves called to take a greater part in ecclesiastical affairs. In March, 1379, a conference was held upon a high, thickly-wooded mountain, at which various wonders took place, in order to command the Friends of God to look on merely for another year. At the end of this year, at the same place, thirteen came together, among whom, besides Nicholas and his four associates, were several foreign brethren from Hungary and Italy. Then a letter should have fallen among them from heaven, to inform them that God would grant to Christendom a respite of three years; if it did not improve within this time, then his judgment would come upon it; meanwhile, the Friends of God were "to lock themselves up," but at the end of three years they were "to separate to the five ends of the world," in case it did not improve. After this respite, their traces are lost; probably they went forth to labor as preachers of repentance. From Nider's *Formicarius* we learn that Nicholas of Basle and two of his associates, John and Jacob, were condemned, by the Inquisition, to be burned at Vienne in Dauphiny; and from a Strasburg MS., that the Benedictine, Martin of Mayence, was burned as a heretic at Cologne, in 1393, because he belonged to the Friends of God, and was obedient to Nicholas. Shortly before this also, Friends of God were burned at Heidelberg. The Knights of St. John, far from regarding them as heretics, made many fruitless attempts, after the death of Merswin, to discover their dwelling place. It is for future investigations to determine whether anything more

particular can be discovered, not only concerning the colony of the Friends of God in the highlands, but also concerning the secret plans of a league which had members in Switzerland, in Hungary, and in Italy.

Of the writings of Nicholas the following are yet known: 1) The history of the Rev. Dr. Tauler, found in most of the editions of Tauler's sermons; 2) Rules, in the form of the alphabet, concerning the pious life (Tauler's Life, p. 32, according to a Strasburg Coll.); 3) Five years of his early life, or the two men (two short fragments in the Strasburg Coll.); 4) The epistle written after the earthquake at Basle (after a Basle MS. published at Strasburg, 1840, and as appendix to Tauler's Life, p. 220); 5) The book of the five men, the original MS. of which, in Nicholas' handwriting, exists at Strasburg (from this it is published in the Strasburg Beiträgen zu den theol. Wissenschaften: Jena, 1854, 5 vols.); 6) A number of letters to Rulman Merswin, and to the Strasburg Knights of St. John (in a Strasburg Coll.). C. SCHMIDT.—Beck.

God, peace of (*pax Dei, treuga Dei*), is the peace produced by the Church for God's sake, by which the use of any kind of violence was forbidden. Ancient law allowed among all nations the choice between vengeance and peaceable agreement in case of injury. What the Mosaic law allows in the principle, an eye for an eye, and a tooth for a tooth, etc. (Lev. 24: 19, 20; Deut. 19: 16), and the Roman law in *si membrum rupit, ni cum eo pacit, talio esto* (12 tables, tab. VIII., fragm. 2), German law generally allows, inasmuch as it permits the injured person to compound with the injurer for atonement (*compositio*), or to inflict punishment himself (*faida*, feud). Very early, however, the state endeavored to limit feuds, and towards the end of the 1st cent. we find that feuds were allowed only in case of a great malicious injury, if the injured person did not prefer to go to law. Later they were only allowed when it was impossible to obtain legal redress, as well in civil as in criminal matters. Definite forms were also prescribed, according to which only any one could be thus proceeded against. Three days before the attack, notice must be given by a challenge; and certain persons and things are also excepted from attack, as the clergy, women in child-bed, very sick persons, pilgrims, merchants with their wares, country people, and others. Only by the general treaty of peace concluded at the Diet of Worms, 1495, were all feuds forbidden under penalty (see the proofs in *Eichhorn's deutsche Rechtsgeschichte im Register u. d. kl. Landfrieden*; *Walter, deutsche Rechtsgeschichte*, § 253; v. *Wächter, Beiträge zur deutschen Geschichte* (Tübingen, 1845), No. II).

From the beginning, the Church supported the state in restraining violence. When, at the beginning of the 11th century, the feuds of the nobles became more frequent, the bishops of Aquitania resolved to beseech God to put an end to this great evil. According to the report of the chroniclers, they were united, by divine inspiration, in this resolution, "*ut nemo mortali-um a feriæ quartæ vespera usque secundum feriam, incipiente luce, ausu temerario præsu-*

meret quippiam alicui hominum per vim auferre, neque ultionis vindictam a quocunque inimico exigere, nec etiam a fidejussore vadimonium sumere. Quod si ab aliquo fieri contigisset, contra hoc decretum publicatum, aut de vita componeret et aut Christianorum consortio expulsus patria pellere-tur. Hoc insuper placuit universis, veluti vulgo dicitur, ut Treuga Domini vocaretur" (Rudolphus Glaber, V., 1, ad a. 1034; *Sigebertus Gemblacensis*, ad a. 1032; see *Du Fresne, Glossar. s. v. Treuga Dei*; *Datt, de pace publica*, lib. I., c. 2). Immediately the bishops of South France and Burgundy followed with similar resolutions, as also by degrees in other countries, at the Synods of Narbonne, 1054, Troyes, 1093, Clermont, 1095, Rouen, 1096, Nordhausen, 1105, Rheims, 1136, the Lateran, 1139 and 1179, and others (*Du Fresne* and *Datt, l. c.*). The original limitation, that no feud dare take place from Wednesday evening (*feriæ quartæ vespera*) to Monday morning, under penalty of the ban, was soon extended to the time from first Advent to Epiphany, from the Sunday before Ash-Wednesday until after the close of Easter week, from the Sunday before Ascension to the end of Whitsuntide week, and on various festivals and their vigils. The prescript of Alexander III., in c. 21 of the third Lateran Council of 1179, which was adopted into the decretals of Gregory IX, c. 1, X. *de treuga et pace* (l. 34), determines: *quarta feria post occasum solis usque ad secundam feriam in ortu solis, ab adventu Domini usque ad octavas Epiphaniæ, et Septuagesima usque ad octavas Paschæ*. But, besides the festivals, only the specified week-days were generally observed, as appears from the ancient code of Saxony (Landrecht, Buch II., Art. 66), and of Swabia (Landrecht, Art. 250, ed. *Lassberg*).

If feuds are allowed on the days not excepted, still even on these the clergy, monks, lay-brethren (*conversi*), pilgrims (*peregrini*), merchants, country-people going to and returning from farming, as also the animals which are used in ploughing, &c., were protected. These are *personæ miserabiles*, whom the Church always especially took care of.

The Peace of God was specially announced by the ringing of the bells. Whoever violated it, fell under the ban, and if he did not liberate himself from this, he was outlawed. Since the general introduction of the treaty of peace, the special peace of God was no longer needed; but even in later times the popes have sought to influence hostile princes to peace, and even claimed the authority to set bounds to their wars (see *J. H. Böhmer, jus eccl. Prot. lib. I., tit. XXXIV.*

H. F. JACOBSON.—Beck.

Godeau, Anton, born 1605, at Dreux, in the diocese Chartres. Many see in the meetings held in the house of his relative, M. Conrat, by lovers of poetry for the cultivation of this beautiful art, the first beginnings of the French Academy. Godeau was for some time an important personage in that Parisian circle of literati. His having become meanwhile Monsieur l'abbé, did not prevent him from being *nain de Julie* (d'Angennes, Madame de Rambouillet). He had the good luck to please Cardinal Richelieu with a paraphrase of the psalm *Benedicite*

ia opera Domini Domino, which he had presented him, who wittily replied: *Vous me don- Benedicite et je vous donne Grasse*. The thus became Abbé Bishop of Grasse. The *es de l'église* he enriched with 15,000 stan- which told of the memorable events of rich history, and in his "pseaumes de David, uits en vers français," tried to rival, but with- success, the poets of the Ref. C., Marot and odore de Bèze. More important his other lutions: The paraphrases of the Pauline Catholic epistles, *The Morale Chrétienne* in ls., and *Histoire de l'église depuis le com- cement du monde jusqu' à la fin du huitième le*, translated by Speroni into Italian, and ard the close of the last into German. As a rch Hist., his chief merit consists in his at- tive method of representation. Desirous of gnizing his services, Pope Innocens X. be- ved upon him the bishopric of Vence, where died, April 21st, 1672. *Comp. Histoire de ademie française*, 1743, tom. I., pp. 12, 95, , 396. *Dupin*, *Nouv. Biblioth. des auteurs les*. tom. XVII., p. 286.

K. SUDHOFF.—*Ermentrout*.

Godehard, St., Bishop of Hildesheim (1022-9). Principal source of his hist. is his biog. the contemporaneous *Wolfherr* (first pub- ed, 1518), with the title: *Vita sanctissimi tris Godehardi Hildeneshemensis ecclesie au- itis confessorisque, sanctimonia, virtutum ho- late ac miraculis omnigenis clarissimi*. To found also in *Leibnit. Script. rer. Brunsv. I.*, 2, and *AA. SS. Maji Tom. I.*, 502). — Born out 960, in Reitenbach, Bavaria, near the ister Nieder-Altaich (comp. *Rettberg*, *K.-gesch. utsch. II.*, 253), which he entered in the 31st r of his age, and was afterwards made Abbot. reformed the monasteries Hersfeld, Tegern- , and Kremsmünster. Henry II. nominated n Bishop of Hildesheim; a wonderful dream— says his biographer—overcame his reluctance accept the office, and *Arilbo*, Archb. of Ma- nce, consecrated him, Dec. 1022. — He suc- eded in maintaining the prosperity of the Dio- se, in which his predecessor Bernward left it. e Epiphany Church which he rebuilt (*Ann. ld. ad a.* 1026), the chapels of St. Bartholo- w, and Andreas and Moritz, attest the good e he made of his revenues. Given to strict- ss of life, he required the same of his clergy; e poor, whom he called his "brethren," he addened with abundant alms. Died on the y before Ascension, on Mount Moritz, May h, 1038.—His biographer, *Wolfherr*, mentions iracles as having been wrought by him when ive. One hundred years after his death, shop *Bernard* of Hildesheim, demanded his nonization, which was granted by Innocent I., at the Synod of Rheims, Oct. 29th, 1132 omp. *Leibn. Historia canonisat. I.*, 508; *A. SS. l c. p.* 521). Bern. founded in his honor e Godehard cloister in Hildesheim, 1133 (comp. *auenstein, Hist. diplomatica episcopatus Hilde- ensis I.*, 276; also *Blum, Gesch. des Fürstenth. ildesheim* (*Wolfenb.* 1807), II., 108).

G. UELHORN.—*Ermentrout*.

Godfrey of Bouillon, was the son of Eus- ce, Count of Boulogne, and Ida, sister of God- ey, Count of Lorraine. His uncle adopted

him, and bequeathed to him all his personal es- tate. He received a knightly education, and through his mother's influence was strongly drawn towards spiritual matters. During his youth he lived in retirement on his estates, pro- tected against powerful neighbors by Henry, B. of Liege. Having arrived at maturity he es- poused the cause of Henry IV., and was so gene- rally esteemed, that the banner of the empire was entrusted to him. In the decisive battle of Oct. 15, 1080, he inflicted with the shaft of his banner a fatal wound upon Rodolph. He also accompanied the Emperor in his war against Gregory VII., and was the first to scale the walls of Rome; but his exertions and the warm cli- mate brought upon him a severe fever. The Emperor rewarded him with the county of Ant- werp, and in 1084 with the duchy of Lorraine. The duke soon after had a dispute with a rela- tive involving considerable estates. The judges decreed that it should be settled by a duel, which G., though reluctantly, accepted. God- frey having broken his sword on the shield of his rival, the Emperor offered to mediate. But G. refused to come off with a doubtful reputa- tion, and renewing the battle he dealt with his broken sword such a blow to his rival, that the latter was taken for dead from the lists. These are a few of the more authentic traits, with which legendary story has invested G.'s youth. He was tall, strong and nimble, his face hand- some, his hair blond. When Urban II. preached the 1st Crusade, G. seized the opportunity to fulfil his youthful desire to visit the Holy Land. He pawned his hereditary castle for 1500 silver marks to the B. of Liege, but with a right of redemption to three successors. About the middle of August, 1096, he gathered his army, the strength of which cannot be ascertained, though Anna Connera states it at 70,000 men. Having determined to march to Greece through Germany and Hungary, he was delayed the greater part of September at the Hungarian border in arranging a passage with King Car- loman. On the Greek border he was greeted by an imperial embassy, which promised a kind welcome, and requested a mild treatment of the country passed through. Thus the army ar- rived, Dec. 23, in the best understanding at Constantinople. Tedious negotiations were now opened with mutual distrust; until, April 3, Alexius commenced hostilities by an attack upon some French pilgrims, who had come to buy provisions. The duke at once led his army against the walls of the capital. Alexius, having vainly tried to renew negotiations, or- dered a sally against the Franks, which proved successful. Godfrey now took the oath of vas- salage, and promised to restore all former cities of the empire which might be taken. Hostilities now ceased; G., richly endowed with imperial bounties, showed the utmost attachment to Alexius. At the end of April the armies of Lorraine and Italy left Chalcedon; and, com- manded by Godfrey, Robert of Flanders, and Tancred, marched towards Nicomedia. June 19, it took Nice; June 27th it again marched forward. The battle of Dorglæun, in which G. had the chief command and decided the victory, was very important; for after it Kilidje Arslan

no longer ventured to harass the march of the crusaders through his country. Iconium, Erecli, Armenia and Antioch, were successively taken, and its patriarch restored to the latter city. Disputes among the crusaders delayed the march to Jerusalem until May of the following year. June 13th the first but unsuccessful assault was made. A month later the attack was renewed. In the afternoon, at the same hour, it is said, in which Christ ended his passion, G. brought his tower to the walls, upon which he and Eustace were the first to leap. At the same time Tancred and Robert of Normandy entered the city by a breach near St. Stephan's gate. A frightful carnage ensued. Raymond says, that in the temple of Solomon the blood reached the bits of the horses. It is said, though on unreliable authority, that G. abstained entirely from the slaughter, and hastened to the Holy Sepulchre; where, barefooted, in tears and raptures, he was the first to offer his prayers. Raymond says on the contrary: "it is incredible how much blood Tancred and Godfrey shed on this day." The intoxication of victory among the crusaders was great. Several days passed without adopting a general plan. On the 23d, the princes assembled to devise measures to maintain their conquest, and G. was unanimously elected defender of the Holy Sepulchre. Anthems were hereupon sung in the Church of the Sepulchre; but G. refused to be anointed and crowned, since the place, where the king of heaven had been crowned with thorns, demanded that men should be humble. The crusade had now achieved its object. The hostile powers were broken, and the soil was won on which a Christian state was to be erected. Concerning G.'s government we have very scanty and but legendary accounts. Ekkehard (Col. 524), says that "the duke with small resources undertook great things; he drove out the remaining pagans, built fortresses, restored Joppa and its harbor, supported the church and clergy, made large presents to the monasteries and hospital at Jerusalem, maintained peace for commercial purposes with Ascalon and Damascus, and restrained the excitable jealousy of the German and French knights by a perfect knowledge of both languages. The accounts, which the *Assizes of Jerusalem* furnish with regard to G.'s administrative talents, are not original documents, though based upon such (see v. Sybel, *Gesch. d. 1. Kr. zuges*, p. 517). One of the first acts of the new king was to endow a chapter at Jerusalem. But Dagobert the patriarch was not satisfied with the arrangements effected. He asserted that Jerusalem, holy and sacred to the Lord, required a spiritual, but no secular head; that the clergy, even before the conquest, had maintained this; that his own temporal rights were clear and well-founded; that in the times of oppression he had been the sole and undisputed head of the Christian population; that he therefore demanded of the Christian princes the restitution of those rights, which pagan emirs had left inviolate. Godfrey yielded, and surrendered to the patriarch Jerusalem with the tower of David and all its appurtenances. He reserved, however, the revenues of the city until several other cities should be con-

quered. In case of his death without male heirs, the city should at once be given up to the patriarch. G. took the oath of vassalage to the Holy Sepulchre and the patriarch, and promised to defend the cause of God and of the patriarch with all his might. Thus the spiritual character of the state was established. But the climate and his exertions destroyed G.'s health. He was taken with a quartan ague, and died at Jerusalem, July 18, 1100. He was buried in the Church of the Holy Sepulchre, and lamented alike by Franks, Syrians and Greeks. His tomb bears the inscription: "Here lies Godfrey of Bouillon, who won this entire land for Christendom; may his soul repose in Christ."—See H. v. Sybel, *Gesch. d. 1. Kreuzzugs* (Düsseldorf, 1841); F. Wilken, *Gesch. d. Kreuzz.*, Lpz., 1807-32. Dr. Pressel.—Reinecke.

Goetze, John Melchior, born Oct. 16th, 1717, in Halberstadt, studied at Jena, under Sig. Baumgarten, later at Halle. Having preached nine years as assistant at Aschersleben, he was called to Magdeburg. As first pastor of St. Catherine's, Hamburg, he displayed that activity which inwove his name in the historical work of German Prot. and its literature. A skillful critic awarded him the praise of being a good bibliographer and numismatist. Comp. F. L. Hoffmann, *Hamb. Biblioph.* IV., Serapeum, 1852. Nro. 21, a. 22. The fact that Lessing, who lived in Hamburg from Easter, 1767, to Easter, 1770, frequently visited him, disproves the judgment passed upon him by the shallow rationalists of his day. A representative of orthodoxy, and zealous Lutheranism, like Böckler—a preacher at St. Jacob who, in his "Von des Herrn Christi hochwürdegem Abendmahl," published 1557 at Michelmas, styles Luther "Holy Father, Holy Dr. Luther, true Prophet," etc.—and the Reformed, "spiritual thievery, robbery, poison and fire,"—he defended his system with a vigorous pen. He combatted the naturalism of Basedow, and published, in opposition to his colleague Schlosser, who inclined to neology, his "Theol. Untersuch. der Sittlichk. der Deuts. Schaubühne," 2d ed., 1770. Foreseeing the disastrous effects of Semler's and Teller's teachings on an inspired Bible and evangel. Prot. he lifted up his voice boldly against the new theology, as well as against the spirit of the age which tended to destroy the doctrines both of the Church and the Bible. The agreement, which down to this period obtained between G. and Lessing, now disrupted. The publication of the "*Wolfenbüttler Fragments*," occasioned strife between them. Believing that important doctrines were at stake, he entered the lists. It cannot be denied that Lessing's views tended to destroy Christianity as well as Evangel. Prot. for they were based neither on the Bible nor on the facts of the Gospel. G. himself remarked: "Were Lessing to publish a Bible which contained nothing but what he believed, it would certainly be a pocket edition. Only for 'subjective religion,'—to use his own language—not for 'objective religion,' did he consider L.'s opinions dangerous. His object was to protect the mearest of his flock, while L. regarded 'unthinking Christians' as the most contemptible portion of Christendom (comp. Anti-Götze, W. W. Vol. IV.,

7). How inferior soever to L. in ability, must be looked upon as a courageous defender of the Evangel. Church in a period of an. He died May 19, 1786, and left behind more than 60 works. His autobiog. was published 1786, 8vo.; Hamburg. Comp. *Meusel*, IV., ss Gelehrt. Hamb. Deutsch. Biblioth. Vol. I., 615-629. K. SUDHOFF.—*Ermentrout*.

Gog and Magog.—Thus the nations in the quarters of the earth are called in Rev. 8. The names, etc., are taken from Ezek. 38 and 39, where Gog appears as the prince of a people, who at the head of his subjects, with whom are associated crowds of European, Asiatic and African nations (38:2-6), invade the favored land of Israel, but are destroyed by divine judgments, especially a rain of fire (38:22; 39:6). Farther back (Gen. 10:2), Gog appears as the name of the second son of Ham. From this Magog as the name of a son and country, Ezekiel, as it seems, connected the name of the King Gog, in that he put the Ma as a local prefix, and the Apocalypse connects Gog and Magog, king and subjects, as the designation of the last, and numerous enemies of the kingdom of God, which are to become stationary.—The names Gog and Magog, in Ezekiel, have been understood as referring to the Turks (*Luther*), or to Antiochus Epiphanes (*Grotius*), or to the Chaldeans (*Cald*). On the other hand, *Josephus* already understands thereby the Scythians (*Ant. I.*, 6, 1), and *Jerome*, expressing the opinion of the Jews of his day, says: *Magog gentes esse Scythicas immanes innumerabiles*. This view has been lately defended by *Knobel*, who identifies the Scythians with the Slaves. In any case, we have to seek Magog in the extreme north of the world known to the ancients, in the countries north of the Caucasus (Ezek. 38:15; 39:2).—The prophecy of Ezekiel concerning Gog is one of the most detailed in the Old Test., whilst, in other cases, the prophetic vision generally extends only to the restoration of Israel, and the conversion of the heathen. Ezekiel foresees in the end, that even the ungodly world would not altogether be conquered, but would once more rise against Israel. Gog, having an eye only for the temporal treasures of Israel, would undertake to plunder it. Ezekiel appends the event to its national and historical side, according to the entire standpoint of the Old Test. (39:9, 10; 21, sq.); although even he intimates, that this is the final judgment on heathenism, the completion of the victory of the kingdom of God over heathenish power" (*Havernick*), see 38:8, 9, 17; 39:7, 8. The Apocalypse, with its enlarged vision (comp. concerning the difference between the prophecy of the Old and of the New Testament: *Der Prophet Daniel*, und die *Off. Joh.*, pp. 76, 328, 341), traces the event to a deeper, super-terrestrial basis in the spirit world, and places it in a more comprehensive eschatological connection. It is Satan again unbound, who once more inflames the distant nations of the earth to a last rebellion against the kingdom of God, and the judgment on Gog and Magog is changed into that on the devil and the last great day, with which is connected the new heavens and the new earth. Of old on account of

the great power of sin, every period of special divine mercy was closed by an apostasy; the flood, the building of Babel and heathenism, unbelieving Judaism, anti-christianity, etc. Accordingly also the last period, in which God reveals himself most gloriously, the millennium beginning with the restoration of Israel, must end in an apostasy. As opposed to this highest manifestation of the glory of God on earth, the apostasy, which is represented in Gog and Magog, is the deepest and greatest—the final one: it is diabolical, and embraces the most remote ends of the earth, and it must therefore be followed by the final judgment.

Comp. *Knobel*, die Völkertafel der Genesis, p. 60-70, *Havernick*, Comm. über Ezekiel, p. 594, sq., *Züllig*, Off. Joh. II. p. 371, sq., *Hofmann*, Schriftbeweis II., 2, pp. 536, 656.

AUBERLEN*.

Goliath, the name of the Philistian giant of Gath, who was slain by the youthful David. Having slain him with a sling, David cut his head off with his own sword (cf. *Herod.* 4, 64), took the spoils of the giant home, and deposited the sword as a trophy in the national sanctuary (1 Sam. 21:10; 22:10; 24:9; comp. Art. *Gath*). The fortunate duel decided the victory of Israel over the Philistines, whom they pursued to the gates of their cities, and the returning victors were welcomed by the women of Israel with the song: Saul has slain his thousands, but David his tens of thousands—on account of which the envy of the suspicious prince was aroused against his rival (1 Sam. 17:18; 19:5; 21:12; 29:5). With regard to what is said concerning his great size and the weight of his armor, it is not at all necessary to suppose that the statements have been exaggerated by tradition; persons 6 ells and 1 span high, i. e., according to *Thenius*, 9 feet 2 inches Paris measure, have existed elsewhere, comp. *Herod.* 1, 68; *Pliny*, *H. N.*, 7, 16. and the account of a skeleton found at the Himalaya mountains in the *Asiatic Journal*, Nov. 1838. Goliath wore a brazen helmet, a coat of mail, weighing 5000 shekels of brass (= 142 lb Dresden weight), brazen greaves, and the staff of his spear was like a weaver's beam, the head of which weighed 600 shekels = 17 lb.—To reconcile this account of the death of Goliath with that in 2 Sam. 11:19, where the killing of Goliath is attributed to Elhanan of Bethlehem, a warrior in David's army, it is not necessary to suppose, either that these were two giants of the same name, so that Elhanan killed the one, David the other, both being of Gath, and both having spears like a weaver's beam (*Winer*, *R. W. B.* 2 Aufl.), or that the account in 2 Sam. 21, is the older and more original, out of which later tradition embellished a victory of David over another Philistian (*Ewald*, *Gesch. Isr.* II., pp. 523, 611). That there were two Goliaths of Gath is very improbable, and the second supposition is inadmissible on this account, because the account of David's contest with Goliath, although made up of two different reports, carries in itself all the marks of historical fidelity. Much rather 1 Chron. 20:5, offers the correct reading, as already *Piscator*, the English version, *Movers* and *Thenius* admit: "Elhanan slew *Lahmi*, the brother of Goliath the

Gittite, and בֵּית-הַלְחָמִי אֶת-נָלִית, is to be changed to אֶת-הַלְחָמִי אֶת-נָלִית, which is the more allowable, because, as is generally admitted, 2 Sam. 21 : 19 contains other plain errors (יַעֲרִי instead of יַעֲרִי, and the double אֶרְנִים).

David's heroic act is also mentioned in Sirach 47 : 4. In the *Koran*, 2, 250, sq., Goliath is mentioned under the name جالوت and *Abulfida*, hist. ante-Islam. p. 176, calls him a king of the Canaanites, and relates that after his death, a colony of his kinsmen went to North Africa and settled in Mauritania. Comp. *Herbelot*, Bibl. Or., p. 392, s. v. Gialont (ed. Paris, 1697, fol.), see also *Ewald*, Gesch. Isr. II., p. 521, sq.; *Winer's R. W. B.*; R. E. Art. David, p. 299.

RÜETSCHI.—Beck.

Gomarus, Francis, born Jan. 30, 1563, at Brügge in Flanders, of wealthy and noble parents, whose ardent attachments to the Reformed faith led them, in order to practise it undisturbed, to emigrate, 1578, to the Reformed Palatinate. The young Gomar, who had finished, in his 15th year, the gymnasium course in his native town, enjoyed in Strasburg the tuition of *John Sturm*. In 1580 he attended the Reformed school at Neustadt on the Hardt, where *Franciscus Junius*, *Zacharias Ursinus*, *Jerome Zanchius*, and *Daniel Tossanus* taught. It is worthy of remark that, a brief sojourn at Oxford and Cambridge excepted, he was educated by Heidelberg theologians alone. In 1585 and 1586, he studied theol. at Heidelberg. It cannot be denied that G., in every essential point, showed himself a genuine, faithful disciple of his great teachers, and harmonized, doctrinally, with the Heidelberg school. None but historical scribblers can deny that Olevianus, Tossanus, and Zanchius, were also predestinarians (*Urs. Opp. Heid.*, 1612, T. IV., p. 28). Having officiated in the Reformed Church at Frankfort-on-the-Main, from 1587–1593, G. removed to Leyden, Jan. 26, 1594, as Prof. of Theol. Heidelberg crowned him with the Licentiate and the Doctorate. Here he labored in peace till the advent, 1603, of *Jacob Arminius*, as the successor of *Franciscus Junius*, who, though he at first promised to teach nothing opposed to the *Confessio belgica* and the *Heidel. Cat.*, began, 1604, to deliver exegetical lectures which conflicted with these symbols. To abate the theological strife that now ensued, colloquies were resorted to. Gomarus threw himself into the breach. It is worthy of remark that not only G., but the Synod of Dort—as its acts clearly show—distinctly perceived the radical difference that obtained between the view of A., and the doctrines of the Reformers. Arminius died at Leyden, Oct. 13, 1609. The election of the Socinianizing *Conradus Vorstius* as his successor, added fuel to the flame. Tired of controversy, G. retired to Middleburg, Seeland, 1611; but in 1614, accepted a call to Saumur, from whence he removed to the University of Gröningen.

At the Synod of Dort which had, in the mean time, been summoned, G. played a prominent

So decided was his opposition against

Remonstrantism, that he waged war against all ambiguous phrases—though not heterodox in themselves—that might serve as a cover for the Armenians. Though all agreed in applying the Reformed interpretation to Ephesians 1, where Christ is named the foundation of election, yet, as the Armenians made use of this expression, in an anti-reformed sense, it is true, to denote Christ as the foundation of the decree of election itself, the propriety of employing it was debated. From the strife that ensued on this point between Gomarus and the Bremen theolog. *Martinus*, it must not be inferred that the German Reformed doctors were anti-predestinarian; on the contrary, they came to the Synod with strict predestinarian instructions (comp. *Schweitzer's Centrald.* II., p. 114–141), and subscribed the canones of Dort with the *rejectio errorum*. Nor is there any historical evidence of a protest, on the part of the Hessian and Bremen theols., against the canones of the election of grace. The difference did not concern the fundamental point.

In the year 1633, G. withdrew to Leyden to take part in the revision of the Holland Bible. Died Jan. 11, 1641, aged 78. Married three times; with the second wife only had he children.

Works.—*Erklärungen zu Matthäus, Lukas, Johannes; Analysis et Explicatio epistolarum Pauli; Analysis et Explicatio prophetiarum quarundam, Mosis, de Christo; Analysis Hobadix; Disputationes Theologicae*, a work of Dogmatics, in 39 Locis; *Explicatio 5 priorum capp. Apocalypses; Tractatus theologici, nempe Conciliatio doctrinae orth. de Providentia Dei; Anticosteri libri III.; Examen controversiarum; Dissert. de Evang. Matthæi, quamam lingua sit scriptum; De Sabbato; Judicium de primo articulo Remonstrantium; De Perseverentia SS.; Davidis Lyra*. Published entire, 1645 and 1664, fol.: Amsterdam.—**Sources:** *Vitæ professorum Groningensium*: Gron., 1654. Acts of the Synod of Dort, *Schweitzer's Centraldogmen*, II., p. 31–224.

K. SUDHOFF.—Ermentrout.

Gomer (גֹּמֶר) Sept. Γομῆρ, Vulg. Gomer) the first mentioned son of Japhet in the genealogy, Gen. 10 : 2; and, as he had three children, Askenan, Riphath, and Thogerma, v. 3, one of the most widely spread people of antiquity, and dwelling in the extreme north, Ezek. 38 : 6. That Gomer and the Cimmerians (Κιμῆριοι, *Cimmerii*. Od. 11, 14), were one and the same people—these latter located, in the time of the Trojan war, in the north-west by the German Orpheus (*Argon.*, 1120), and known to *Herodot.* (4, 11, comp. 99, 5th cent. B. C.), as dwellers between the rivers Don and Dniester—is clear from the name *Kymr*, and the exceedingly slight difference between the softer consonant and the obscurer vowel in Hebrew, which no doubt represents the original sound. The Cimmerian Bosporus, the mouth of the Cimm. gulf (Καιτος Κιμῆριος), *Herod.* 4, 12, 10; *Strabo*, II., p. 494; *Plin. h. nat.*, 4, 24), called πορθύρια Κιμῆρια, (*Herod.* 4, 12, 45), and the isthmus there ἰσθμὸς Κιμμεριζός, and the Cimmerian mountain and town on the Taurian peninsula, now the Crimea (*Gesenius*, *Lehrgeb.*, p. 141); all this proves the original abode and magnitude of this people. Pressed by the Scythians, they migrated under

their king, Lygdamis (7th cent. B. C.), to Æolia, Ionia, and Lydia, in Asia Minor, conquered Sardis, and remained here till Alyattes succeeded in expelling them (*Bredow*, alt. Geschichte, p. 39; *Ptol.* 5, 9, 5; *Plin. h. nat.*, 6, 6; 5, 32; *Ierod.* 4, 12). The name given to the wife of Ioseph (1:3), attests their position in Israel. That the *Cimbrians* known to the Romans were

the קמרי = Kymr, of the Hebrews, and the Κιμρῖοι of the Greeks, cannot be disputed. Apart from the fact that the names easily blend, the Greek μεσημβρία derives from μεσημερία, an Hebrew, Αμβρι from Omri or Ambri, and Cimbrod from Nimrod. Besides, the Cimbrians—called by *Appian* (bell. Mith., 15), Ταῖροι—lived on the Cimm. Bosphorus, and, according to *Plutarch* (Marius, c. 11), those who had invaded Asia Minor were only a section of the Cimmerians, the largest and bravest part having settled by the North Sea in a country whose thick forests the sun never penetrated, and which stretched to the Hercynian mountains of Germany. With the supposition that the principal portion had migrated towards the north-west before the encounter with the Scythians, the Mosaic geneal. best accords. From the peninsula Jutland—in ancient geog. Χερσόνησος Κυμρική—(*Plin. hist. nat.*, 2, 67; 4, 27; *P. Mela.* 1, 3; *Ptol.* 2, 11; 2, 12), the Cimbrians invaded Illyria, 114 B. C., vanquished the Consul Papius Carbo, 113 B. C., marched through Switzerland, across the Rhine, to Gallia, seized on Roman territory, and for five years defeated all the Consuls sent against them. On their return from Spain, whither they went, 104, joining arms with the Teutons, 102, they proceeded towards Italy, but sustained a total defeat at the hands of Marius, near Verona, 101, B. C. Their great military expeditions imply an equally great extension. Indeed, *Strabo* (7, p. 293), locates them between the Elbe and Rhine, *Pliny* (4, 28), in the neighborhood of the Rhine towards the north, *Cæsar* (B. Gall., 2, 29), and *Dio Cassius* (39, 4), number amongst them the Aduati in Belgium, *Appian* (Gall. 4), the Nervi. From Belgium, (*Cæs.*, 5, 12; *Ammian. Marc.*, 15, 9), they migrated to Britain, and, even in our day, may be found here and there in the western part of England: proven by the remains of the ancient Cimbrian language, by Wales, which in the Middle Age was called Cambria and Cumbrin, the *B* being almost suppressed by the shire Cumberland in north-western England, and by the fact that the inhabitants of Wales who still preserve the tradition of their migration, regard themselves Cimbrians, and call themselves Cymri, Cumri (*Diefenbach*, Celtica 11, 2, p. 125), which identically accords

with the Hebrew קמרי.—It is absolutely necessary to consider more closely the descendants of the three sons of Gomer mentioned in Gen. 10:3. As the Teutons, called by the Cimbrians their brothers (*Plut. Mar.* 24), and so considered by Jewish commentators (see Targ. to Gen. 10:2, and 1 Chron. 1:5, where Gomer is termed Germania)—a relationship indicated besides by their agriculture, figure, language and customs—were a decided German stem, it is particularly

important to ascertain what people are meant by the *Ashkenaz*.

The word קנזשנא—a term more complex than simple—analyzed קנז, to be compared with γένος, lat. gens, genus, goth. kuni, ahd. kunni, chunni, ags. chneov. altn. kind, engl. kin, kind, celt. oinadh (*Edwards* sur les langues celtiques, p. 282), and means race, stem or stock of a people. But the first inhabitants of Scandinavia of the Germanic stem were the subsequently deified Asen (*Edda*, Sämund, 77, 865; *Ritter*, Vorh. europ. Völkergesch., p. 472; *Grimm*, Gesch. d. deutsch. Sprache 1, 767), who came with Odin from beyond the Don, and from thence, as northern legends mention, three Odins seem to have emigrated, at short intervals, from time immemorial (*Geijer*, Gesch. v.; *Schwed.* 1, 19, 27). The similarity between Asen and קנז in the word Ashkenaz is not accidental, but indicates the original name of our great people, the Asen-race, *Asenvolksstamm*, and the stem which, in south-eastern Europe, was known, 600 B. C.—400 B. C., by the name of Thracians, Geti, and Goths, in the western and north-western, shortly before Cæsar, of Germans (Germania), (*Tac. Germ.* c. 2, *Ceterum Germaniæ vocabulum recens et nuper additum*), and, in 9th cent., of Teutsche, Deutsche = German, a name of their own taking. Though these, as all other people of Europe, came from Asia, some still remained there. In 6th cent. (see Jer. 51:27), we find a kingdom, Ashkenaz, next to Armenia and Meni, also in Asia, and later the Greeks and Romans found people with this name beyond the Don. *Ptolemaus*, 5, 9, 16, mentions the Ασαῖοι in Asiatic Sarmatia, the *Uscardei* (*Pliny, hist. n.*, 6, 7), and the *Asburgians* of *Strabo*, p. 495, 556, on the north-east side of the Black Sea, remind us of the Asen and of Asgardr. That the original home of the people in question was the northern slope of the Caucasus, can also be learned from the *Osseti* who still occupy the middle of this mountain; called by the Caucassians *Osi*, *Os*, by Russians, *Jasen*, by earlier travellers, *As*, *Aas* (*Klapr. Asia polyglotta*, p. 84; *Neumann*, Völker d. südl. Russlands, p. 40); by *Klaproth* and *Kohl* (*Reissen* in Südrussland, 2, 193), characterized as of purer, less adulterated blood than the other people of the Caucasus, with European physiognomy, blue eyes, fair reddish hair, in language Indo-Germanic, many words like the German in pronunciation and sound (*Kohl* und *Klapr. kauk. Sprachen*, p. 176).

The use of the name in the Trojan era (about 1200, B. C.), *Askanius*—the Greek word for the Hebrew original—the son of Priam being so called (*Apollod. Bibl.*, 3, 12, 5), also that of *Æneas* (*Liv.*, 1, 3; *Dion. halic.*, 1, 65), proves that a portion of the Asen-stem must have gone southward across the Caucasus and through Asia Minor, over the Hellespont to Thrace and Germany. There was, too, a country, *Ashkania* (Il., 2, 862; 13, 719; *Plin. h. n.*, 5, 40), also an *Ashkansan* Sea, on which was situated Bythinia, capital of Nicæa, and an *Ashkanian* river (*Strabo*, 12, p. 565; 14, 681; *Plin.* 5, 43; *Ptol.* 5, 1, 4). The *Teutones* even must have spent some time with these their brethren, before

Troy reached its zenith, in the north-west of Asia Minor; since we find in south-western Mysia a country *Teuthrania*, where reigned from time immemorial a king Teuthras (*Strabo*, 12, 572; 586, 615; *Plin.* 5, 33; *Steph. Byz.*, sub. *Τευθρανία*). Still more: the name Asia clearly reminds us of the *Asen*-stem which has permanently stamped its name on this country. If we follow the *Asen*, *Ashkennas*, to Europe, we will meet them in the Thracians who are described by *Herodotus* 5, 3-8, as only *Germans* could be, and by *Tacitus* in his *Germania* really as such. Indeed, *Wirth* (*Gesch. d. Deutschen*. I., 206-232), in order to prove that the Thracians were no other but Germans, draws from the figure of their bodies, their military and domestic manners, their language and their religion; an argument so convincing, that the most sceptical must submit to it. As, according to *Strabo*, (*Geogr.* 7, ed. Casaub., p. 212), the Thracians, Dacians, and Geti, spoke the same language, these three people, inhabiting the country this side and beyond the Danube, must have belonged to the same stock. *Herodotus*, I., 4, 93, says expressly that the Geti were a stem of the Thracians (*αἱ δὲ Γέται θρηίκων ἰόντες καὶ γερμανότατοι καὶ δακρυότατοι*). If, then, it can be shown, that the Geti pertained to the same stem with the *Goths*, who became known in the 4th cent. after Christ, it follows that the ancient Thracians were Germans, for the *Goths* spoke, as we learn from *Ulfilas's* translation of the Bible, Gothic, that is, German. The proofs of the identity of the *Goths* and *Geti* may be briefly given, thus: 1) Though from the 5th cent. B. C.—3d A. C., the name *Geti* was exclusively used, all on a sudden, with 4th cent., in the same countries bordering the Black Sea and the Danube, was introduced the name *Goths*, the vowel of the one gradually softening, as it were, into that of the other, indicating beyond question the same people. 2) From this time on to the 6th cent., *Geti* and *Goths* were used interchangeably, as by *Jornandes*, a native author, who in his *de orig. act. etque Getarum edit. Basileæ*, 1532, repeatedly declares that they were the same people (*quos Getas jam superiori loco Gothos esse probavimus*). So, too, 3) the Greek hist. *Procopius* (6th cent.), *de Bello Gothico*, I., 24, says that, in his time, the *Goths* were called a *Getish* nation, and in his second book on the Vandal war (*Lib.* 3), that the Vandals, Gepidi, East and West *Goths*, were regarded as *Getish*, because, though variant in name, in all things else alike, all having a white skin, yellow hair, the same laws and language. 4) A striking proof in *Ael. Spartianus* (4th cent.), a Latin author, who makes *Helvius Pertinax* say of *Caracalla* (his life by *Spart.*), who had marched against the *Goths*, and had, at the same time, murdered his brother *Geta*, that he could be called *Geticus Maximus*, and adds: *quod Getam occiderat fratrem et Goti Getæ dicebantur*. 5) A contemporary hist. (*Jul. Capitolinus*, 211-217), in his life of the two *Maximins* writes: *sub Macrino a militia desit Maximinus Thrax in Thracia in vico, ubi genitus erat, possessiones comparavit ac semper cum Gothis commercia exercuit. Amatus est autem unice a Getis, quasi eorum civis*,—this passage presupposing

that the interchangeable use of the two names was so well known that he did not think it necessary to say they denoted one and the same people.—The identity of the *Goths* and *Geti* thus incontestably proved, and these latter of Thracian origin, it follows that the ancient Thracians also were Germans; a conclusion confirmed beyond a doubt by a comparison of the description of *Herodotus* (*Terpsichore*) of the T., with that of the G. by *Tacitus* in his *Germania*, in both which are given characteristics peculiar to these two people, viz., greatness without national unity, bravery and a natural inclination to war, love of drink, and contempt for agriculture, buying of wives, and, in necessity, selling of children. The *Goths*, pressed by the *Huns*, left their homes, 375, and appeared in Italy, 400. When *Jornandes* narrates an expedition of *Goths* as having been made before the Trojan war (about 1200 B. C.), from Scandinavia to the countries around the Black Sea, and from thence to Asia, it is to be referred, in all probability, to a return from Scand. to this sea or to Asia Minor, in order to aid their brethren who had settled there long before the war. Hence the probability that the first migration of the *Ashkenas* to Scand. took place several centuries prior to the Trojan war. *Knobel*, too, is right in affirming that the *Ashkenas* of the Bible settled on the lands of the East Sea. Tradition supports this view. *Josephus*, together with *Jerome*, in explaining *Gen.* 10: 3, and other passages, refer *יִשְׁכָּנָז* to *Pyrges*, who are none other but a Gothic people living on the East Sea (*Tacit. Germ.* 43; *Procop. Bell. Goth.*, 2, 14; 3, 2). Scandinavia, therefore, is to be regarded as the chief seat, in the most ancient times, of the Germans. Thence as an *officina gentium* and *vagina rationum* marched an army of *Goths* through Scythia to the Black Sea (*Jornand.* 1, 4, 17); from this, later, *Teutons*, *Heruli*, *Longobards*, perhaps, also, *Gepidi*, *Vandals* and *Alani*, went southward and westward. Even these from this northern peninsula did not forget their original name *Ashkenas*. *Tacitus* (*Germ.* 3), mentions a place on the Rhine by name *Asciburgium*, evidently from *יִשְׁכָּנָז*, ash, a name still retained in *Asburg* or *Asseburg* in the dukedom *Meura*, among the nobility, (*Cluver. Germ. ant.*, p. 414; *Beckmann, Hist. d. Fürst. Anhalt*, 1, 15), and later, a somewhat similar name of a town on Lower Rhine by *Ptol.* 2, 11, 28, and *Marcian.* *Heracl.*, 2, 10. In the same country is situated *Duisburg*, its name from *Tuisco*, the progenitor of the German people (*Tacitus*, *Germ.* 2, connects *Tuisco* with *Teut*); to which must be added, in proof of the wide extension of this people, the name *Asciburgis sc. mons*—the mountains of the gigantic *Asen*. Besides, the whole name *Ashkenas* is to be found in the word *Scandinavia*, which cannot be otherwise interpreted. Its termination *navia*—*navis*, *ναῦς*, in *Pelagian* and old German—an island, while the peninsula was simply called *Scandia*, which, with the rejection of *N*, is a slight modification of *יִשְׁכָּנָז*, pronounced *Ashkenads* or *Ask-nads* or *Askands*. Examples of the same law

omitting the first letter and Ἰσχυρῆς, Scyth, Itin. Hier., p. 594; from *Askalonia, Scangia, du Fresne*, Gloss. d. Mittelalt. s. h. v.

Let us now turn our attention to Riphath. The similarity in sound between the *montes Rhipaei* and *Riphaei* mentioned in the classics, and the word רִפְיָה, would seem to warrant us

locating them there. The ancients were acquainted with a mountain range of this name at the sources of the Don and Volga (*Pliny, H. N.*, 24, 26; 6, 14; *Virg. Georg.*, 1, 240; 3, 381). And here, in all probability, north-east from Gomer, and north from Ashkenas, we must seek the original home of the *Celts, Gauls*, (Greek, *Galatians*). Their armies coming from Asia, must have settled at the Carpathian Mountains, also called by the Greeks ὄρη Πίρρα. Now *Plutarch* (Cam. 15), narrates that the Galatians, having gone in search of new homes, some of them crossed the Rhipaean (Carpathian), to the Northern Ocean, and lived in the furthestmost extremities of Europe, and some settled between the Alps and Pyrenees. This must have taken place before 600 B. C., as, about this time, after having resided in Gaul, they planted colonies in Upper Italy. But the Bastarni and Peucini, according to *Polyb.*, 26, 9; *Diod. Sic.*, 30; *Liv.*, 5, 57; 44, 26, a Celtic nation, dwelt at the Carpathian mountains, whence named *Alpes Bastarnicae*. Between Upper Weichsel and Oder lived the *Gothini*, whom *Tac.*, Germ. 43, makes to speak Celtic, and south from the Bastarn., the *Leurisci*. In the modern Moravia and Bohemia dwelt the *Boii*; in Pannonia, the Celtic stem *Scordisci*; in Vindelicia, *Celts*. The *Helvetians* were also *Celts* who, in the course of time, became Germanized.

The chief seat of the southern *Celts* was *Gaul*, the *Belgians* in the north, and the *Iberi* in *Aquania*, who, mixing with the C., made the *Celtiberi*. We find C., also, in the British isles, and in Ireland. The *Aestorum gentes* on the East Sea, also *Celts*; perhaps, too, C. in Scandinavia. The old portions of East Zealanders were called Κελτικη. *Plut. Mar.*, 11, and *Florus*, 3, 3, styles the *Cimbri* and *Teutoni ab extremis Galliae profugi*. And when *Pythias* (*Strabo*, 1, 63), speaks of Κελτικη as distant only several day's journey from Kent in England, he must have referred to Scandinavia, where he also locates *Celts*. Finally, according to *Polyb. hist.*, 4, 46, the *Celts* in Thracia established a βασιλειαν Τυλην; Norway has still the name *Thule* or *Thyle* (*Münter* in *Städlin's Arch.*, 3, 2, 254). If, now, by רִפְיָה

in the Mosaic Geneal. but one *people* is meant; if the otherwise inexplicable names of the mountains *Riphaei* in Central Europe, viz., the Carpathian, and in Northern Russia at the rise of the Don and Volga, point to this people; if it has been shown that here *Celts* lived in large numbers who thence spread themselves southward over Europe: these things being so, it seems to us demonstrated beyond a doubt, that the author of the Mosaic Geneal. meant by רִפְיָה no other people than the *Celts*.

Touching the third son of Gomer — called in Vulg. *Thogorma* — besides the mention of his name in Gen. 10:3, it occurs but in two other

passages of the O. T. From the one (*Ezek.* 27:14), we learn that the *Phoenicians* carried on a trade with them in coach and riding horses, and in mules; from the other (*Ezek.* 38:6), that they were connected with the *Scythians* and *Cimbrians*, and must be sought for in the north from the time of the Mosaic Geneal. to the 7th, and beginning of 6th cent. before Christ. *Herod.* 1, 194, and *Strabo* 11, 529, narrate of the *Armenians* that they were renowned for their equestrian abilities, and reared many asses. Not only do ancient authors trace them back to *Thogarma* (*Syncellus* 1, 91; *Dind. Schol.* on *Ezek.* 38:6), but they themselves derive their descent from *Haik*, a son of *Thorgom*, grand-son of *Tiras* (comp. Gen. 10:2), great-grand-son of *Gomer* (Gen. 10:2, 3), who was a son of *Japhet* (*Moses Chor.* 1, 4, 9–11; *Euseb. Chron. Arm.*, 2, 12; comp. *Ritter*, *Erdkunde* 10, 358, 585). Agreeing with the Georgian tradition in *Klaproth*, *Reise in d. Kaukasus*, 2, 64, that the *Armenians*, *Georgians*, *Lezgier*, and *Mingrelians*, descend from *Thargames*, it is also well known (*Ritter*, 10, 579; *Zeitschr. für Kunde d. Morgenl.*, 1, 242), that the *Armenian* language belongs to the Indo-Germanic family (*Ritter*, 10, 585; *Klaproth*, *Asia polyglotta*, p. 97; *Cassel*, *magyarische Alterth.*, p. 243). The ancient *Phrygians* must be considered in connection with the *Armenians*; they are thus viewed by *Jos. Ant.*, 1, 6, 1; *Hieron. quest.* in Gen. 10:3; *Zonaras Ann.*, 1, 5. Characterized by *Homer*, *Il.*, 3, 185, as well versed in the equestrian art (*Claudian Laus. Ser.* 191). The *Phrygian* language was not only allied to the Greek (*Plato Cratyl.*, p. 410), but — what agrees excellently well with *Thogarma* as the son of *Gomer* — nearly all the *Phrygian* words still surviving (*Jablonski opusc.*, 2, 63), can be traced to the Indo-European family of languages, particularly to the *Cimbrian* stem (*Goschede ariana ling.*, p. 21; *Cassel*, *Magyar. Alterth.*, p. 238). *Herod.*, also, 7, 73, says expressly that the *Armenians* and *Phrygians* were closely related.

The original seat of the *Thogarmathian*, i. e., the *Armenian-Phrygian* people, was *Armenia*, from whence they sent colonies westward to *Asia Minor*, of which they had, at one time, nearly entire possession.

Around the Black Sea were thus located the *Gomerian* people; *Gomer* himself on the *Taurian peninsula* (*Crimea*), and northward from the Black Sea; *Ashkenas*, at the northern declivity of *Caucasus*, and farther north between the Black and Caspian Seas; *Riphath*, at the sources of Don and Volga, between the *Rhipaean* and *Hyperborean Mountains*; *Thogarma*, south of *Caucasus* on the Black Sea to the Caspian. In Europe, the *Cimbrians* spread furthest north-west to the peninsula *Jütland*, from thence south and west; the *Asen*, from Scandinavia, in every direction; the *Celts*, from Carpathia, north, east, and west; the *Armeno-phrygians*, towards Thrace. J. G. VAIBINGER. — *Ermentrout*.

Gomorrah was one of the chief cities in the vale of *Siddim*, occupied by a primitive tribe of *Canaan* (Gen. 10:19); its site is now covered by the southern portion of the Dead Sea. It had its own king, and was involved in the plot against *Chedorlaomer* (Gen. 13:10; 14). It sub-

sequently shared the fearful doom of Sodom, &c. (Gen. 18:20, &c.; 19:24, &c.). Its wickedness and fate are often held up as a warning (Is. 1:9; Jer. 23:14; Amos 4:11, &c. &c.).—See *Lengerke*, *Kanaan I.*, 278, &c.

RÜRTSCHL.*

Gonesius, Peter (*Conyzy, Goniadzki, Gonionedzki*), born c. 1525, in Goniadz, Poland, was one of the first advocates of anti-trinitarianism, and anabaptism, in Poland. He commenced his public life as an opponent of the Reformation. This won for him the favor of Romanists. But their hopes of finding in G. a faithful champion, were frustrated. In 1554, on a tour through Germany and Switzerland, he became acquainted with the doctrines of Servetus, and regarded them favorably. On his return to Poland he rejected the Nicene, Athanasian, and all other creeds, except the Apostles', and openly avowed Unitarianism. At the Synod of Secenium, Jan. 1556, and at that of Brzesk, Dec. 1558, he denounced infant baptism. The influence of his views was so great, that in 1565 the Reformed C. in Poland split into two parties, the Trinitarian and Unitarian.—(See *SANDII Biblioth. Antitrin.*, I., 1, p. 106; 2, p. 1097; *Krasinski*, *Gesch. d. Ref. in Poland* (Lpz. 1841); *Lukaszewicz*, *Gesch. d. ref. Kirche in Lithauen*).

F. TRESCHEL.*

Gonzalo of Berceo, a Spanish poet of 1168–1268, probably so surnamed from his native town. Though little is known of him personally, he is the first mentioned poet of Spain. His works were printed in 2 vols. from *Sanchez's collection*. His chief studies, judging from his poems, were the Bible and mystical literature. He translated into verse the Latin Lives of the Saints. Nine of his poems are still extant: three biographies of Saints; a poem on the Mass; one on The Signs of the Judgment; a Eulogy upon the Virgin; an account of her miracles; one of her grief at the Crucifixion; and one on the Martyrdom of St. Laurentius. That on the Mass is of value for Church antiquities, as it describes many obsolete customs. That on the Judgment is the best.—(See *CARUS*, *Darstellung d. Span. Lit. im Mittelalter*: Mainz, 1846, I., 229–273, who represents G. as having been no ordinary poet).

DR. PRESSEL.*

Good, the Highest.—Much was done by *Schleiermacher* to clear up and fix the true force of this important idea. He defines the religious and scientific use of the phrase. If by it, it is intended to designate God as the highest good for man, it is inappropriate; for this should rather be the knowledge or love of God, his providence, his grace, or the mystical enjoyment of him. But it may simply designate him as *supreme goodness*. In an *ethical* sense (the *finis bonorum* of older philosophers) the *Highest Good* is one of the three fundamental principles of Ethics, the other two being *Duty* and *Virtue*. If *Duty* is the demand of a moral course of action, and *Virtue* the moral strength and firmness of the subject, the *Highest Good* is the objective result of moral conduct, the product of all moral activity, which, however, may be assumed as the starting principle of Ethics, so far as it conditions the perception of Duty, and its claim to Virtue. On

this basis *Schleiermacher* built his system of Ethics. In opposition to Kant's and Fichte's treatment of Ethics as the *doctrine of duties*, or as a mirror of individual virtues, he showed that a system of moral precepts, even if it comprehended man's whole life, was applicable only in single cases; this would cause an utter confusion of life as a totality, and clear ethical definitions would only incidentally appear. But Virtue is the ethical perfection of the subject, who, if we reject the fiction of total isolation, must be regarded as standing alone in but few things, so that Virtue depends upon a condition which could not exist without the co-operation of others. S., therefore, strove to obtain in the Highest Good an objective and systematically comprehensive organic principle of Ethics. This Highest Good was not merely to be referred to the single individual, but was to be seen completely only in the totality of the human race, as the *Reason* existing in this totality, and under the conditions of our globe. Starting from this principle, with the addition of individual and universal nature, on the one hand the organizing and symbolizing activity of the Reason, on the other the entire sphere of Ethics, may be compassed. S. expressly refers here to the State of Plato, who was the only ancient philosopher who investigated (in his *Philebos*) the Highest Good, and apprehended it from this general objective standpoint: the exhibition of the spirit, *νοῦς* (or in the Republic, of righteousness), the authority of Philosophy in individuals and in the world. Aristotle, on the contrary, with whom the idea of virtue predominates, places it in the happiness of the individual, not in the Epicurean sense, but so that it becomes the realization of a perfect life through perfect virtue (*ζωὴς τελείας ἐνέργεια κατ' ἀρετὴν τελειωμένη*).—In the further progress of the history of Ethics, it is important, in defining the Highest Good, to distinguish: 1) the individual from the general; 2) the subjective from the objective, according to which the Highest Good is sometimes apprehended as a *condition* of man (Epicurean pleasure, or stoic callousness) or a *product* of the activity of mankind, as the aim of the race; 3) but this leads to the opposition between the systems of pleasure and activity, according to which the Highest Good is found either in enjoyment or in the results of moral action, whether in or beyond the subject; 4) finally the activity may be regarded as mainly theoretical (Spinoza, Hegel) or as mainly practical (Kant, Fichte).—In Christian theology the Highest Good is the Kingdom of God which comprehends the individual and the general, the theocratic and practical sides, moral activity with its products, activity and enjoyment, way and end. The way is that all together, and each one singly promote the coming of this Kingdom; the end is, that this Kingdom come to them, as the Kingdom of heaven—to the individual as salvation, to mankind as a whole, that God may be all in all.—(See *SCHLEIERMACHER*, *Ethische Abh.* (phil. Nachl. II., 12, 13, Kritik d. bish. Sittenl., Ethik von TWISTEN; *HEGEL*, *Gesch. d. Philos.* II.). C. BECK.*

Gorgias one of the three generals whom Lysias sent with 40,000 foot, and 7000 horse,

against Judea; the other two were Nicanor and Ptolemy. The order in which these are named in 1 and 2 Macc. indicates G.'s inferiority (1 Macc. 3 : 31, &c.; 4 : 1; 2 Macc. 8 : 8, &c.; 12 : 23, &c.). As Judas Macc. lay, with a small force, S. E. of the enemy, Gorgias planned a night attack upon him with 6000 picked men. But Judas Macc. informed of the scheme, quit the place, and fell so unexpectedly and vigorously on the main body of the foe, that they fled south and west. When Gorgias returned and saw his army routed and his encampment in flames, his corps was driven in dismay to the coasts of Philistine (1 Macc. 4 : 1-25). But two years later G. gained a decided victory over the Jews (1 Macc. 5 : 55-60). At Marisa, also, he slew some over zealous priests (1 Macc. 5 : 67; cf. 2 Macc. 12 : 1, &c., which is a different version of the same events).—(See WERNSDORF, *de fide Maccab.*, p. 114, sq. WINER'S *Lexicon*. EWALD, *Jesch. Isr.* III., 2, p. 361, *Anm.* 1. But WELTE *K. Lex.*) contends that they are narratives of two distinct events). DR. PRESSEL.*

Görres, *John Joseph*, born Jan. 25, 1776, at Loblentz. Carried away by the political excitement of his day, he established, 1798, under Jacobite auspices, a journal called *das "Rothe Blatt."* His visit to France—whither he was sent, Nov. 1799, as a member of a deputation whose object was to hand in complaints touching the cruelties practised by the French troops on the Rhine, and, if circumstances favored, to effect a union between the country on its left bank and France,—having convinced him that the liberty of the French revolution was a military despotism, he declared to his companions that his conscience would not allow him to favor any such union. On his return, he published his "*Resultat meiner Sendung nach Paris.*" Having now studied medicine he married, 1801, Catharine of Lassaulx, became Professor of Physics in his native city, and devoted himself to Philos. and Natural Sciences. His *Exposition of Physiology*, 1805; his aphorisms on art, 1802; his treatise on faith and knowledge, 1805, attracted attention. He went to Heidelberg, 1806, where he delivered lectures on Physics, published, in connection with Brentano, and Achim. Arnim, the "*Einsiedlerzeitung*," returned to Loblentz in 1808, and published his *Mythengesch. der asiatischen Welt* (Heidelberg, 1810), and his *Einleitung zum Lohengrin*, 1813. The war for freedom induced him to issue the *Rhine Mercury*, the first number of which appeared Jan. 23d, 1814. In point of strength of language, national spirit, and influence, it never had a rival. He won back for his country the Gallicized province of the Rhine, and upreared the old standard of the German empire. The paper was suppressed, Jan. 3, 1816, by the Prussian government. His treatise on Germany, in which he expressed the idea of a restoration of German Imperialism, occasioned his departure from Prussia, and that on Germany and the revolution, 1819, caused his flight to Strasburg, in order to escape imprisonment. In his exile he wrote a larger work on Europe and the revolution: Stuttgart, 1821; and a smaller one on the Congress of Verona: Stuttgart, 1822; and a "*Sachen der Rheinprovinzen u. eigener An-*

gelegenheit:" Stuttgart, 1822. The main idea of all these works was, that as the new order of things established subsequent to the fall of Napoleon, was not based on truth and justice, it could not stand, but would be succeeded by another revolution. Whilst in Strasburg his views approached more and more the theocratic standpoint; he wrote on the Cologne Cathedral, St. Francis, a characteristic of Suso, and edited for some time "*der Katholik.*" Having urged upon King Louis of Bavaria, 1825, the necessity of protecting the interests of the Cath. Church, he was made Prof. of Hist. in the newly-established University of Munich. Here, 1830, he wrote "*Ueber die Grundlage, Gliederung u. Zeitensfolge der Welt-Gesch.*," in which he dwelt on the providential element of history, and affirmed creation to be a type of the course of history. His work "*Ueber die christliche Mystik*," 4 vols.: Regensburg, 1836-42, proves that he had now found his spiritual home in the Mediæval Catholicism. His *Athanasius*, 1837, created great excitement in the Catholic world. In 1838, he published "*Die Triarier Leo, Marheinecke, and Bruno Bauer*," and gave the first impulse to the Historico-Political papers. The interests of the Cath. Church he again vindicated in his "*Kirche u. Staat nach Ablauf der Kölner Irrung:*" Weissenburg, 1842; and *Wallfahrt nach Trier*: Regensburg, 1845. Touching the building of the Cologne Cathedral, he wrote "*Der Kölner Dom u. der Strassburger Münster:*" Regensb., 1842. Towards the close of his life, he composed two erudite essays for the Academy of Sciences: *Ueber die Japhediten u. ihre gemeinsame Heimath Armenien, u. die drei Grundwurzeln des celtischen Stammes in Gallien.* Worthy of notice as an expression of his view of history, are the six hist. lectures published in the historico-political papers: Jahrg., 1851, Bd., 28, and a survey of hist. from Christ to the Reformation. The catastrophe subsequent upon the fall of Abel's Ministerium, saddened his soul, dire presentiments beclouded his last days, and he predicted that, before the expiration of five years, a revolution would break out. Died Jan. 27th, 1848.

For G.'s biog., see three sections of his life by his son in the historico-political papers, 1831, vol. 27; I. His Childhood; II. His Education; III. Revolutions of the age, and his own studies. *Deutsche Vierteljahrsschr.*, 1848, Heft 2, p. 126. *Der Rheinische Antiquarius*. I. Abthlg. Bd. II., pp. 433-509. KLÜPFEL.—*Ermentrout*.

Goshen, a district in Egypt which was assigned at the request of Joseph to the family of Jacob, and was occupied by his posterity until their departure to Canaan (Gen. 45 : 10, &c.). Its precise locality is not mentioned, but several hints point to the country on the E. side of the Nile, between its Pelusiac branch and Arabia Petra, and stretching S. to Heliopolis, in the present province of Sharkiyeh (see *Merasid*. I., 330; *Muschtar*. 149; *de Sacy Abdollat*., 396, 706; *Quatremère Recherches*, &c., 183). For: 1) Goshen appears to be on the border towards Palestine (Exod. 13 : 17; cf. Gen. 46 : 28, 29). The assignment of it to the Israelites, because shepherds were an abomination to the Egyptians (Gen. 36 : 34) implies that

it was a border district, where the Israelites might live apart from the Egyptians. 2) Neither on their arrival nor departure from Egypt, is any mention made of the Israelites having crossed the Nile. 3) At their departure they have but a short march from Rameses to the Red Sea (Ex. 13 : 20 ; 14 ; Numbers 33 : 6, &c.). 4) The LXX has, Gen. 45 : 10, Γεσὴν Ἀραβίας, which implies a district of Egypt which might be reckoned with Arabia. *Ptol.*, VI., 8, calls it νόμος Ἀραβίας, and *Plin.*, V., 9, *Arab. nomus*. This is also implied in the LXX translation of "towards Goshen," Gen. 46 : 28, 29, by πρὸς Ἡρώων πόλιν, adding in v. 28, εἰς γῆν Παρισσοῦ. Heroopolis, where Manetho locates the Hyskos (*Jos. c. Apion.* I., 26. Cf. *CHAMPOLL. l'Égypt.* II., 87, *sqq.*) lay, according to Strabo (XVI., 4, 2 ; XVII., 3, 20, p. 552), and Pliny (VII., 33) between the Nile and Red Sea. Saadia and Abn-Said translate Goshen by *Sadîr*, a region on the way from Palestine to Egypt. (See *Merasid.*, II., 19 ; *Muschtar.* p. 242). According to Gen. 45 : 10, Goshen must have been near the royal city, Memphis, or more probably Zoan or Tanis (see HENGSTENB., *Moses and the Egyptians*, 41 ; ROBINSON, I., 52). In either case the locality we have assumed would be confirmed. But G. must have extended to the Nile, or even beyond it ; for the Israelites seem to have always lived among, or beside the Egyptians (cf. Ex. 2 : 3, 5, 8). In Ex. 8 : 26, &c., Moses asked leave to accompany his people three days into the wilderness ; in 11 : 2 ; 12 : 35, 36, the Israelites borrowed from the Egyptians ; in 12 : 22, 23, they sprinkled their door-posts in order to be distinguished from their neighbors ; and in Numbers 11 : 5, the fish were doubtless such as they themselves caught. Ex. 16 : 3 (cf. Numbers 20 : 5), doubtless points to the fertile valley of the Nile. With this must be taken the excellence of the land (Gen. 45 : 18, 20, &c.), which could hardly apply to its mere relative value for grazing. All this applies fully to *Sharkiyeh* (see ROBINSON, *l. c.*). In Gen. 47 : 11, the land of Rameses in part parallel with Goshen (cf. LXX. Gen. 46 : 28 ; Judith 1 : 9), because R. was the capital of the district. This Rameses is one of the treasure cities (Ex. 1 : 11) ; that it was the capital follows from Ex. 12 : 37 ; Numb. 33 : 3. Its locality is uncertain. Jablonski (*Opusc.* II., 135, &c.) thinks it was Heliopolis, against LXX. Ex. 1 : 11. *D'Anville*, *Hengstenberg*, and others, suppose it identical with Heroopolis. But this view rests upon a misapprehension of LXX., Gen. 46 : 28. H. is more probably the Bual-zephon of Ex. 14 : 2, 9 ; Numb. 33 : 7 (see GESSEN., *Thesaur.*, 1297). It was most probably situated in the centre of Goshen, between Heliopolis and Heroopolis (see TUCH, *Genesis*, 537). Pithon is probably the Πάτουμος of *Herod.* II., 158, on the canal between Bubastis and the Arabian Sea (in *Steph. Byzant.*, 227, 24, ed. *Westerm.*, Πάτουμος Πόλις Ἀραβίας ; comp. above the Γεσὴν Ἀραβ. of the LXX. Gen. 45 : 10). This corresponds with Strabo's ἡ Φιδωνος (according to *Larcher* on *Herod.* instead of Φιλωνος) πόλη, XVII., 3, 20, p. 552. In *Itinerar. Antonin.*, p. 163, 170, it is called *Thoum* (Θοῦμ, or Θου) between Babylon, and Heroopolis.—(See, besides the chief Lexicons—MICHAEL-

LIS, *Suppl.*, 371–81. TUCH, *l. c.* KNOBEL, d. *Genesis*, 302. HENGSTENB., *l. c.* ROBINSON, *l. c.*) 2) Goshen is also the name of a city and district in the mountainous part of Judah (*Josh.* 10 : 41 ; 11 : 16 ; 15 : 51). ARNOLD.*

Goths, the, are found in the 3d cent., A. D., in the countries of the lower Danube, the former seats of the *Getæ*. In fact, the two names, as has been shown by J. GRIMM (*Gesch. d. deutsch. Sprache*, 2 vols., 2d ed. : Lpz., 1853), designate but one and the same nation. We thus obtain important information concerning the religion of the Goths at a time when, until lately, it was involved in obscurity ; and of their deeply rooted predisposition to Christianity. The powerful confederacy of the *Getæ* founded by Boerebistes soon dissolved : but during the reign of Caracalla the different tribes appear again united, now under the common name of Goths. This restored unity inspired them with greater boldness in attacking the Rom. empire, so that the latter already in the reign of Alex. Severus paid them annual tribute to preserve peace. Maximinus, a Gothic warrior, raised himself in the army to the dignity of *imperator*. The attitude of the Goths became constantly more threatening, and the issue of the struggle with Decius incited them to new irruptions. Commodian, the contemporary Christian apologist, regarded the Goths as the instruments of the divine judgment preceding the appearance of Anti-christ. According to him the seventh persecution of the Christians ended immediately on the approach of the fearful enemy. In the reign of Valerian and Gallienus they again attacked the empire with still greater impetuosity in three large armies ; and destroyed, among other monuments of antiquity, the temple of Diana at Ephesus. The dangers with which the Goths threatened the empire during the 3d and 4th centuries, were removed by Constantine the Great ; who, after a fierce conflict, concluded a peace with them which continued as long as C.'s family reigned. In the reign of Valerian and Gallienus the Goths had carried off some Christian captives, who became the first heralds of the gospel among them. Sozomenus says : "the clergy among the captives healed the sick and cast out devils by calling on the name of Christ, the Son of God ; besides which they overcame all prejudices against the Christian name by the purity of their life and their virtues. The barbarians, filled with admiration of the life and wonderful deeds of these men, saw that it would be well to gain the favor of the Christian God : and when they sought for it, they were instructed, baptized, and formed into congregations." Philostorgius, the Arian historian, gives a similar account of the planting of Christianity among them. During the reign of Constantine, Athanasius could appeal apologetically, to the triumphs of the gospel over the barbarians, especially the Goths, whose barbarism had been exchanged for civilization. When Church historians connect with the conquest of the Goths by Constantine their submission to the cross, they mean only their compact ecclesiastical organization, which was effected at this time. At the Council of Nice, 325, a Gothic bishop, Theophilus, was present, and subscribed

he decrees. The aim of C. was, to connect the dangerous Goths with the empire by ties stronger than treaties, viz.: by a common worship; and the surest means seemed to be to incorporate them with the empire as a Church province with a Bishop of their own. — The further extension of Christianity among the Goths was the work of Ulfilä (see Art.). He labored, especially after he had become Bishop, 48, with great zeal for the conversion of the Goths: for at this time the number of Christians increased so much, that Athanarich, the heathen king of the Visigoths, waged a bloody persecution against them, which induced Ulfilä to cross with a number of Christians into Roman territory, near Nicopolis, in Moesia. Here Ulfilä labored until 388 for the spread of the gospel among the Goths, even those beyond the Danube. He propagated the Arian doctrine as defined by the Synod of Constantinople in 360. The number of Christians beyond the Danube again increased rapidly, and Athanarich waged a new persecution, in which many suffered martyrdom or exile. The Gothic prince caused an idol to be drawn on a car to the houses of the Christians, with the command that the latter should pray and sacrifice to them; on refusal the houses were burned with their inmates. In the church of a village many men, women, and children were burned to death. Men of low state and men of the highest nobility and influence proved the sincerity of their faith by their constancy under the most cruel tortures (*Acta SS.*, Sept. 15). — About the middle of the 4th cent., Eutyches had labored among the Goths beyond the Danube; hence, along with Arian, we find also Catholic Goths. About this time also, Audius, who had separated from the Syrian Church, arrived among the Goths beyond the Danube, and established monasteries for the converts: for by his doctrine of the corporeality of God he could easily gain the yet heathen Goths, since German heathenism invested the gods with the forms of ideal men. In consequence of the separatism natural to the German character, this separatist tendency could be carried out among the Gothic Audians to greater lengths than in the Syrian Church. They refused even to pray with men of unblemished life, if they held communion with the Church. After the persecution of 370 they vanished. — The persecution of the Gothic churches did not cease until domestic disputes arose among the Goths beyond the Danube, and the noble Frithigern, the adversary of Athanarich, protected the Christians. That F. confessed Arianism, may be owing less to a real understanding of his system, than from considerations of the aid and friendship of Valens. His example was perhaps also decisive for many Goths; but this was merely the completion of a work began by Ulfilä. The latter regarded Arianism as more simple, and therefore more primitive and scriptural, than the Nicene doctrine; and he had disseminated it widely among the Goths, to whose theology it bore a striking resemblance. When after 370 the Goths beyond the Danube were accessible to missionary labor, Ulfilä translated the Scriptures into their language. But it was only a few years that Christianity could spread

uninterruptedly among the Goths beyond the Danube. The Huns, who were advancing from Asia in countless hordes, crowded first upon the Ostrogoths, whose old heroic King, Hermanrich, was unable to render effectual resistance. The Visigoths took refuge on Rom. territory south of the Danube. The party led by Athanarich turned to the mountains in the north. A field for missions was again opened among those who had followed Frithigern to Thrace, some of whom were still heathens, and others, though confessing Christianity, still practised heathen customs. The oppression practised upon the Goths in Thrace by the Rom. prefects soon stirred up new troubles, and a fierce war for a time interrupted the missions. Frithigern, to whom the chief command of the combined armies of the Visigoths and Ostrogoths had been assigned, sought to come to terms of peace with Valens; but his proposition was rejected. The ensuing battle, 378, ended in favor of the Goths, who now pressed forward to the very gates of Constantinople, and ravaged all the country along the coast. Theodosius, now elected emperor, undertook to drive back the Goths, in which he was no little aided by the death of Frithigern, and the consequent separation of the tribes. In this time of danger Athanarich once more united them, and threatened the emperor; but the latter opened negotiations with the Gothic prince, and a peace was concluded. Athanarich died soon after. The Visigoths now entered the Rom. service as *fœderati*. They continued without a common leader, and Theodosius took care to attach them to himself by bounties. This relation of Theodosius to the Arian Goths explains why the emperor, though a strict adherent of the Nicene creed, was nevertheless favorable to efforts of union with the Arians; so that, if that creed should not become the universally accepted symbol, there might be a new one on which all might unite. The Council of Constantinople, 383, led to no result in this direction. A new Council, promised to the Arians in 388, was prevented by the Nicene party. Considerable restrictions were also laid upon the Arians on account of an insurrection stirred up by them in the capital during the emperor's absence. — Near the end of the 4th cent., the question, whether God could be called Father even before the Son existed, gave rise to a controversy among the Arians in the capital. The Goths with Selenas, their bishop, successor to Ulfilä from 388, took side with Marinus, who asserted the affirmative. But a new schism arising in the party of Marinus, many Goths, especially priests, separated from him and united with the Catholic Church. Chrysostom was induced by this defection from Arianism to labor among the Goths in order to their reunion with the Catholic Church. He ordained presbyters, deacons, and lectors, who spoke the Gothic language, and gave them a church in the capital. He himself preached frequently for this church. Many were thus gained for Catholicism. Of the zealous efforts of the Catholic Goths at Constantinople to obtain a more accurate and profound understanding of the Scriptures, their correspondence with Jerome (*ep. ad Lunniam et Fre-*

lam) is a splendid testimony. Chrysostom extended his efforts also to the Pagan Goths along the Danube. These had, indeed, accepted Arian Christianity; but many of them no doubt differed but little from Pagans. Chrysostom also sent Bishop Unila to the Goths in the Crimea, and established an ecclesiastical connection with them. Gothia, along the Cimmerian Bosphorus, continued during the middle ages, a See of the Byzantine C.; and as late as the 18th cent., the Bishop of Capha bore the surname of Gothia. The Catholic Goths in the Crimea, of whom Busbek had accounts in the 16th cent., disappeared with the surname of the Bishop. The *Gothi minores* near Nicopolis vanished even earlier. In the 16th cent. they still had a Bishop, although a successor of Selinas is mentioned. They seem to have vanished among the nations which, in the 7th cent. invaded the Danubian countries. The two chief Gothic tribes turned to the West. The Visigoths under Alaric took the lead, when after the death of Theodosius their subsidies were refused them. They ravaged the countries south of the Danube past the capital to the Peloponnesus. The Christian Goths spared even less than their Pagan ancestors the temples and altars of the gods, and destroyed with the sword what Christian emperors had been unable to abolish by laws. The sack of Eleusis abolished the famed mysteries of Ceres. Priests and philosophers, the surviving props of Paganism, were cut down. Alaric next threatened Rome, and forced it to pay tribute. This, after the death of Stilicho, being refused, he appeared in 408 before Rome. The city was in the utmost distress. In vain the gods were invoked; Alaric's demands had to be satisfied. In order to this the statues of the gods were melted down, among them the *Virtus Romana*. Honorius refusing to ratify the treaty made with the Senate, Alaric in 410 again appeared before Rome, which at once surrendered. Attalus, the prefect of the city, after being baptized, was made emperor. But Alaric seeing that Attalus was not only incapable, but that also the Christian God opposed his government, sent the imperial insignia as an overture of peace to Honorius. The latter continuing inflexible, Alaric appeared a third time before Rome. The Christian apologists regard Alaric as a scourge of God to punish the wicked metropolis. Alaric himself declared that he did not march against Rome of his own will; but that some one was constantly urging him: "Arise and destroy the city." But the city was not to be destroyed; the Christian people of Rome were to be awakened to repentance. The barbarians spared the churches and all who had taken refuge in them, whilst they plundered and destroyed the most admirable monuments of Paganism. The destruction of the city by the Goths was the death blow to Roman paganism. Alaric led his army to southern Italy, where he died in the flower of his life. Athaulf, his brother-in-law, became his successor. He opened negotiations with Honorius, and undertook to restore the Roman power in Gaul and Spain. By his marriage with Galla Placidia, daughter of Theodosius the Great, peace seemed to be fully estab-

lished. The Gothic king, seeing that his people must first be trained to obey laws, renounced his plan of destroying the Roman empire and converting it into a Gothic one; but labored now to reanimate it with Gothic help. Contemporaries regarded the marriage of Athaulf with Placidia as a fulfilment of Dan. 2: 32, etc. The conquest of Spain, continued in the interest of the emperor by Wallia, was rewarded with permanent seats in Gaul, where the Visigoths (see Art.) founded a kingdom of their own. — The Ostrogoths obtained from the Eastern Empire seats in Pannonia. Made strong by union, they soon again threatened both the Eastern and Western Empire. The East bought peace. After the death of Walmir, his brother Widmir led his hordes into Italy, whence he proceeded to Gaul and united with the Visigoths. But the greater part of the Ostrogoths followed Theodoric into the Eastern Empire, where new seats were granted them. The Emperor Zeno subsequently induced them to remove to Italy, whither in 489 Theodoric departed and founded the Ostrogoth kingdom (see Art.). — See Dr. J. ASCHBACH, *Gesch. d. W. Gothen*: Frankf. a. M., 1827; K. ZEISS, *Die Deutschen u. d. Nachb. stämme*: Münch., 1837; KRAFFT, *K. Gesch. d. Germ. Völk.*: Berl., 1854.

KRAFFT. — *Reinecke*.

Gottschalk. — This theologian, noted in the controversies of the middle ages, was descended from the family of Count Benno. He was placed in youth at the monastery Fulda, but on reaching maturity became weary of the place, and strove to escape. Subsequently he became a zealous advocate of Augustine's doctrine of predestination, and even went beyond this Church Father, in contending for a predestination to death as well as to life. The persistency with which he advocated his extreme views led to his condemnation by a Synod at Mayence, 848, and by one at Chiersy (*Carisiacum*) 849. He was scourged, and imprisoned for 21 years. So far from recanting, he continued to write in defence of his views. During his last illness absolution was offered to him if he would recant; but he refused. The offices of religion were denied him after his death; his body was buried in unconsecrated ground. Nevertheless there were some who embraced his views, though without adopting their full consequences (see *Predestination*). Gottschalk and Hinemar had a controversy, also, about the Trinity, G. accusing H. of Sabellianism, and H. denouncing G. as an Arian. — (See MANGUIN, *vell. auct., qui saec. IX., de predest. et gratia scrips. opp. et fragm.* USHER'S *Gottsch. Hist.* CELLOT, *opp. misc. ad hist. G.* GFRÖRER, *Unters. ti. Alter, Ursprung, &c., d. Dekr. d. falschen Iddorus*: Freib., 1848, p. 67, &c. HAGENBACH.*

Gottschalk, Prince of the Wends, and Martyr. — For centuries the Slavonian or Wend tribes, settled on German soil between the Baltic, Elbe, Oder, and Saale (the Obotrites, &c.), resisted the introduction of Christianity, and the sway of the Germans. Christianity was made doubly hateful to them by Charlemagne's attempt to force it upon them, and their political antipathies were inflamed by their religious hatred. In the 10th cent. Otto I., after the con-

quest of the Slavonians, established among them the Sees of Havelberg, 946, of Brandenburg, 949, of Meissen, Oldenburg, Merseburg, Zeitz-Naumburg, and the Archb. of Magdeburg, 949. But in 983, already, under Otto II., the Wends rebelled, and with Mistiwoi for their Prince, put an end to the German rule, and Christianity among them. Mistiwoi, subsequently, indeed, again embraced Christianity; his son Otto rebuilt churches, and had his talented son, Gottschalk (his Slavonian name is not known), educated in St. Michael's monastery at Luneburg. But when G. heard that a Saxon had murdered his father (1032), he forsook the monastery and Christianity, to revenge his father. A bloody war, new devastations, new persecutions of the Christians followed, until the Margrave Bernhard, of Lower Saxony, conquered and captured G., who then ardently embraced Christianity again. Set at liberty, G. went to the court of Canute, spent 10 years in Denmark and England, and returned (c. 1043) with the daughter of a Danish King as his wife. He became Prince of the Obotrites, and then by conquest and voluntary submission, the chief of a great Wend empire. Then he made zealous efforts to Christianize his people, earnestly beseeching them to be baptized. Missionaries were called in. The aid of Archb. Adalbert, of Bremen-Hamburg, was sought. By his assistance G. established two more Sees, Razeburg and Mecklenburg, and monasteries in Lentzen, Oldenburg, Rezeburg, Lübeck, Mecklenburg. G. himself preached, and translated the liturgical forms and the sermons of the German missionaries. — Many were converted, churches were built and adorned, priests multiplied, and schools founded. But a new insurrection broke out under Kruko, Prince of the Rugians, and Pruaso (Blussu) G.'s brother-in-law. On June 7, 1066, G. was murdered, and with him his old teacher, Abbot Eppo (Yppo), at the altar. A general insurrection of the Slavi followed. All Christian institutions were destroyed, and Christians, especially the clergy, were put to death. For ten years Christianity was extinct. In 1105–27, G.'s son, Henry, who, with his mother, had fled to Denmark, restored the Obotrite kingdom, and Christianity in part; but the work of Christianizing and Germanizing those regions was not completed until Albrecht, the Bear (1133), and Henry, the Lion (1142–62), wholly subdued the Wends. The Wend Prince, Niklot, Henry's cotemporary, was, probably, a grandson of the martyred G., who, therefore, was the primogenitor of the house of Mecklenburg. — (See ADAM, *Bremen hist. eccl.* HELMOLD, *Chron. Slav.* SPIEKER, K.-u. Ref. Gesch. d. Mark Brandenb.: Berlin, 1839. WIGGER's K.-gesch. Mecklenb.: Parchim, 1840. GIESEBRECHT, *Wend. Gesch.*: Berlin, 1843. *Piper's evang. Kal.*, 1856, 172, &c.).

WAGENMANN.*

Goudimel, *Claude*, distinguished for his contributions to the Church music and poetry, was born during the 1st quarter of the 16th cent. in Franche-Comté. His chief work was the composition of music for four voices, to Marot's and Beza's version of the Psalms. Some of these tunes are still used in the Ref. churches of France, Germany, and Switzerland. His other

compositions are preserved as *Chansons spirituelles*, and in the *Fleur de Chansons des deux plus excellents musiciens de notre temps* (Orlando Lasso, and C. Goudimel). He perished as a Huguenot on St. Bartholomew's eve, at Lyons.

GRÜNEISEN.*

Gozan is mentioned, 2 Kings 19: 12; Isa. 37: 12, along with Haran, Rezep, and Eden, as a country of Mesopotamia subdued by the Assyrians. In Isa. 10: 9, Carchemish is named instead of Gozan, so that it was probably the capital of the district. *Ptol.*, V. 18, mentions Γαζαρίτις as situated between the Chaboras and Caocoras. Shalmaneser led the ten tribes into exile, and located them in Halah, on the Habor, the river of Gozan, and in the cities of the Medes (2 Kings 17: 6; 18: 11. The distinction made between the Habor and the river of Gozan, in 1 Chron. 5: 26, is doubtless an error of the copyists). Various opinions exist about "Habor, the river of G.," some think it identical with the Chebar of Ezekiel (1: 3, &c.), the Chaboras of the Greeks. Then Gozan would be the Γαζαρίτις of *Ptol.*, and the locality of the first exile under the Assyrians would be the same as that of the second under the Chaldeans (*Gesenius, Winer, Hitzig, Knobel, Ritter*). Others hold that Chebor is the Chaboras, but the Hobar to be an eastern tributary of the Tigris (*MERASID.*, I., 333. *Schultens [Ind. geogr.] C. B. Michaelis, Rosenmüller*). Others, as *Bochart*, consider Habor the mountain dividing Assyria from Armenia, the γαζάριας of *Ptol.*, VI., 1, 1. Then Gozan, like Γαζαρία in *Ptol.*, VI., 2, 10, would be taken for a city of Media; but this places it too near the Caspian sea for the Bible notices of it. Gozan must, therefore, be the district through which the Habor passes. Jewish tradition also locates the exile there (see *Zeitschr. d. Deutsch-Morgenl. Gesellsch.*, 1851, 467–82).

ARNOLD.*

Grace. — The grace (*gratia*, χάρις, ἡ χάρις) of God is the basis, the distinguishing feature, and the essential form of the Christian religion; the idea of it runs through its entire system of doctrines. First it appears in the *theological* branch, as, in a measure, the crown of God's attributes. It concludes the *anthropological* branch as the decree of salvation, and the founding of the plan of redemption. In *christology* it comes forth as the leading characteristic of completed revelation, of Christ and his soteriological work. In *Pneumatology* it constitutes the order of reconciliation and the kingdom of grace; and it culminates in *Eschatology* as redemption completed in the bestowal of the reward of grace. — *Grace as an attribute of God.* God is gracious in hearing prayer (Ex. 22: 27), in staying his wrath (32: 12), in exercising free mercy (33: 19), in showing pity and long-suffering (34: 6), and in causing the light of his countenance to rest upon the just (Numb. 6: 25). His grace accompanies the revelation of himself (Deut. 33: 16). In the Old Test. it is often joined with truth (Ps. 98: 3; 108: 5, &c.); also with justice and the judgment (Hosea 2: 19). In the New Test. St. John (1: 14) describes the revelation in Christ as one of grace and truth; whilst Paul and John call the ground-thought

of Christianity, *Grace* (John 1 : 16 ; Rom. 3 : 24 ; cf. 1 Peter 1 : 13). In Rom. 3 : 24 the nature and operation of grace are stated. Earlier theologians sometimes associated Grace with the love of God, sometimes with his goodness. Calov. and Hollaz describe it as: *amor Dei gratuitus, quo complectitur creaturas omnes*; Ammon as, *bonitatis continuatio erga indignos*. But older theologians also describe *gratia* as, in a wider sense, *benignitas*. Bretschneider, following Reinhard, teaches that "the goodness of God has different names in the Bible, according to what it refers to: a) *Grace* (Matt. 5 : 45 ; Rom. 11 : 35 ; Eph. 2 : 5, 8) so far as God bestows all benefits without merit, or in a narrower sense continues them even to the unworthy. b) *Mercy*, when the miserable and unfortunate are helped (Ps. 25 : 2, &c.). c) *Long-suffering*, when punishment is delayed to afford sinners time to repent. d) *Pity* when the severity of the punishment is softened." In some modern theologians Grace is hardly (Marheineke) or nowhere (Martensen) treated as an attribute of God. Schleiermacher calls Grace the power of the divine consciousness in the soul (§ 80); Marheineke: the manifestation of God's goodness towards human unworthiness.

The true nature of Grace must be more clearly determined according to the Scriptures. Primarily we distinguish those attributes of God which refer to the world in general from those referring to individuals, and then note especially those which arise from God's relation to men as sinners (see *Lange's posit. Dogm.*, p. 60, &c.). In the first case the benevolence of God is universal *goodness*; in the second, *love*; in the third *grace*, as the absolute working of the benevolence of God, in removing the guilt of the sinner. Grace is essentially redemptive from sin (Rom. 3 : 4).—It may, indeed, be asked how grace can be an eternal attribute of God, if man's sin first called it into exercise? But the Bible teaches that it was eternally active as the purpose (*εὐδοκία*) and election (*προϋποθέσις*) of grace. In this view it is to be regarded as the eternal reciprocal activity of the love and justice of God. For in the operations of grace both these appear. God is to the sinner first a hidden, then a jealous, then a gracious Being. In the first case love is concealed in justice; in the second justice prepares the way for love; in the third justice is revealed as saving, regenerating love, as justifying righteousness. Hence grace does not stand in negation to wrath, but in harmony with it, as the Gospel to the Law. But the relation of mercy to grace, is like that of goodness to love. And both not merely remove but overrule evil for good; grace transmutes guilt into saving righteousness, mercy makes death the destruction of death.—Grace contemplated as love, is more than an attribute of God, it is the substance and soul of revelation itself. The eternal activity of God in relation to the world is called in the Scriptures (Eph. 1) mainly a *purpose*, an *election*, a *covenant*, of grace. Under the first older theologians distinguish: 1) *decretum prædestinationis*, God's purpose to save men (in a narrower or wider sense) through Christ; 2) *decr. gratiæ* in a narrower sense, God's purpose to make sinful

men able to believe; 3) *decr. justificationis*, God's purpose to justify those who believe in Christ. But the purpose of justification is involved, already, in that of election; so that of grace. According to Rom. 8 : 29, &c., two divine purposes (and acts) precede calling and justification, viz., election and predestination. God first destines a man to be in Christ, i.e., defines his personality in its eternal relation to Christ as the centre of salvation; only after this can the destination of his temporal allotment, and his entrance into the kingdom of grace come into view (*Lange's posit. Dogm.*, 950, &c.). But if the purpose of grace is taken in its most general sense, everything in the scheme of redemption must be referred to it. In this sense the purpose of God is his eternal will, relatively to the entire plan of the world (see *Hahn, Lehrb. d. chr. Glaubens*, 197).

Underlying God's decree of grace is the idea that his power surpasses and overcomes man's resistance, not in the form of necessity, but of free love (Rom. 5 : 20, 21). In this view Revelation after the Fall appears as a kingdom of grace, through the covenant of grace. The doctrine of such a covenant of grace has been developed mainly by Reformed theologians, as Cocceius (*Summa doctr. de fœd. et testam. Dei: Lugdun. Bat.*, 1648). He distinguishes between the covenant of works in man's innocence, and that of grace introduced after the fall. The same division, in a modern sense, underlies Schleiermacher's system, and those of others after him. Even Cloggenburg had adopted this distinction before Cocceius (*Hahn*, p. 83).

In Christ the purpose of grace, which lies at the basis of the Old Test. covenant economy, and even of the law (Gal. 3 : 15) appears in its perfected realization (Tit. 2 : 11 ; 3 : 4). The glory of the only-begotten manifests itself in grace and truth (John 1 : 17). The truth in Christ is revelation completed, or the ideal side of the incarnation; grace is Redemption completed, or the ethic side of the incarnation. Hence the grace of God in Christ is also the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ (2 Cor. 8 : 9), who is essentially grace, as the atonement, the mercy-seat (Rom. 3 : 25). Hence, also, his life is a continuous pouring forth of grace, and power.—This doctrine of grace, therefore, comes first fully into view when we treat of the subjective appropriation of salvation by the Holy Ghost. The Holy Ghost (see Art.) is so much the agent of salvation, and the principle of life in grace, that he has been designated *gratia applicatrix* (see *Schweizer, Glaubensl. d. ev. ref. K.*, II. 443.—*Grace*, means of). The gracious operations of the Holy Ghost include, for man's apprehension, all the divine workings of grace. *Gratia dei in univrsam*, too often confounded with *goodness*, is distinguished from *gratia salutaris*, specific grace; and this may be *gratia affectiva* or *beneficentia Dei*, and *affectiva* or *beneficentia dei*. *Gratia effectiva*, again, may be *general*, as in the universal revelation of God in nature and the reason, or *special* as in the Gospel. Such special grace may be *præcurrens*, *præveniens*; *operans*, *convertens*; and *cooperans* (*conservans*, *inhabitans*).—The order of the saving operations of grace is (Rom. 8): election,

redemption, calling, justification, glorification. These manifest themselves in corresponding states in the subject; from election results the susceptibility for salvation; predestination ranges the allotments of man's life; calling operates conversion, justification, faith; glorification, sanctification. From the combined operation of all these, result man's religious destiny, the pilgrimage, prayer, adoption or peace, and love or godliness. As grace, in its very nature, the victory of divine love over man's opposition, there is no point at which it operates statistically; but none, either, at which it is not the predominant creative life-element, none at which soliciting divine influences do not unite with corresponding human activities.

For the various opinions touching the relation of divine grace to the human will, see Winer's *comp. Darstellung*, p. 80. The Protestant C. disputes a synergism *before conversion*, whilst Rom. Catholics, Armenians, and Socinians allow passive synergism. Protestantism seems even not to admit of a synergism in conversion, especially not that the sinner can do good works. It does, however, allow that man may possess *iustitia civilis*, and this may make a proper use of the means of grace. The more rigid Reformed hold to irresistible grace in the elect, whilst Lutherans maintain that man must be wholly passive. This view has often been proven inadequate (*Schenkel's Unionsberuf d. v. Prot.*, 372, &c.).—*After conversion* Reformed theologians admit an active co-operation of the regenerated (*Conf. Helv.*, II., IX. So the Lutherans—Winer, 107).—The grace of God in Christ has established a *regnum gratiæ*, placed between the *regnum potentiæ* and *r. gloriæ*. This is the Church itself, in its divine character, as Christ reigns in it by his word and Spirit. Connected with this idea is that of a season of grace, in a wider and narrower sense. The time of grace for the world is limited by the final judgment; but how with that of each individual? Quakers speak of a day of visitation (Winer, 87). The Protestant view is by no means fixed by the denial of a *purgatory*, and the assumption of a *purgatory* involves only a seemingly more liberal view, since it relieves believers alone, or applies to such as, according to the Protestant dogma, are included in a general pardon. The Bible limits each one's day of grace by his self-hardening. The death of the impenitent may also be considered a *judgment* for them, though not to the exclusion of the final judgment. But the end of grace is the perfection of man; his transformation into a child of God, after the image of Christ, in the kingdom of heaven. If the reward there bestowed on him, is called the reward of grace, it must not be identified with justification; this rests on faith alone, that on the works of faith. But it must be understood that the believer obtains this reward on the basis of grace, through the means and Spirit of grace, and from the hand of grace. LANGE.*

Grace, Means of.—In this article we shall only consider the means of grace in general, their idea and contents, then their value and necessity, or their relation to divine grace and the salvation of man, and finally their efficacy

and conditions. Evangelical Protestantism teaches, that the ordinary means of grace are only the word of God and the sacraments by Christ.

The starting point for this doctrine is contained in the 5th Art. of the Augsburg Confession. Grace, in the form of justification by faith, is presupposed. The ministry was instituted to preach the gospel and administer the sacraments, in order to produce this faith. "*Nam per verbum et sacramenta, tamquam per instrumenta donatur Spiritus sanctus, qui fidem afficit, ubi et quando visum est deo in iis, qui audiunt Evangelium,*" etc.—This definition is connected with this addition: "*damnant Anabaptistas et alios, qui sentiunt, spiritum sanctum contingere sine verbo externo hominibus per ipsorum præparationes ad opera.*" The Heidelberg Catechism gives the same definition, Question 65: "Whence does this (saving) faith proceed? From the Holy Ghost, who works faith in our hearts by the preaching of the gospel, and confirms it by the use of the sacraments." (For the other most important passages of the symbolical book, see Apolog. IV., p. 153; Art. Smalc. Pars., II., 2, 8; Catechism. maj. Præceptum, III., p. 426; Symbol. Apost., p. 502; Formul. conc. Epitome: de lib. arbitr. Negativa VI., Solid. decl., pp. 655, 669, 828; Conf. Helv., II., c. I.; Conf. Gall., art. 25, 35; Conf. Belg., art. 24).—The connection between word and sacrament, consequently the idea of the means of grace, is not so clearly defined by Reformed as by Lutheran theology. The latter always connects word and sacrament, not so the former. The Conf. Helv. treats of the Word of God in chap. 1, of the sacraments chap. 19. The reason of this is, that the Holy Scriptures as the Word of God was to be the beginning of the system. It does, however, at another place, combine them together: *prædicationi verbi sui adjunxit deus mox ab initio in ecclesia sua sacramenta, vel signa sacramentalia*. We have seen how the Heidelberg Catechism combines the two. The unity of the idea, means of grace, is not regarded by evangelical theology as a formal, human, theological connexion of the Word of God, Baptism and the Lord's Supper, but as the sequence of a divine fact, of the founding of the Church and of the ministry. The means of grace are not merely discursive possessions of the Church, but they constitute inalienable fundamental characteristics of the Church itself, which are mutually related. The Church is called into life by the Word of God, it becomes visible as a congregation of believers, by Baptism and the Lord's Supper (Conf. Aug., Art. VII.). The unity of the means of grace, briefly expressed, consists in this, that they constitute the real Church as the organ for the mediation of grace, of the Holy Spirit for the world needing salvation. The internal side of their unity is the grace, which they mediate, the external side is the *ministerium*, the office instituted by Christ, which has to administer them.

This brings us to the value and necessity of the means of grace, or to the doctrines of the Evangelical Church on these points in opposition to the Rom. Catholic doctrines on the one hand, and the views of Protestant sects on the

other. The first point of difference exists in the different view concerning the bearer of the means of grace, of the spiritual office. Both parties regard the ministry as of divine institution, but, according to the Protestants, a *ministerium*, which can be regarded as a constant Christian activity of the Church in word and sacrament, according to the Rom. Catholics the *sacerdotium*, which, as the proper, fundamental mean of grace, itself creatively increases the means of grace, according to the features of apostolic tradition (*Dieringer, Lehrbuch der Kath. Dogmatik*, p. 512). Even if the *sacerdotium* is regarded as conditioned by the Scriptures and by tradition, it still appears again as an element of tradition, and obtains, in this position, creative superiority over the means of grace. The power to lessen them has sufficiently manifested itself in the prohibition of the Bible, the withdrawal of the cup, and similar things; the power to increase them in ecclesiastical legislation, and in the multiplication of the sacraments; the power to modify them, in the relation of the doctrines of the Church to the Scriptures, in the doctrine of the sacrifice of the mass and others. The Protestant doctrine concerning the means of grace is related, in the first place, to the Rom. Catholic negatively, in that it substitutes the *ministerium* in the stead of the *sacerdotium*. Then in the way and manner in which it fixes the organism of the means of grace. Here it is, first the word which mediates grace, then the sacrament, there the sacrament first, then the word in an accessory way. See "Inwiefern den Katholiken die Sakramente mehr gelten als das Wort," *Nitzsch in den Studien*, 1834, IV., 851." (A Protestant reply, &c., p. 149); also *Schenkel, der Unionsberuf des ev. Protestantismus*, p. 139. — As to the Word of God, it is, for Protestants, contained purely in the Holy Scriptures, as explained and applied by the preaching of the gospel, whilst Rom. Catholicism understands by it simply the *prædicatio verbi* (*Winer*, p. 115). Compare the Arts. on the Word of God and on the Sacraments. The third difference between Prot. and Rom. Cath. appears in the way and manner in which the means of grace themselves are determined in relation to grace and to salvation. According to Concil. Trident. Sess. 7, the sacraments act *ex opere operato*; the Conf. Aug. (Art. XIII.) rejects this doctrine. As to the true meaning of the *opus operatum* consult *Bellarmin, Sacr. II.*, 1, according to whom, the objective and active effect of the sacrament is meant by it, which is to be received in a purely passive way.

Against the Rom. Cath. doctrine the Evangelical Church maintains the distinction between grace and the means of grace; against separatists, the appointed and legitimate connection between the two. We must, however, distinguish such separatists who generally reject the necessity and order of the means of grace, and such as find them alone in the Word of God, and not in the sacraments. The former were represented, at the time of the Reformation, by the Anabaptists, and the definitions of the symbolical books are made against these; later they are represented by the Quakers. They are of the

opinion, "that the Holy Spirit, without the Word, immediately enlightens every man (on his appointed day of visitation), and he becomes hereby first able to understand the Word of God" (*Barclay, Apol. thes.*, 7, 3. *Winer*, p. 86). It would, however, be doing injustice both to the Quaker and to the Anabaptist, to suppose that he altogether rejected the idea of the means of grace. The Quaker especially is distinguished for diligent use of the Scriptures. However, he will not acknowledge any *divinely appointed specific means of grace in the Church*. Socinians and Mennonites, on the other hand, regard the Scriptures as an objective means of grace in a limited sense, whilst the former see mere signs of the Christian confession (*cerimoniae*) in the sacraments, the latter, at all events, regard them also as objective signs of the effect of grace, working in the soul of the believer (*Ris, Conf. Art. 30*; comp. *Winer*, p. 122, sq.). In the latter case, the objective seal is also wanting. *This, however, is accepted by the Armenians, Conf. Remonstrant.*, 23, 1. It is proper here to remember the restoration-doctrine of the Anabaptists, the doctrine of the Quakers concerning the general government of the Spirit of revelation (*deus spiritus revelatione se ipsum semper filiis hominum patefacit*; *Barclay, Apol. Theol.*, II.), and the Socinian view of an extraordinary influence of the Spirit upon single individuals together with his ordinary influence through the gospel (*Ostorodt, Unterricht K.*, 34). The Protestant Church possesses, in the doctrine of *gratia præveniens*, a theory upon which it can acknowledge the limited correctness of the latter views, and nevertheless still hold fast continually to the necessity of the means of grace. The sphere of *gratia præveniens* extends, even according to the Scriptures, beyond the circle of theocratic revelation. The Spirit dwells where he will, the Logos shines into all human souls; the *gratia præveniens* is active in all receptive souls. But those thus prepared first attain to *experience* of salvation only within the circle of revelation, to *certainly* of salvation first through the appointed means of grace. From this view of the necessity of the means of grace, the difference between the Lutheran and Reformed doctrine concerning the means of grace, must appear, so far as such difference really exists. The possibility of the enlightenment of single individuals within the Church, *sine externo ministerio*, is acknowledged by the Conf. Helv., II., cap. 1. The article, however, declares it to be the divine plan, that enlightenment is mediated by the *usitata ratio instituendi homines*. The *prædicatio dei verbi* is more strongly emphasized as necessary, to which then must be added the *interna spiritus illuminatio* and the theocratic or ecclesiastical sphere seems to be presupposed in every case. The necessity, however, is defined as a *necessitas præcepti, non absoluta*, i. e. God, in saving man, is not bound to this mediation, as is shown by prophecy and revelation, but, in condescension to the weakness of our nature, he has appointed these means (*Schweizer, die Glaubenslehre der ev. ref. Kirche II.*, p. 561). Luther, on the contrary, "even refers the inspiration of the prophets to the *verbum vocale*" (Art. Smalk., p. 333). A second

ference is, that, in Lutheran theology, word and sacrament are more closely connected with each other, and that Reformed theology, on the contrary, emphasizes the value of the word of God as the *causa instrumentalis* (see *Ebrard, Christliche Dogmatik*, p. 578). In this connection is to be considered also more particularly, the connection between grace and the means of grace. Lutheran theology most evidently teaches a more decided self-limitation of the Holy Spirit through the means, the Reformed a free administration of the same beyond the means, the former an organic interpenetration of grace and the means of grace, which, however, does not extend to identity, the latter an economic connection, which, however, excludes irregularity and contingency. As regards the Word of God, its *efficacia* is more strongly affirmed by Lutheran theology, and Calovius and Quenstedt speak of an *unio mystica gratiæ sive virtutis divinæ cum verbo* (*Hahn, Lehrbuch*, p. 549). The connection of the Spirit with the word, is, according to the Reformed, conditioned by the circle of the elect within the circle of the non-elect, therefore it is represented in the predestinarian confessions as simultaneity, whilst the Heidelberg Catechism gives prominence to the interpenetration of both: the Holy Spirit works faith in our hearts by the preaching of the gospel. The difference becomes still greater in the doctrine concerning the sacraments, which we will not anticipate here. According to *Nitzsch* the unity of the confessional differences on this point lies in the idea of the pignus (*System*, 168; comp. also *Winer*, p. 121, the note). We will only remark yet, that the necessity of baptism is not so strongly urged by the Reformed as by the Lutherans. The *Confessio Scotica*, p. 127, rejects with horror the Rom. Cath. dogma, that unbaptized children as such are lost. Also *Calvin, instit.*, IV. 16, 26. As regards the change effected by baptism in relation to regeneration, the 27th Art. of the Conf. Anglio. rightly understood is an irenical type: baptism is *signum regenerationis, per quod recte baptismum suscipiunt ecclesiis inseruntur*. That is, *ecclesiastical, social* regeneration is effected, *individual spiritual* regeneration is thereby made perceptible to the senses and sacramentally *guaranteed*. Concerning the Lord's Supper compare the Article.

With reference, finally, to the effect and the conditions of the means of grace, the above-mentioned differences of the various confessions appear again. Whilst the Evangelical Church teaches, that the sacraments act savingly, upon the condition of faith (for even infant baptism presupposes faith in some form), to confirm and perfect faith, the Roman Catholic Church teaches that the sacraments are real factors of faith, which presuppose nothing but faith in authority, and can be made inefficient only by mortal sins.

Finally, the proper dogmatic idea of the means of grace is yet to be stated. They represent, without doubt, the eternal presence of Christ in the congregation, or the ideal Church, which exists for the real Church, and through it for the world. Christ unites himself with his institutions in the Holy Spirit, and gives his sal-

vation to the world in eternal presentiality. But especially is the Word of God the Church, which proceeds from Christ. The sacraments then constitute the realization of the Church; baptism, the Church coming into existence; the Lord's Supper, the Church coming to clear manifestation in the celebration of its faith. Word and sacrament are thereby indissolubly connected together: the word is fully realized and sealed in the sacrament, the sacrament finds its light and life in the creative effect of the word. If the means of grace in union with the Holy Spirit, prove the entire saving power of Christ's life to be appropriations of salvation, then they are, according to their nature, as much conditioned by faith, as Christ conditioned his personal presence on earth by faith. He demands a perfect faith beforehand just as little as he constrains to faith. To him that asketh shall be given.

LANGE.—Beck.

Gradual—in the mass—is chiefly some verses of a Psalm, or other Scripture, sung between the *Epistle* and *Gospel*. Formerly it was called *Antiphonarium, responsorium, cantus resp., Responsum* (*Ord. Rom.*, I. n. 10), and *Psalmus resp.* (*Greg. of Tours*), because sung by the precentor and choir. Its present more exclusive sense is derived from the *elevation* (*gradibus*, the Ambon, choir, altar) on which it was sung. It is now sung whilst the deacon, having read the Epistle, still occupies the steps of the altar, or ascends them to chant the Gospel. During Lent, when hallelujahs are forbidden, the choir sings the *tractus* instead of the Gradual. In Augustine's time in Africa a whole Psalm, and at Antioch one after each of the three lessons, was sung; the Gradual, whose author is unknown, was adopted in the place of this custom. Ambrose and Gregory M. are mentioned as composers of the Graduals, and Celestine I. is said to have ordered them to be sung at Mass.

K. SUDHOFF.*

Grâl, St.—The legend of the sacred Grâl, in its origin from Pagan, Moorish, Christian, orthodox, heretical, Nestorian, and Gnostic elements, its successive development and transformations in different ages and countries, as also its substance and meaning, is of more than generally acknowledged importance for the history of the Christian Church and doctrine. The first tidings of it seem to have come during the crusades from the East to France, Spain, and England; and reached a luxuriant growth especially in Provence and Bretagne. Besides a MS. of Toledo and a chronicle of Anjou, of which accounts only remain, Flegetanis, Kiot of Provence, Chretien de Troyes, Gautiers de Denet, Gerbers, and Manessier, are mentioned as authors; to which must be added the Mabinogia of Wales and Bretagne, among which especially the Welsh Mabinogian, *Peredur ab Efrawc*, in the red book of Hergert preserved at Oxford, gives an account of the Grâl, and Parcival, the last Grâl-King. Most important for us is the German form of the legend in the 13th century, as found in Parcival and in two fragments of the Titurel of Walfram of Eschenbach, and the younger Titurel of Albrecht of Scharfenberg.—The legend begins with the expulsion of the fallen angels from heaven, in which a precious

gem, the only one that had remained untarnished, fell from the crown of Lucifer, and was ever since carried by angels between heaven and earth, until in the fulfilment of time, it came down to the earth. Of this gem the vessel called Gräl was formed. It was designed to serve the Saviour and his disciples at the last Passover. Thence it passed into the hands of Joseph of Arimathea, who caught up in it the water and blood from the side of the Saviour. It continued thence the symbol of salvation really accomplished on earth, and was entrusted by God to a King Titirel, and to such of his descendants whose names might at any time appear on its edge. The last Gräl-King of the West was Parcival. The Gräl was kept in the chapel of a temple standing on a high mountain (Mt. Salvat) in a deep forest (Floresta Salvat) inaccessible to the uncalled, in the land of Salvaterra. This temple-mountain with its sacred deposit was afterwards removed by the prayer of faith from Spain to India. After Parcival had reigned here for many centuries, he was succeeded by a priest-King, named John, whose name passes, in evident opposition to the Papacy, through all centuries. This legend deserves the minutest attention. The very name, *Saint Gräl*, has been variously interpreted, derived (as from *קֶרֶן*, prepuce, referring to the blood of circumcision as typifying the blood of Christ) and modified. It is certain, however, that Gräl means a vessel, saucer, or cup. Such a precious vessel was really found in the first crusade at Caesarea and brought to Genoa, where it was for many centuries kept and venerated in the church of St. Lawrence, until in recent times it had to travel to Paris.—As the name Gräl was applied to the holy vessel at Genoa, so also the name *Templeises* seems to have reference to the Templars, who were organized to afford a real, as the Gräl a legendary aid, but also counterpoise, to the clerical office. It seems probable also that the mythic-mystical kingdom of John, which attached itself to the Gräl legend, had some connection with the still surviving Gnostic sect of *Disciples of St. John*.—More important than this is the traditional use and purpose of the Gräl. On every Good Friday a wafer is laid into it from above as food for many: hence it seems a continuation of the miraculous feeding of the thousands; it affords sufficient food and drink to all its own, but is visible only to the elect, not to the uninitiated and unbaptized. Nor can it be reached by force or the understanding; it is imparted only through grace by calling and election; only that the offered grace is accepted by faith, and not lost by apathy or guilt. The inmost meaning of the legend clusters around the mystery of the sacrament, in the form of a real presence of Christ. The Gräl serves the water of holy baptism and the elements of the Lord's Supper. As the vessel of the sacraments, it is also the central and culminating point of the Church; which, like it, visible and invisible, gathers and instructs the race, and organizes it into different offices and estates, according to the various gifts and powers. Hence it is the Church which advances and cherishes faith, and defines and determines

it according to the Scriptures to prevent error. By its wanderings, also, the Gräl reminds the Church of its mission among unbelievers.—Psychologically viewed, the legend seems to embody the indestructible effort of the Christian to comprehend the incomprehensible; to retain the past in the present, in order to be the more certain of its historical reality.—BUSHING, *der heil. G. u. seine Hüter* (Alt-deutsches Mus., Bd. 1: Berl., 1809); BOISSERÉE, *üb. die Beschreib. d. h. G.* (Münch., 1834); LACHMANN, *Wolfram v. Eschenbach* (Berl., 1854, 2d ed.); SAN MARTE, (Schulz), *Die Sage von h. G.* (Leb. u. Dicht. Wolfr. v. Eschenb., Bd. 2, 1841); SIMROCK, *Parcival u. Titirel. Uebers.* (Stuttg. u. Tüb., 1842); GÖSCHEL, *die Sage vom Parciv. u. vom Gräl, nach Wolfr. v. Eschenb.* (Berl., 1855).

C. F. GÖSCHEL. — *Reinecke*.

Grandmont, the Order of, was founded by Stephan of Tigerno (1073–83) whose biography by Gerhard, 7th prior of G., is found in MARTENE ET DURAND, *ampliss. collectio*, VI., p. 1050. He was born in 1046 at the castle of Thiers in Auvergne, and educated and ordained to various clerical offices by Milo, B. of Benevento. From the 24th to the 28th year of his age he abode at Rome. His request to be allowed to found an order according to the rule of the Calabrian monks, was refused on account of his youth, by Alexander II., but granted in 1073 by Gregory VII. Returning to France, he built in the solitude of Muret, near Limoges, a hut of interwoven twigs, and ordered his life according to the rule of the Calabrian hermits. At first his rigor found few imitators; but the fame of his sanctity gradually attracted many, who submitted to his guidance. He refused the name of master or abbot, and allowed only that of corrector. He died Feb. 8, 1124, aged nearly 80 years. Both the Augustine and Benedictine monks asserted that S. had adopted their rule; he himself always evaded a direct answer with regard to it. The bull of Gregory VII. authorized him only to found an order of the rule of Benedict; but he might have added to his rule whatever he found worthy of imitation in others. After his death the Augustinians of Ambazoc claimed Muret as their property, and took the name of *Grandmontensians*. His second successor, Stephan of Lisiac, gathered the rules of the order, which latter numbered already 60 colonies. The first monastery of the order built in France was that at Vincennes, which was founded in 1164 by Louis VII. Ademar of Friac, the 8th prior, framed new and very severe rules, which were confirmed by Innocent III. The predominance of lay over clerical brethren caused many domestic disputes, which were with difficulty suppressed by successive Popes. In this way the order degenerated more and more, and its subsequent history consists merely of idle quarrels. Their dress was a coat, scapulary and peaked cowl. The order became extinct in the storms of the first French revolution.—MABILLON, *Anal. ord. s. bened.* V., p. 99, sq.; HELYOT, *Gesch. d. Klost.- u. Ritterorden*, VII., 480–93.

DR. PRESSEL. — *Reinecke*.

Gratian, Emperor of Rome (375–383) the son and successor of Valentinian I. He associated his brother, Valentinian II., with him

self. He was active in the suppression of heathenism. He resigned the office of *Pontifex Max.*, had the altar of Victory removed from the Senate-Hall, abolished *Vestalium virginum prerogativas*, *Sacerdotii immunitatem*, confiscated the revenues of the temple, and refused the Vestals and priests *victum modicum iustaque privilegia* (SYMMACH., X., Ep. 61; AMBROS., Ep., 17), although he had to endure the sacrifices in Rome, for a season. Q. Aur. Symmachus, the Prefect of the city, in vain petitioned (382) Gratian to retract these measures. The edict of 383 was naturally regarded by the heathen as a punishment sent by the gods for the suppression of their religion.—At the request of a Roman Council Gratian was led (378 or 81) to enact a law, giving the Bishop of Rome the right of decision in a final appeal, in cases of schism originating in Rome, but without interfering upon the authority of provincial Metropolitan. The most important act of his reign was the investment of the youthful Theodosius with the Empire of the East. DR. PRESSEL.*

Greek and Greek-Russian Church (and theology).—This name embraces not only the Greek National Church, but in general the Church which originated in the old Greek Church, gradually formed with the Oriental Church an integral whole, and, in distinction from the Roman and afterwards from the Protestant, continued its existence without great revolutions and reforms. Its seat is Greece, Asia Minor, Egypt and Eastern Europe; its history rich in remarkable phenomena, its mission peculiar, its extent greater than its present force and efficiency.—The Greeks were no longer a nation when Christianity reached them; but they lent to it their language and the wide arena of their civilization; their conversion to it decided its universal mission. Greeks are found among the immediate disciples of the Apostles. Among the Greeks of Hellas, Macedonia, and Asia M., Pauline Christianity grew up and gained strength. Greek cities became centres of Christian missions. A new life arose on the soil of classical literature, to advance which the latter very soon proved itself very faithful. Was it not a grand victory of the gospel, that it so quickly made subservient to itself the Greek mind, which was so remote and foreign to itself? How numerous the facts and relations, which can be explained only from the position which Græcism occupied abroad partly with reference to Judaism, and partly to the other then known world. We mention only the fact, that the oldest Christian literature could connect itself directly, in its own language, with the Scriptures. Next in succession to the New Test. canon are mostly Greek works; in these the tendencies of Jewish and Oriental piety are brought together, and in this way they are conveyed to the West. The first defence of the Christian faith, and the first exposition of Christian doctrine, was made in the Greek. In Greek forms of thought, also, was clothed a large portion of the old Gnosis; which, without this means, could not have expressed its manifold elements. Greek treatises formed a bulwark for Christian knowledge against Greek philosophy, but also a bridge to it and a medium for a long continued and fruit-

ful reciprocal influence. There was, therefore, a respectable Christian literature before the Latin Church had anything original. The importance of the Greek language and civilization was twofold: it furnished the remote parts of the Church with a common middle ground for communication and exchange; and modified, also, in various ways the spirit of the old Christian doctrine.—Geographically, also, we may characterize the position of the old Greek Church as a middle and connective one. She embraces Hellas, Macedonia, and the provinces of Asia M., which latter, however, were strongly mingled with Jewish elements. Hence it lay between Syria and Palestine on the one side, and Italy and Africa on the other. Indeed for a time it was doubtful to which section of the Church it would belong.—Of the churches of Greece and Asia M. we can trace a large number into the dim age of the 2d century: e. g., Corinth through the epistles of Clement, and of the later Dionysius; Ephesus through the Ignatian epistles; Smyrna and Philippi through Polycarp and Ignatius; Hierapolis through Appollinaris. Laodicea occurs in the paschal controversy; Sardes in Lydia is mentioned by Melito. Quadratus and Publius are mentioned by Dionysius (*Euseb.* IV., 23) as Bishops of Athens. Melito (*Euseb.* IV., 26) speaks of persecutions by Antoninus against Larissa, Athens, and Thessalonica. Athenagoras, the apologist, was a native of Athens. Subsequently Greece proper and its capital, though long the seat of the celebrated school of philosophy, visited even by the teachers of the Church, withdrew from the main current of Church movements; whilst other sections maintained their place, and especially Ephesus and Thessalonica became important for the future. In the churches of Asia Minor Christian life struggled with heathen and Jewish movements, since these latter endeavored to obtain ecclesiastical sanction. Here, perhaps, the first collections of the New Test. canon were made. But that from these struggles a prevalently practical realist tendency and an ethical-ascetic movement unfolded themselves, is proven from the simple gnosis of Marcion, the controversy concerning the true paschal festival, and by Phrygian Montanism. The resemblance of this spirit with the mind of the Latin Church cannot be denied. Hence Irenæus, though a citizen of Asia Minor, could, with his theology, which, though sharply defined and presented in universal outlines, rested nevertheless throughout upon authority and positivity, obtain a place as a distinguished representative of the Catholicism just arising in the West. Another and more original Greek phase of religion was to arise in Alexandria, the importance of which city Eusebius already admits (*H. E.*, II., 24; III., 21) by enumerating the names of its bishops. At Alexandria Christian Græcism understood itself, and its natural mission as assigned to it by its earlier history and scientific position. Gnostic aberrations came first; then followed a churchly gnosis, the first theology in its narrower sense. The Alexandrians united love of learning and of exegetical investigation with free, vigorous thought; and elevated themselves to a bold speculation without forsaking the

Church basis. The labors of Origen satisfied the majority, and attained to general acceptance in the 3d century. His school, as the example of Dionysius of Alexandria proves, was not so one-sidedly erudite, that it neglected practical affairs. The spiritual cast of the *Greek theology* can now already be discerned. It was always inclined to trace spiritual things in the letter and sensuous forms; always sought the chief importance of the Christian faith in speculative theorems and in the metaphysics of the doctrines of God, the Logos, and the incarnation: and always retained the conviction that man, notwithstanding his fall and sensual degradation, still possessed moral freedom and capacity. But from the intellectual versatility of the Greeks, this general doctrinal character was capable of various modifications and applications, so that it became in turn rigidly dogmatic, or philosophical, or mystical; for all which the germs were already present at this time. The *ethical position* of the Greeks is psychologically important: they cannot be charged with neglecting the moral; against this their inclination to asceticism and their care for Church discipline would be decisive. But since they found the means of reformation and approximation to God in the elevation of the spirit above the earthly and sensuous, they did not sufficiently distinguish between the moral and intellectual difficulty of human sanctification. The good, according to their view, was too vague and too little obligatory; hence they fell short of the stricter conscientiousness and sense of duty which belonged to Latin Christendom. — The second period embraces the 4th cent., and those next succeeding. After the Greek Church of the first age had participated in all the variations of Christian life and suffering, and had taken precedence in some of them, she was now to unfold in the sphere of doctrine a still more lively and more one-sided activity. The Roman empire, now reconciled to Christianity, established a new centre of power at Constantinople, and thus rescued the East from the disasters to which the West was soon to succumb. Since the Church in its territorial divisions had adopted the division of the Rom. empire into dioceses, it was natural that the political division into the East and West should also become an ecclesiastical one. Doctrinal disputes also assisted to loosen existing ties, and occasioned in the 5th cent. already a temporary schism. The patriarchates of Byzantium, Alexandria, Antioch, Cæsarea, and Ephesus became more closely connected, whilst Rome stood isolated in the West. The elevation of Constantinople did not destroy the independence of the other patriarchates, for they maintained a thoroughly free and co-ordinate position for a long time after: but it did give to Eastern Christendom an episcopal seat, which claimed an equal dignity with the Roman. A Greek papacy was impossible for many reasons: but the dignity of Constantinople and the extent of its diocese occasioned a bipartite division of the Church, which prevented the more remote East from forming a third independent organization, and led it to attach itself to the Greek Church. This close connection of the Greek-Oriental Church was encouraged by doc-

trinal movements, as a mere glance at their arena and connections will show. The Arian controversy commenced in Egypt, passed over to Asia Minor, Palestine and Syria, and in the West to Illyria and Thrace, but less to Italy: it was decided in the Greek empire; Asia Minor and Byzantium furnishing the most important forces. In the christological controversies, Ephesus, Alexandria, and Constantinople took the lead; the doctrine assumed an Alexandrian and an Antiochian aspect. No party gained a decisive victory: the higher union of the two views which was at last achieved, was maintained only at the price of the Nestorian, Monophysite and Monotheletic schisms; so that Church unity was not fully maintained in the East. What part the Emperors played in these and later transactions, is known. Thus much had been settled, with the rather feeble aid of the West, upon Greek-Oriental territory; for Rome and the Orientals, having little doctrinal productiveness, assisted only by successful interferences and by drawing practical consequences. On the other hand, Augustinism and Pelagianism were phenomena and opposites peculiar to the West, to which we find no complete analogies among the Greeks. Both parties learned from each other, though in an unequal measure; the Romans appropriating far more from the Greeks, than the reverse. Even if a few men, such as Jerome and Rufinus, evince to us this commerce between the two sections of the Church; we are even in them reminded of its inequality. Rufinus translated Origen and Eusebius into the Latin: but who at that time translated Latin works into Greek? — Greek Church literature had flourished during this time with an extraordinary exuberance. Its interior circle was composed of works specially doctrinal: but what a contrast between the hard zealous dogmatism of Epiphanius, and the poetic-speculative views of Synesius or the philosophy of religion of Nemesius and Æneas of Gaza: between the sober common sense of Theodoretus and the mystic transcendentalism of Pseudo-Dionysius! The old Christian Platonism had been suppressed, at times even to make room for Aristotle; but reappeared at times in isolated individuals. The defects of the earlier exegesis were most successfully removed by the Antiochian school. If we add yet the works on Church history, the homilies and sermons of Chrysostom and the Cappadocians, the liturgical productions which under the name of James, Basilides, and Chrysostom, attached themselves to the Apostolical Constitutions, the Catecheses of Cyril, of Jerusalem, the monastic rules and contributions to spiritual poetry and hymnology; we must be surprised at the productiveness of the Greeks. In the 6th and 7th centuries the Greek mind had become impoverished; doctrinal theology was reduced to barren dogmatic forms, and yet the literary inheritance was sufficiently great to give plenty of work to John of Damascus. — In the *third period* we embrace the entire Byzantine middle ages of the Greek Church. Thus far she had still held communion with the West; but now important circumstances arose, to confine her more decidedly to herself. The resolutions of the *Concilium Quini-*

extum, 692, arose from a desire for ecclesiastical independence. In the image controversies (726-842) the strong inclination of the Greeks to religious symbols, and the power of the monks with their half sensuous and superstitious, and half supersensuous devotion, manifested itself. The West, more calm and sober, although it did not agree with the enemies of images, could not approve of the enthusiasm of their friends. The West was still less affected by the wars against the Paulician and Bogomil heretics. When Chosroes II. attacked the Eastern empire; when the Muslims had conquered Syria, and the Arabians the Persian empire, Egypt and N. Africa; the Byzantine dominions were robbed of several provinces, and the patriarchates of Alexandria, Antioch and Jerusalem were temporarily suspended; all these losses also threatened more directly Eastern Christendom only. The Greek Church had its own peculiar history, dangers, cares and struggles; nor did the arbitrary and despotic interference of the Emperors in its domestic government make it more inclined to draw closer to the West. This is *one* reason of the increasing alienation: *another* one is the growing centralization of the Western Church under Roman supremacy. The occasions of the actual rupture, which Roman authors, as *Maimbourg*, have very unjustly called an *apostasy* of the Greeks from Rome, are well known. *Photius* (see Art.) succumbed, it is true, in the patriarchal controversy of the 9th century; but he betrayed for the first time a specific anti-Roman spirit and zeal, and referred to controversies as yet unappealed to. The same violent zeal led, under *Gerularius* (see Art.) to mutual anathemas: on his side were the three other patriarchates. It was soon an essential part of Greek orthodoxy to condemn certain points of the Latin doctrines and ritual, and to confirm at the same time the principle of Chalcedon, that the patriarchs of Rome and Constantinople were equal in rank and dignity.—To explain and decide upon the quarrel, at least in its main features, is no longer difficult. It was not chiefly of a political kind, for the Emperors often wished to avoid it, and remove it: nor was it purely doctrinal. The disputes concerning the word *filioque* touched, indeed, an essential doctrine: but whatever weight was attached to it by Synods and wild controversial writers, neither it, nor other partly very trivial liturgical and disciplinarian divergences, would have formed an irreconcilable difference. But these single divergences rested upon a difference in spirit and history, which had grown up gradually and been confirmed by centuries. The two ecclesiastical roads were divergent; and even grand movements like the crusades, all absorbing in force and of universal Christian interest, could not reunite them, but brought the inward hostility into clearer light. Their past gave to the Greeks a most enacious feeling of their superiority, and the proudest consciousness of the antiquity, genuineness and dignity of their Church. Possessing the older hierarchical organization and ritual, as also some minor doctrinal points, they resisted the advance of the more recent monarchical principle of the West, and regarded the peculi-

arities of the Latin Church as unapostolical innovations. The *papacy is the wall of separation*: this and its measures the Greek Church resisted, and would not become subordinate to it.—Amid the inert stability of the Byzantine Church, we can merely point out the threads, which for centuries guided its existence so strangely uniform, self-sufficient and opposed to foreign influence. In 1204 the Latins expelled the hereditary Emperors from Byzantium to Nicæa, and called into existence several small Greek sovereignties at Trapezus, Rhodes, and Epirus. The Greek worship was suppressed by the Roman prelates and bishops with brute violence, and Constantinople had to accept a Latin patriarch. Almost against his will Innocent III. became the head of both churches—a forced union and productive of the worst fruits. The Emperors, even the better ones, seldom served the Church in the right way; many, by their hyperchurchly zeal, favoritism and partisanship, only injured it (see Art. *Constantinople*). The Church enlarged its territory by the final acquisition of Bulgaria, the contemporary conversion of the Mainottes, the acquisition of S. Slavonians in Bohemia and Moravia, which in the 10th cent., however, went over to the Roman Church, and the founding of the Russian Church under Wladimir the Great (980); but it lost by the conquests of the Latins and Turks. The Slavonian element coalesced in some regions with the Greek. Among cities, Constantinople continued the most important ecclesiastical seat. Thessalonica, Trapezus and Chonæ also deserve distinction; Athens in a less degree, since it had suffered fearfully in the M. A., first from the Slavonians, and afterwards (1205) from the Latin conquest, which destroyed for a long time all civil and ecclesiastical freedom.—If we look at the literature and science of the Church, we see generally that the traditional tenacity of Byzantinism enabled it to retain, at least outwardly, its inheritance; but also that the Byzantians had neither the desire nor power to *learn new things*, and were therefore left behind by the more acquisitive West. If the Emperors or other circumstances were favorable, there would at times be a faint rise in spiritual culture; never a high degree of it. When in the 9th and 10th centuries all higher culture in the West lay prostrate, science was still fostered among the Greeks. The Comneni intended well. A better state existed to the end of the 12th century; but after the restoration of the empire the moral and mental degeneracy was all the more fearful, and only the Arsenian schism (1266-1312) and the Hesychast controversy (1341-50) could produce any kind of life. Of particular productions, the following are worthy of mention: 1. The exegetical labors of the Byzantians, such as the Comm. of Oecumenius, Theophylact, and Euthymius Zigabenus. They are important; for philological knowledge and aptness, fostered by the study of the Old Greek literature, had maintained among them an exegetical tact, which had long before vanished among the Latin scholastics. 2. The collectanea of *Photius* with his scholiasts *Balsamon* and *Zonaras*, of the somewhat later *Suidas* and *S. Metaphrastes*, embraced sacred

and profane history, literature, canon law, and antiquities; their fruits have become indispensable to modern literature. 3. The collecting and amassing of materials present are the chief importance of the doctrinal polemical works of *Euthymius* and *Nicetas Choniates*. They use the method of *J. Damascenus* in a deteriorated way, but complete the polemical apparatus by controverting new heresies. The mysteries of the Trinity and the incarnation, together with the synergistic doctrines of freedom and sin, were still the favorite themes of Greek theologians. They became more skilful and zealous when, though not without many historical inaccuracies, they controverted Islam as monolatry and fatalism. Christian apologetics thus received a new impulse and employed many, even imperial pens (see *Gass*, *Gennadius* and *Pletho*, I., p. 106). 4. More original than the above was, in the 12th cent., *Nicholas of Methone*, who in his refutation of *Proclus* displays a deep knowledge of Christian Platonism. *Michael Psellus*, the younger, was more of an Aristotelian and expounder of Aristotle. Indeed the Peripatetic logic had already been applied to theology by *J. Philoponus*, and partly by *J. Damascenus*. Perhaps, though it is as yet unproven, both philosophical tendencies existed contemporaneously; although for a time Aristotelianism must have prevailed in the schools, since Platonism in the 15th cent. asserted itself very strongly, as if after a long neglect. In the age of the Empress Anna we find the germs of a scholastic dialectics; and even of certain scholastic opposites, which may be compared to those of *realism* and *nominalism*: but these germs, as generally among the Greeks, were not developed to clearly apprehended and defined principles. 5. Greek mysticism had its chief source and food in the works of the pseudo *Dionysius* and the explanations of *Pachymeres* and *Maximus*, the monk. The Byzantines also retained a mystical vein, which attached itself to their taste for art, for symbolism and typical combinations; but was never in opposition to their forms of doctrine. Related to this mysticism are the expositions of the liturgy. In these the communication of the divine to the Church through the cultus and the sacrament seems to be half materialized and made sensuous, and half idealized. What *Cyril* had commenced in his mystagogic catecheses, found an artistic development in the liturgical works of *Maximus*, *Sophronius*, and *Simon of Thessalonica*; and the mystical view of transubstantiation prevalent among the Byzantines strengthened this tendency. Not only the mysterious act itself, but also its entire ceremonial, the utensils and furniture of the Church, the sacerdotal robes, the altar and temple around it, became objects of interpretation, leading them at one time into sublime speculation, at another into vague transcendental mysticism. We cannot deny to these liturgical phantasies a high degree of that meditative depth peculiar to Greeks; but they set aside too much the practical common sense and moral nerve; nor, since they directed the mind so constantly to the miraculous in forms and effects, must we be surprised to find the devotions of the people to

be a stupid, passive amazement. This inclination to mysticism encouraged monasticism also; which played no unimportant part in the separate civil-ecclesiastical embroilments; but it never occupied a position sufficiently noble and imposing, to exert a moral influence upon either high or low. 6. The Byzantine literature is also rich in rhetorical works, eulogies, funeral discourses, monodies, etc., often very adulatory. They are the special models of the current style; thus also the letters, of which we have a large number, both printed and unprinted. As the Byzant. historians move slowly along in cumbrous periods, so this rhetoric presents a strange mixture of redundancy, pomp, choice imagery and polish. But a noble disposition and true piety have also manifested themselves in it. We mention the excellent *Eustathius of Thessalonica*, *Michael Acunatos of Chona*, and the Archb. of Athens, brother of *Nicetas* the historian. 7. We must yet notice the fact, that the ecclesiastical authorship of that time did not confine itself to its special theological field, but also exercised itself upon history and philology, which is one of its peculiar characteristics. Historians, like *Anna Comnena* and *Nicephorus Gregoras*, make lengthy doctrinal digressions; whilst bishops and theologians prosecute tedious classical studies. Even pulpit oratory often shows a recollection of ancestral fame and an afflatus of old Greek inspiration: and although orthodoxy was the most indispensable requisite of laity and clergy, yet with these labors amid the ancient classics a very unchurchly mind was often found connected.

The relations to the Roman Church continued generally hostile. At the same time the decline of the empire under the Palæologi, the fall of the christian sovereignty in Palestine, and the growing danger from the Turks, repeatedly urged a nearer union with the West. The theologians, however, continued to reproach the Latins with a host of abuses, as the use of unleavened bread, eating things strangled, fasting on Saturday, single immersion in baptism, priestly celibacy and sharing of the bread, the incorrect mode of making the sign of the cross, confirmation by bishops only, the engaging of the clergy in wars, the excessive elevation of the papal power, and, besides many other things, the *filioque*. Party rancor seemed to become more bitter, as the points of difference were less important. Some, as *Theophylact* and *Peter of Antioch*, were more reasonable, and reduced the controversy to a few main points. We may readily expect, then, that a union party favorable to the Latins and the imperial negotiations always existed. *Nich. Blemmidas*, *J. Bekkus*, *Man. Kalkas*, and *Demetr. Cydonius* are memorable as latinizing teachers, and *Marcus Egenicus*, Archb. of Ephesus, as orthodox. To understand the conflict of these tendencies, we must remember that the Greeks, notwithstanding their disdainful aloofness, could not entirely resist Latin influence. Thus in literature we possess Greek translations of passages from *Augustine*, *Th. Aquinas*, and *Anselm*. *Demetr. Cydonius*, a skilful writer of the 14th cent., furnished several such translations. An acquaintance with certain Latin scholastic doc

rial forms, as Anselm's theory of redemption, & betrayed even among members of the anti-Roman party. Perhaps the similarity in the sacramental doctrine also belongs to this connection. For how happened it, that after J. Damascenus and others after him taught variously two, three, and six sacraments, the number seven at last prevailed even among the opponents of Rome? Did the Greek system lead to this conclusion, or was it the general influence of the Latin doctrines? However this may be, what has thus been said explains in a general way both the protracted and often resumed negotiations for union, and the fate of the synods of Lyons (1274), and Florence (1439), and the later efforts of Gregory XIII. and Clement II. — A fourth period we date from the fall of Constantinople to the founding of the modern Greek Church, during which the latter was forced from its isolation into a certain degree of contact and commerce with the West. Fear of the conquerors drove many humanists, such as *Chalcondylas*, *Chrysoloras*, *Pletho*, *M. Apostolius*, *Theodore Gaza*, and *George of Trapezus*, to Italy. The knowledge and culture which they brought with them, were to flourish in their new home, and produce important fruits for the future. *Pletho* published an unchurchly but religiously inspired Platonism; the controversy between him and *Gennadius Scholarius*, and other adherents of Aristotle, was carried on on both sides with excess of passion; it is like a reaction of the ancient Hellenist and also universal-religious consciousness, and can be understood as such. *Bessarion* took a conciliatory position between the Aristotelians and Platonists, as also between the two churches. If the Greeks had produced the revival of letters in the West, and thus opened the way for the spiritual revolution of the following age; it became a question of interest what position the Greek Church would take with regard to the reformation. The eyes of the reformers turned anxiously in this direction; for they saw in Greek Christendom a great organization furnished with the marks of an apostolical age, and yet independent of Roman supremacy; a palpable evidence that to be a church no papal guardianship was needed. The Protestants turned back to the original of the New Test., and also held the Greek Church Fathers in high estimation. Luther's *Smaller Catechism* and the *Augsb. Confession* were translated into Greek; D. Chytræus and M. Crusius gave special attention to the affairs of the Greek Church. In one chief and several minor points the Evan. Church felt its oneness with the Greek; ought they not to enter into a closer union? Several efforts were made to this end, but in vain. Neither the negotiations of the Tübingen Lutherans with Patriarch *Jeremias* (ab. 1575), nor the Calvinizing patriarch, *Cyrillus Lucaris*, accomplished anything. No mere doctrine, but a practical principle decided the question: for when the patriarch named insisted upon the seven sacraments, the necessity of good works, monasticism and an energetic doctrine of freedom, he showed himself nearer to the Rom. Cath. doctrines than to the Protestant. In the 17th cent. also the intercourse was merely casual and through individuals.

Rome, on the other hand, succeeded in stirring up partisan feelings in its favor, and also in gaining some leading minds from the Greek Church. Distinguished among these was the celebrated scholar and librarian of the Vatican, *Leo Allatius* (ab. 1650); who, though highly meritorious as an author, was a bad unionist, since he Romanized his church and spent infinite labor in trying to show an agreement between the two forms of Catholicism, which did not exist in reality. In 1566 a college was established at Rome for Greek teachers; many Greeks studied at Padua; and Jesuits, as *Passevin*, made efforts to gather union circles in various sections, and to proselyte the Oriental sects, such as the Maronites.—Except these individual movements, however, the Greek Church, even during this period which shook every thing, continued in its old position. She discarded the *Reformation*, and consequently, to guard herself against former foreign influences, she had to resort to a *restoration*. Here begins the fifth period, that of the modern Greek, Oriental, or *Anatolian Church*. Constantinople was too powerless at the time to give an impulse to the movement, and its patriarch could only accede to the confession (*Ορθόδοξος ὁμολογία* &c.), published, 1643, by Peter Mogilas, metropolitan of Kiew, and approved of by the patriarchs of Alexandria, Antioch, Jerusalem, and Moscow. Besides this, a more extensive symbolical apparatus grew up from the confession of *Gennadius* against Islam (1453), the declarations of the Synod of Jerusalem (1672), the confessions of *Metrophanes*, *Critopulus*, *Cyril*, *Lucaris*, *Dositheus*, the acts of the Wurtemberg negotiation, and some other documents. A symbolism might easily be constructed from these documents, if it should have reference merely to the most common doctrinal materials; but it would be very difficult if it should consult the more remote and ancient literature, and enter upon complicated liturgical, practical, and sacramental questions. These confessions are simple in doctrine and artless in style. They are decisive wherever they rest upon the old symbols; but in anthropology and soteriology, as opposed to the Protestant doctrines, they become vague and undetermined, and could have been satisfactory only with a living theology to accompany them. The Church does not surmount the catechetical position, since it merely details the requirements and elements of Christian life, without uniting them in a deeper principial union. *Faith* comes first; a participation in the divine is effected through an orthodox confession and the sacraments. Then, under the name of *love*, follow good works, as the second indispensable factor: the link between the two is *hope*, to which is joined the exposition of prayer and the beatitudes. Tradition is co-ordinate to the Scriptures; of the councils of the ancient Church, the eighth (879–80) also is regarded as oecumenical, and several Greek Synods are regarded as authoritative.—We will now endeavor to give a general description of the modern Greek Church, as it has maintained itself with tolerable uniformity on the basis of the above named resolutions and confessions. In all its parts it shows a most intimate unity; and yet

we can trace the part performed by different ages in its development, and distinguish between the ancient Church and later Byzantine additions, as also changes of later centuries. Its constitution was from an early age aristocratic and representative; hence it was possible to establish a permanent Synod co-ordinate to the patriarch, which took place first at Constantinople under Turkish supremacy. The inferior clergy was graded downward to the hypodiaconus, lector, cantor, and liturgist. They were obliged to marry, but only once; since a prejudice rested upon a second marriage, and a fourth one was forbidden even to the laity. The higher clergy enjoyed greater consideration, especially whilst they were yet in part administrators of civil justice. They were mostly taken from the monasteries; and monasticism, partly regular and partly a free eremitism, was, and is even now, yet viewed by the people as the highest and almost supernatural form of piety. Besides the clergy there were other officers to administer the secular affairs of the Church. We possess several catalogues of these semi-clerical officials. *Codinus Curopalata, de offic. eccl.* (*Codini Excerpta de antiq. Const. Venet.*, 1729) enumerates no less than 45 of such officials; other catalogues mention fewer. Leo Allatius (see *Codin.*, 1 c. p. 8) evidently has in view the later period of the 16–17th century. According to his statements the lower and higher officers are divided into two groups; the choir to the right, and that to the left. The right and superior choir is divided into three orders of five persons each. Its members, whose duties, however, are uncertain, are: 1, ὁ μέγας αἰκόνομος, supreme warden of Church property, deacon at mass, and assessor of the ecclesiastical court; 2, ὁ μέγας σακελλάριος, chief director of monasteries; 3, ὁ σκευοφύλαξ, warden of the sacristy, the implements and vessels of the Church; 4, ὁ χαρτοφύλαξ, chancellor, warden of the legal documents of the Church, judge in matrimonial affairs; but also with the Bishop the highest tribunal in clerical trials, and keeper of the protocols; 5, ὁ τοῦ σακελλίου, inspector of nunneries; 6, ὁ πρωτονοτάριος, framer of missives, contracts and arrangements; 7, ὁ λογαδίτης, accountant, keeper of the seal and member of the court of justice; 8, ὁ πανστρίσιος, bearer of the censor and incense; 9, ὁ ῥεφερενδάριος, clerical charge d'affaires, who received messages to the superior, etc.; 10, ὁ υπομνημογράφων, clerk and keeper of minutes; 11, πρωτεύδικος, president of a tribunal for minor cases, intrusted also with the care of prisoners; 12, ὁ ιερομνήμων, receiver of petitions, keeper of the Church record, representative of the Bishop at Church dedications and in other affairs; 13, ὁ ἐπὶ τῶν γονάτων, who tied the Bishop's girdle cloth and assisted at mass; 14, ὁ ὑπομνήσμων, receiver of petitions and messages to the court; 15, ὁ διδάσκαλος, expounder of the gospel at mass. Thus far the catalogues agree very nearly; although with the last two, *Codinus* mentions ὁ ἐπὶ τῶν σεπρέτων, a secretary and superior in judicial transactions; and ὁ ἐπὶ τῆς ἱερᾶς καταστάσεως, an officer for the maintenance of order in Church. In the following series there are great divergencies, which, however, we cannot state. According to

Leo Allatius the left choir was as follows: ὁ πρωτοπαπᾶς, first ministrant at mass; ὁ δευτερεύων, second ministrant; ὁ ἄρχων τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν, superior of the Church; ὁ ἐξαρχος, Church visitor; ὁ κατηχητής, teacher who prepared proselytes from other sects for baptism; ὁ περιοδεύτης, travelling priest; ὁ βορτιστής, assistant at baptism; αἱ δύο ἐκδικος, attorneys of the Church; αἱ δύο δομειστικοί, leaders in singing; αἱ δύο λαοσυγκληταί, who called the deacons and the congregation together, and assisted in singing; αἱ δύο πριμμήριοι, properly superiors, here in singing and the lesson; ὁ πρωτοψάλτης; ὁ πρῶξιμος, master of the chapel; ὁ δεπότατος, who preceded the Bishop to open the way; θύριοι, guards of the Church; ὁ ἐπὶ τῆς εὐταξίας, a kind of master of ceremonies; ὁ καταγοριάρχης, sweeper; ὁ κομβοκλήτης, chamberlain; ὁ δεκανός, who paid the perquisites to the priests; αἱ λαμπαδάριοι, lamp cleaners; ὁ περιεισερχόμενος, who placed the candles on the altar; βασταγάριος, bearer of the images; μυροδότης, who was entrusted with the holy myron (see *Comm. in Codin.*, 1, c., p. 9, sqq.; *Du Fresne, Lexic. et Suiceri Thes.*). We need only to glance at this catalogue to see the circumstantiality and pedantry of the Greek organization. Most of these offices, however, have been discontinued in more recent times, or exist merely in name.—In the *cultus* many things show the highest antiquity, such as trine immersion in baptism; turning toward the East in prayer, the text of the forms and hymns. Bells are found but seldom; organs not at all; and it is remarkable that the ancient Greek prejudice against the use of musical instruments in worship (*Pseudojust. Quæst. ad Orthod.*, 107) has continued so stubborn down to the present times. A Greek Church or chapel, with its single and stationary altar, its curtain and sacred door, the reading desks, the nave without seats, has much resemblance to a temple. The mystery also does not transpire before those present, but the curtain opens and closes significantly. The position of the congregation, too, is peculiar; it is separated according to sexes, and stands; the liturgical recitations and Bible lessons are interrupted only by the singing of the choir. This latter varies from a very low to a higher degree of excellency. Paintings and Mosaics have their place according to fixed rules. Preaching is even less prominent than in the Rom. Cath. Church. The ceremonial is elaborately complete, especially the mass service according to the order of Basil and Chrysostom. The manner in which the priest cuts off with the lance a piece of the *leavened* bread, the position of his fingers in pronouncing the blessing, the manner of making the sign of the cross, elevating the candles, and swinging the censor, are all accurately prescribed. The Greek cultus, though in some things almost the same with the Roman, deviates widely in other things: for among the Greeks the elements are borne about without a special elevation and veneration of the host; it is not consecrated in the presence of the people; the Lord's Supper is administered in both kinds, and what remains of the consecrated bread is distributed. We have not the space to describe the consecration of the altar and the holy water, which, however,

is not put into basins in the Church, the anointing in baptism, extreme unction, which is applied to the sick in general, the processions and feet washing. In general the Greek service is kindred to the Roman, and is no less productive of superstition and Jewish legalism. The Greeks, indeed, have no masses for the departed in the Rom. sense, and no purgatory: but image and relic worship, liturgical pomp and strict fasts mislead them to a like, perhaps even a higher degree of religious formalism, and the reproach of Judaism made against the Latins rebounds against themselves. That they did not hurl anathemas and excommunications so liberally, may result from the fact that there was no Pope to wield these weapons. — So much in general. We are here met by *three forms* or branches of the Greek Church: 1, that in *Turkey*; 2, in *Russia*; 3, in liberated Greece. These may also be distinguished as: 1, the Greek Church in its greatest isolation and traditional uniformity; 2, its close connection with the State and the Slavonic nationality; 3, the renewal of a national Church life. — 1. After the capture of Constantinople the Osman dominion extended after various fluctuations over Greece, Trapezus, Epirus, the Danubian countries, the Greek isles, Syria, Palestine, and Egypt, and hence included Greek, Slavonian, Armenian, Jewish, and mixed nationalities. The Turkish sovereignty displayed in the course of centuries all the attributes of an Asiatic despotism and the horrors of tyranny. But they never, at least where they were in secure possession, exercised tyranny over conscience. The Christians generally, though for heavy sacrifices, enjoyed religious liberty. From the first the higher clerical offices depended on bribes and the will of the sovereign. The better churches were seized by the conquerors; the rest became impoverished, and were suffered neither to be enlarged nor restored. The conquered nations were exhausted by numerous tributes: their character also degenerated, since the Greeks had to limit their labors to monetary and commercial interests. Science and education declined, or were fostered at most in a few cloisters. If any moral one still survived, it was due partly to the Church and the administration of justice by the clergy, and partly to the congregational administration still in the hands of the people. The practice of religion was not disturbed, and to the higher clergy the Turks did not refuse all respect. The Greeks accommodated themselves to their proud lords, and even invoked their aid at times against the Romish emissaries. The aid of the West against Turkish oppression was but seldom sought; as happened in 1734, when the archimandrite, *Dorostamus*, visited Germany to solicit contributions for the ransom of Christian captives taken in the conquest of Morea (see *Elssner*, *Neueste Beschreib. der gr. Chr.*: Berl., 1737). Surrounded by a hostile population, the Greeks still retain their ancient hatred of Romanists and their writings, and their isolation from Protestants; and they still occupy the hard, unyielding soil of their orthodoxy. Of late, however, they show some longings for deliverance, to come from the West through the agency of the “Franks.” But few of them have

apostatized to Islamism. The well known *Hattischerif of Gülhane* (1839), which made the Christians and Moslems equal at law, has vastly improved the condition of the Greeks, which has been still more alleviated by the present reigning Sultan. — The following statistics are given by *Klose*. The diocese of Constantinople (see Art.) embraces European Turkey, Asia M. and the islands; and contains above 80 metropolitan seats, whilst the Synod of Antioch contains only 18, and the Synod of Jerusalem only 8. The Patriarch of Alexandria has subordinate to him only the Bishop of Lybia. Prominent in Macedonia are the Archbishopric of Salonica and the monk republic of Athos (see Art.); in Thessaly, Larissa; in Bulgaria, Varna, Widdin, Silistria; in Bosnia, Belgrade. In Bulgaria, after numerous apostacies, Islam has become predominant; in Turkish Croatia, the Latin Church; in Herzegovina, Montenegro, and the isles of Candia and Cyprus, the Greek Church. The Greek Christians of Moldavia are subject to the Metropolitan of Jassy; those of Wallachia, to the Metropolitan of Bucharet. In all these countries there is no want of churches, priests and monks, nor of respect for them; but of cultivation, manners and education; Protestant efforts in this direction are regarded but little, Catholic ones are hated. The support of the clergy is very unequal, dependent at times on the mere perquisites. The monks are most respected. Popular piety is in some provinces mixed up with the wildest superstition: talismans and charms are used; the corpse of an excommunicated person is supposed never to decay. In Asia Minor the metropolitan seats of Smyrna, Ephesus, and Nicomedia are of some importance; here, however, the clergy and religion are sunken even more deeply, and the Armenian churches stand higher than the Greek. In other Asiatic countries the orthodox Church has had to yield to the Nestorians, Maronites, and Jacobites; in Syria it exists along with the united Church; in Jerusalem with the greatest mixture of religions. In all Egypt there are only about 8000 orthodox Greeks; in Arabia almost none at all. In Hungary, Galicia, Austria, Transylvania, and Dalmatia there are scattered *orthodox Greek* churches with strict forms of worship, but having little connection with the Church at large. In Hungary, where in the 17th century, already numerous Greek Christians from Moldavia and Wallachia had settled, their Church affairs were ordered at several Synods, especially at the Diet of 1791. The *united* Greeks, or those who have submitted to Roman supremacy, have a few congregations in the Turkish dominions; more numerous ones in Hungary, Transylvania, Italy, and Austria. They have their own Bishops, liturgy, and discipline; but have accepted the Roman doctrines of the Trinity and purgatory. — 2. In no country was the Turkish sovereignty more oppressive than in *Greece* itself; where, in servile dependence, a new Greek people with a new language gradually arose. This state of things continued through the last century, though love of liberty had never perished altogether. For thirty years the Greeks endured the tyranny of *Ali Pasha of Janini*, 1786–1821; and the revolts

of the Suliotes terminated in the slaughter of thousands. The Bishops had long already fostered the national spirit; religion sanctified the war of liberation; and the bloody tyranny of the Turks against the clergy, the execution of the patriarchs and many Bishops, inflamed the enthusiasm of the oppressed. After Greece had become independent (1827) and the new kingdom established (1833), the question arose whether the Church also should take part in the revolution. After the revolt the connection with the œcumenical patriarch had become looser; the tributes were withheld, and the priests sent to Greece were refused. Count *Capodistrias* approved of the separation, and appointed a commission which temporarily organized the Church. At the instance of 36 metropolitans, assembled at Nauplia, the regency declared, July 23, 1833, the "orthodox Oriental Church of Greece" *independent of every foreign authority*; that Christ was their only head; that she was capable of self-government; but that this separation from the patriarchate should not affect the common doctrine. The same act established a *permanent Synod* as the supreme authority of the Church, which was to act independently in all purely inward affairs of the Church; but with governmental and royal supervision and co-operation in all external and mixed affairs. The Synod consisted of five clerical members, appointed *annually* by the King, and two royal officers. The result was that the hitherto clerical part of jurisdiction became secularized. The monasteries were also reduced from 400 to 82, and the nunneries abolished except three; the means thus obtained were applied to Church and school purposes. The first president of the Synod was Cyril, Metropolitan of Corinth. Corresponding with the political division, the country was divided into ten Sees, and the chief city of each See became an episcopal seat. To gratify aspirants, some provisory bishoprics were also established. A theological faculty and seminary were instituted subsequently. This Church organization has been deprecated by Roman authors as a poor imitation of the Russian, and the permanent Synod as a feeble counterpart of the Protestant consistory. It is true, the framers of it had reference to Russia; and the composition of the Synod of members chosen *annually* by the King was certainly a mistaken and highly restrictive measure. But this disadvantage was counterbalanced by the exodus from Byzantine thralldom, and it could be expected that a Greek national Church would not shut itself up like the Russian against Western cultivation and religion. Since 1843-44 the Church has become more independent of the State. It was natural that a State-church government, administered so one-sidedly, should not please all. Public opinion, so far as there was any, fluctuated; and a hierarchic party made efforts, in 1839, to reunite with Constantinople. Nor did the patriarch of this city acknowledge the ecclesiastical independence of the new State until 1850. But the religious mind which was just springing up was subjected to various influences. On national ground arose, in 1837, the University of Athens and an improved school system;

whilst Protestantism, even from America, sought access through translations of the Bible and missions. The Rom. C. also continued its efforts; but, as Pius IX. showed, with the smallest results. The Archbishop of Attica, in 1836, excommunicated all parents who sent their children to English or American mission schools. Strict science and literature, but thinly represented at the end of the last century by men of classical education, received now a new impulse from the questions of the day. What has become known of the controversial writings of *Germanos, Oiconomos, Pharmakides, Bembas*, and some journals, betrays in part an exceedingly narrow, traditional spirit and zeal. *Oiconomos* deprecates the study of the Hebrew Bible, asserts that the Septuagint is the only authoritative version, and that the modern Greek versions are useless and delusive. Mixed marriages are warned against, and a return to the supremacy of Constantinople recommended as the means to ecclesiastical freedom. But there are also evangelical sympathies and a party of progress. Good results have flowed from exegetical and patristic publications, and the study of the ancient canons. Among devotional works we find a translation of Baxter's "Saints' Rest." — 3. The Russian Church is generally regarded as a younger daughter of the Byzantine, and similar to it in spirit and character. But however undoubted the kindred, we must not overlook the differences between them. In doctrine, cultus, and organization the Russian Church was always receptive with reference to the Greek, and obtained from it the principle of an immobile uniformity. But it did not carry forward everything received with the same zeal; for it became less theoretical than practical, popular, and productive of a piety which corresponded to the national mind. Like the Byzantine Church it readily attaches itself to the secular government, and encourages religious and civil submission. But whilst the former suffers from a feeble and ineffectual oscillation between the hierarchic and political powers, the latter presents decidedly and strongly marked conditions at first of hierarchic independence and afterwards of organic submission to the secular ruler. The Russian Christians suffered also from the Tartars as the Greeks from the Turks; but they threw off earlier and more completely this foreign barbarism and tyranny. — Russian Church historians trace back the origin of their Church to a pretended journey of the Apostle Andrew to Cherson and the Dnieper (A. D. 33). But it cannot have been earlier than the 9th cent., when, according to doubtful accounts, the Russians attacked the Bosphorus under Photius, and soon afterwards became acquainted with the Gospel. Under Oleg and Igor small bands of Christians are said to have existed; in 955 Olga was baptized at Constantinople. Vladimir's government was decisive, for he destroyed the heathen cultus, and by his marriage with Anna, sister of the Emperor Basilus, confirmed the ecclesiastical bond. After Kiew, in 1051, had become the supreme national bishopric, the patriarch exercised his supremacy in appointing the metropolitans, sometimes with the oppo-

tion of the sovereign. In the following age the Church was in an active development. *Kiew, Nowgorod* and *Rostow* became ecclesiastical centres; and monasteries, especially the one at *Kiew*, were flourishing. Civil justice was administered by the Bishops according to the Greek Monocanon. The ecclesiastical relation with Constantinople is at times interrupted by the sovereigns, or by a leaning towards Rome: nevertheless Innocent IV. tried in vain, about 1246, to bring Alex. Newsky over to the Roman communion. Whilst the Greek cultus spread through Lithuania and Poland, but in the latter was opposed by the Roman, it suffered from the violence of the Tartars. The authority of the clergy and monks was steadily increasing; they were even respected by the Tartars and secured by laws. Some of the higher clergy even settled the quarrels of princes, laid penances upon them, and thus prepared them as heroes or patient sufferers to enter the growing list of saints. The monasteries were houses of refuge even to the great, or the gates to a blessed death.—A second period dates from the end of the 16th century. The Roman Church having after the fall of Constantinople become more independent, and the Metropolitan of *Kiew* having crowned Iwan Wassiljewitsch, Jeremiah I. resolved to grant them a native patriarchate. With the consent of Alexandria and Jerusalem, Job, the metropolitan, became the first Russian Patriarch, the fifth in rank. Subsequently the right of electing their patriarch was also conceded to the Roman clergy. In this way Russia had become an independent province of Greek Christendom, and now made rapid advances. In the 17th century its domestic organization became complete. It resisted the efforts of Rome and the Jesuits, who, in Little Russia only, succeeded in establishing a United Roman majority. In 1643 it adopted, from *Peter Magilas*, its own fundamental creed, sanctioned by the orthodox Greeks and Orientals. The institution of Greek and Latin schools, the purification of church music and the cultus, the improvement of sacred literature, and important synods, elevated the people to a higher stage of intelligence. In the life of Patr. *Nikon*, of Nowgorod, all the tendencies and labors of his age are found united.—Thus far the Church had reigned in Russia alongside of the divided but afterwards united and growing, sovereign power. But when through Peter the Great Russia became a Grand Power, the Church also had to give up a part of its independence and hierarchical power.—This brings us to a third period, that of its *independence of the secular head*. In 1702 Peter left the patriarchate vacant, and entrusted its administration temporarily to an exarchate of Riasan with very limited powers. After 1701 he made many changes, diminished the jurisdiction of the clergy, made laws for the monasteries, determined the number of priests, and other clergy for each cathedral; and, in 1721, placed the general administration in the hands of a permanent "*holy Synod*." With this thorough measure even the Patr. of Constantinople had to comply, and in 1723 he gave to the Synod the title of patriarchal. It consisted of 12 members,

was connected with the crown through a procurator, its supreme head was the Emperor himself, its seat at first Moscow, but afterwards St. Petersburg. To the monarch belonged the administration of Church estates, and the appointment of the Bishops from two candidates presented. He could not, however, decide theological questions. Thus originated a State-churchdom, such as modern Christendom knows no second one; a Cæsaropapism, which is alleviated only by the fact that the nation endures it willingly and has adopted it into its national and religious consciousness. In consequence of it the Emperor must be a member of the Church and orthodox; political dangers are often regarded as also ecclesiastical ones, and other denominations are regarded and treated upon political and police principles. The principles of Peter passed over to Catharine II., but were applied in a more noble way by succeeding Emperors. The State enriched itself from the property of the monasteries, and lessened the revenues of the clergy; but increased the number of schools and seminaries, provided for the spread of Christianity in Siberia, and gave security to the scattered Greek churches beyond the empire. The liberty of conscience which Peter had given to Lutherans and Catholics, was restricted by political interests. Conquests also left their influence upon the Church. The Roman United Christians of the Polish provinces submitted to an absorption with the established Church; and the churches of Lithuania and White Russia were brought back by their clergy to the orthodox Synod, to which they had belonged up to the end of the 16th century.—The inward development of the Russian Church presents to us a remarkable sect system. Heresies, properly speaking, could not arise in a Church without theological spirit or religious mobility. Liturgical affairs, however, and questions of Church polity gave rise, in the middle ages, already to wild and incurable discord. In 1375 Karp Strigolnik at Nowgorod protested against the manner of confessing to the priest and against payment for ordination. Among the malcontents he found a party, called *Strigolniks*, which long continued in spite of persecution and the removal of their grievances. Another so-called Jewish sect led to a kind of Mosaism, and set aside the entire Church creed. The origin of the *Raskolniks* is connected with the improvement of the Church books. The Russians at a very early date had their biblical and mass books in the Slavonic language, but in the most imperfect form. Their gradual improvement required centuries. Great efforts were made at the time when Russia became politically one, to remove these literary corruptions and to introduce learning: the greatest and most effectual of which were made by Patr. *Nikon* and the council of 1654. This aroused prejudices, which saw in the progress of learning nothing but innovation. They combined in the sect of the *Raskolniks* (apostates), or *Staroverzes* (adherents of the old creed) as they called themselves, a multiform fanatical and antihierarchical spirit. Some of them rejected the entire priesthood, and differed from the Church on ritual and liturgical trifles. Bloody

scenes, executions, persecution, flight, offers of peace by the Emperors, but nowhere doctrinal discussions, characterize the history of these as also of other sometimes wildly mystical sects, such as the *Duchoborzes*, *Pomoranes*, and *Kapitonians*.—The creed and learning of the Russian Church have not been able in modern times to resist effectually all modern influence. The Emperor Alexander, zealous in behalf of civilization, granted in 1813 the institution of a Bible Society at St. Petersburg; which, however, was abolished again in 1826, after it had printed and widely circulated Russian Bibles. Learning made rapid progress at the academies of Moscow and St. Petersburg. Scholastic subtilities had formerly flourished at Kiew: more liberal studies, extending even to German theology, were now prosecuted at Moscow and St. Petersburg. The representatives of Romanizing tendencies, such as *Steph. Jaworski*, a pupil of the Jesuits, are very few. At the end of the last cent., *Platon*, Archb. and Prof. at the Acad. of St. Petersburg, became by his writings and instruction the leader of a milder tendency, less opposed to Protestant views. *Philaret*, Metrop. of Moscow, represented the same tendency. The pupils of these men attentively followed Germ. Protestant literature. *A. v. Stourdza*, although strongly opposed to Rome, did not manifest the former rigor against other doctrinal and confessional differences. But these quiet movements have thus far been without practical results. Neither the religious mind of the nation, nor the spirit of the hierarchy, allows a general approximation to what is foreign. The encyclical letter of Pius IX. (1848) to the entire Greek clergy, inviting to a reunion with Rome, met in Russia also the former opposition. The Protestant citizens of the empire enjoy the promised toleration, but are subject to the strictest surveillance, to tricks and annoyances of proselyters.—A few remarks yet on the present condition of the Russian Church. The entire empire is divided into 52 eparchies, and has 24 such episcopal sees with which the archiepiscopal dignity can be connected. Kiew, St. Petersburg, Nowgorod, Kasan, and Tobolsk are metropolitan sees. The Synod of St. Petersburg has also chambers at Moscow and Tiflis. The lower, married clergy, formerly mostly coarse, illiterate and despised, have for some decades been rising in popular estimation; the higher clergy, especially the metropolitans, enjoy the highest public honors. Since generally only the sons of priests become priests, the lower clergy form a compact caste. Alexander exempted the clergy from corporal punishment. The monasteries do not stand in mediæval opposition to the world, but in lively intercourse with it. In 1842 there were 439 monasteries and 113 nunneries, most of which are found in Middle Russia. The schools for the education of the clergy are far more numerous than those for the laity; there are parochial and central schools, besides the theological academies of St. Petersburg, Moscow, Kiew, and Kasan. Every one, even the frivolous and unbelieving of the higher classes, is a member of the Church, and takes parts in its services; for the same bonds of religious patriotism and patriotic churchdom

unites all, and have undoubtedly been a source of moral power to the nation. When on Sunday the mass, without difference of rank, fills the Church, kisses the floor, bows to the priest, and after the service crowds to the chief image to kiss it; when at Easter the people suddenly pass from the earnest mortifications of the holy week to a tumultuous joy, in which high and low, lords and servants, embrace each other, and are thus elevated to the feeling of a universal, Christian, fraternal love; when also the celebration of the imperial birth-day bears the impress of strict religious submissions, we see here the Roman Church in all its peculiarity. Profound reverence, a strong feeling of dependence on the divine power, and eager efforts to gain it by works and saving ordinances, a proud consciousness that here alone the doctrines and form of Christianity have been preserved unchanged, are the leading traits of the prevailing piety, which is always tending, however, to servile devotion, legal sanctity, and superstition. This disposition is fostered by the view of numerous churches, chapels, and crosses; by the custom of frequently making the sign of the cross, and by daily intercourse with sacred images. Few know anything about doctrines. The impression made by the tripartite mass, with its pathetic pomp and monotone recitations in the old Slavonic language depends pretty much upon the appearance and bearing of the gorgeously robed and bearded priest. Cultus and churches differ but little from the Greek; only that pictures and music receive special attention. The preparation of pictures is an important branch of industry. The people regard them with awe, in so far as they bring before the eye the holy original, and are therefore no mere handiwork, but a product of a higher inspiration or secret tradition. Such supposed likenesses, mostly unhandsome and rigid physiognomies, are alone valued by adherents of the old. Impressions on paper are valued only when they bear the name of some noted miraculous picture. But there is also a growing party which desires that these pictures, which are indispensable both to public and private devotion, should be executed according to the rules of taste and art. The same difference is arising in liturgical singing. This latter was brought to Russia from Greece in the 11th cent., and was, therefore, according to the Greek system: but it gradually accommodated itself to the ear and taste of the people, and suffered changes also from the reforms of Nikon, without, however, entirely losing its old character. In this way arose the different styles of singing, such as that of Kiew, the old Greek, Bulgarian, and common Russian. According to these styles the singing is slow and prolonged, figurate and redundant, but always solemnly earnest even to the melancholic. In the style of the *Starowerzes* the prevalence of nasal sounds is offensive to European ears.—In conclusion, we cannot deny a future to a Church, which Providence has spared so wonderfully. May it be a future different from the last thousand years of its existence.—*Sources*, 1. General ones—LEO ALLATIUS, *De eccl. occid. et orient. perp. consens.*: Colon., 1648; *Ejusd.*

Græc. orthod., 1652; LE QUIEN, *Oriens Christ.*, 3 vols.: Par., 1740; DAV. CHYTRÆI, *Orat. de stat. ecclesias. hoc temp. in Gr.*, etc.: Rostoch., 1569; EL. VEJELII, *Exercit. de eccl. gr. hod. Argentor.*, 1666; M. HEINECCIUS, *Abbild. der alt. u. neu. gr. Kirche*: Lpg., 1711; J. FECHT, *Kurze Nachr. v. d. Relig. der heut. Griechen*: Rost., 1711; E. MIRUS, *Kurze Vorstell. der gr. Kirche*: Lpg., 1752; TH. SMITHI, *Epist. de gr. eccl. hod. statu*: Lond., 1678. — 2. *Gr. Church in Turkey*; M. CRUSII, *Turco-Græc., libri VIII.*: Bas., 1584; BICAUT, *Hist. de l'état prés. de l'égl. gr. et de l'égl. armén.*: Mittelb., 1692; DE LA CROIX, *Etat prés. des nations et des égl. gr., armén. et maron. en Turq.*: Par., 1695; J. ELSSNER, *Neuest. Besch. der gr. Christ. in d. Turk.*, etc.: Berl., 1737; GEIB, *Darstellg. d. Rechtszust. in Gr. and währ. der türk. Herrsch.*: Hdlb., 1835; A. BOUÉ, *La Turq. d'Eur.*, 4 vols.: Par., 1840; much information in RHEINWALDS u. BRUNS *Repert.*; KLOSE, *Die Christ. in d. Türkei*, in VIEDNER'S *Ztschr.*, 1850. — 3. *Modern Greek Church*: v. MAURER, *Das gr. Volk in öffentl. kirchl. u. priv. rechtl. Bezieh.*: Hdlb., 1835; I. J. SCHMITT, *Krit. Gesch. der neugr. u. d. russ. Kirche*: Mainz, 1840; J. WENGER, *Beitr. zur Kenntn. des gegenw. Geistes d. gr. K.*, etc.: Berl. 1839. — 4. *Russian Church*: KING, *The rites of the Greek Church in Russia*: Lond., 1722; PINKERTON, *Russia*: Lond., 1833; II. J. SCHMITT, *Die morgenl. gr. russ. K.*: Mainz, 1826; P. STRAHL, *Beitr. zur russ. K. G.*, Th. 1: Halle, 1827; the same, *Gesch. d. russ. K.*, Th. 2: Halle, 1830; H. WIMMER, *Die gr. K. in Russl.*: Dresd. u. Lpg., 1848; WIGGERS *kirchl. statist.*, Bd. 1, p. 212; KLOSE, *Russl. kirchl. statist.* in REUTER'S *Repert.*, 1850; HAXTHAUSEN, *Etude sur la situation . . . de la Russie*, Vol. II., p. 92. GASS. — *Reinecke*.

Supplementary Note.—The reading of the Bible was never prohibited in the Greek, as it was in the Rom. Church. Hence in the reign of Alexander a Russian Bible Society could be formed, to circulate the Bible in the Russian vernacular. The clergy, however, became alarmed, and Nicholas, in 1826, abolished the Society. The English agents of the Prot. Bible Society continued zealously the work of spreading Russ. Bibles, wherefore the government forbade them to issue a new edition of it. The agents now purchased the depositories on hand among the priests. In the Slavonic, or Russ. holy language, the Bible is still circulated in Russia. But as few people can understand this, and the popes sell even such Bibles only to those whose orthodoxy is above suspicion, the circulation of the Bible is but little advanced. The most extensive acquaintance with the Bible is found among the spiritualistic-mystical Duchoborzes. Nor was the reading of the Bible prohibited in the other sections of the Greek Church.

THE EDITOR. — *Reinecke*.

Greenland, an Arctic country of North America, belonging to Denmark, in form, as far as known, a peninsula, stretching south to 59° North lat., was the outermost colony of the Norwegian race. Towards the close of the 9th century, Guunbjorn, a Norwegian, discovered a group of islands between Iceland and Greenland, and called them Guunbjorn's shears, after

his own name; they were visited, about the middle of the 10th century, by a second Norwegian explorer, who was murdered while there by his own companions; at a later period Eric, the Red, having been outlawed in Iceland, undertook an expedition to the same islands, but instead of finding them, came to Greenland. In this way the country was discovered. Eric hastened back to Iceland, collected a number of colonists, and with them returned to Greenland (which euphonious name he gave to the country in order to entice new colonists to its shores), and began a permanent settlement in the year 985. He found no signs of inhabitants, except a few Esquimaux. Among his colonists were single Christians who lived unmolested in the midst of the heathens, but not without taking part in their religious and superstitious customs. It was not until King Olaf Trygvason (see Art.), the founder of Christianity in Norway, Iceland, the Orkney and Farø Islands, gave the impulse, that Christianity prevailed in Greenland; and even then it consisted only in the acceptance of baptism by the few colonists who were there. Eric's son, Leif by name, was the agent whom the king employed in this mission. Leif had become well disposed towards Christianity while on the Hebrides, where he fell in love with Torgunna, who was reputed to have a knowledge of sorcery, but, at the same time, to be a good Christian. In the year 999 he went from the Hebrides, or, according to another record, from Greenland, which country he had visited, to Norway in order to present himself to the King at Druntheim. The latter preached the gospel to all his heathen subjects who had come to meet him there; and was so successful, in the case of Leif, that the man was baptized together with his entire ship's company, and remained at court, for the winter, in high favor with the King. Afterwards he was sent by Olaf to Greenland, in order to proclaim Christianity there. Several ordained priests were commissioned to accompany him. When the King first spoke of the enterprise, Leif expressed his fears that it would not succeed; but the monarch declared that he knew of no man better qualified to carry it out than he, and that prosperity would attend him. In fact, it appears that Leif was the evangelist and preacher; the priests merely administering the sacraments. Arrived in Greenland, he was well received by all the colonists, and soon began to preach Christianity, making known the message of Olaf Trygvason, and setting forth the pomp and glory which would accompany the new faith. Eric, who had remained in Greenland, was baptized amongst others, but continued a half-heathen. His wife, Thjodhild, on the contrary, became a jealous Christian, and caused a church to be built near her house, where she and all those who had embraced Christianity, were accustomed to pray. Since that time Leif was called *the Happy*. But Christianity had by no means gained a complete victory over heathenism outwardly, much less inwardly. In the 11th century individual heathens continued to serve their gods openly and unopposed. Even in the case of baptized colonists, remnants of their former religion subsisted, side by side, with their new

faith; so that, according to circumstances, sometimes the one and sometimes the other was in the ascendancy. Hence the fact that messengers came from Greenland and the Orkney Islands, to Archbishop Adam of Hamburg (1043-1072), requesting him to send German missionaries to those shores, will excite no surprise; nor the circumstance that Adam of Bremen believed the Greenlanders to have been converted in his time. (*Adam, Br. III., c. 23; IV., 36, ad eos etiam sermo est nuper Christianitatem pervenisse*). In the year 1122 a separate Greenland bishopric was organized, whose See was near Gardar, on the east coast; subsequently it was transferred to the Archbishop of Drontheim. Seventeen Greenland Bishops are mentioned, up to 1408. For a long period the settlements flourished. There were, on the east coast, 190 farms and villages, constituting 12 parishes, and embracing the Episcopal See and two monasteries; on the west coast, the farms numbered between 90 and 110, and formed four parishes. After the union of Norway with Denmark, in the year 1387, intercourse with Greenland ceased; and this country begins to disappear from the page of history. Some suppose that the black death (1348-1350) raged on these distant coasts also; and that, in consequence, the northern savages, who had appeared among the Norwegians in the middle of the 14th century, and had had contentions with them, advanced more and more, and overwhelmed the remnant of the colonists. Others believe that owing to a vast accumulation of ice, all connection with the mother country was cut off, and the settlers deprived of the necessary support. The ruins of churches and other buildings found on the west coast indisputably prove the existence of former Christian settlements. Repeated attempts have been made by the Kings of Denmark to recolonize the country. The last expedition proceeded from Bergen in 1674.

Concerning the Protestant missions in Greenland, since the beginning of the 18th century, see the Articles *Egede* and *Missions, Protestant*. Comp. *Maurer, die Bekehrung des norwegischen Stammes zum Christenthume*, Vol. I.: Munich, 1855. *Münter, Kirchengeschichte von Dänemark und Norwegen*, 1823, Part I., p. 555. *Die Missionen der evangelischen Brüder in Grönland und Labrador*: Gnadau, 1831. [The Moravians in Greenland: Edinburgh, 1835; and especially *Crantz's History of Greenland and the Moravian Missions there*, translated from the German: London, 1767.]

HERZOG.—*De Schreinitz*.

Gregory I. — The Catholic Church calls him "the Great," and numbers him with Ambrose, Augustine, and Jerome as the "fourth *Doctor ecclesiæ*." He was born in Rome, c. 540, of a high and pious family. In his youth he gained the affections of his fellow-citizens as *Prætor urbanus*. But his own inclinations and the spirit of the age led him to enter a monastery. He sold all and founded seven cloisters, one of them, St. Andrew's, in Rome, for his own residence. This life he loved, and pursued it with so strict an ascetical course, that his health suffered. He wished to go as a missionary to the Anglo-Saxons (see Art.), but

Pelagius II. made him a deacon, and in 578 or 579, he sent him to Constantinople as an *Apo-risiarius* (see Art.), where Emperors became his friends, and Leander, Bishop of Hispalis (Sevilla), in Spain, induced him to write his *Moralia*. He succeeded in reconciling the Emperor to Pelagius II., who had been ordained as Pope without imperial consent, and also received promises of aid against the Lombards. In 585 or 586 he returned, and as Abbot of St. Andrews he gained credit by his strictness and by his diplomatic capacities. When Pelagius died in 590, the Senate, the clergy, and the people unanimously elected him as successor. Vainly he tried to escape from this office by sending a secret letter to the Emperor, requesting him to withhold his consent, and afterward even by flight. The letter was intercepted, his flight detected, and on Sept. 3d, 595, he was ordained.

As a Pope he proved himself very efficient. The Roman Church then was in a very critical position. Rome itself was a dependency of the Byzantine Emperors, who looked upon Church and clergy as political instruments, and failed to protect it against the Lombards, their political and ecclesiastical enemies. Protracted wars had nearly ruined the Church in Italy, the church edifices were plundered, the priests expelled, captive or demoralized, the congregations disorganized, and the morals of the people severely affected. The Roman Patriarchal See disturbed by the Istrian schism, the Donatists reviving in Africa, Gaul in confusion under Fredegunda and Brunhilda, Ireland and Great Britain, as far as they were Christianized, disconnected from Rome and overrun with heathen Anglo-Saxons. Spain only presented a hopeful appearance since the conversion of the West Goth king, Reccared, in 589. Indeed, these circumstances called for an extraordinary man, and such was Gregory.

The first sparks of his genius shone in his *Synodica*, the customary inaugural, where he explains the duties of a Bishop, and binds himself to the four Gospels, the four oecumenical Synods, and even to the anathemata of the fifth. Soon after he published earnest exhortations to the clergy in a book: *De cura pastoralis*, and illustrated them by his own conduct. He preached often and lived like a monk, he allowed no luxury and no lay-persons in his household, and spent all his income in benevolence. His efforts to stop the incursions of the Lombards, and to make peace with them, were not quite successful (cf. *Gfrörer, K.-G.*, II., 2, 1061-63; *Lau, Gregor. I.*, 59-67, 138-142), but he succeeded in repairing his churches, and especially in restoring discipline. He took care to have all vacant bishoprics filled with worthy men, and forbade their demanding any payment for consecrations, marriages, baptisms, etc. He refused all presents, and at the Roman Synod, in 595, he had even the customary present for the pallium abrogated. He tried to raise a pious clergy in the monasteries and exhorted them to conduct themselves in a becoming manner, to be diligent, affable, strict, benevolent; not to be absent from their parishes, to abstain from secular pursuits, and not to

submit to secular jurisdiction. He favored celibacy; but the subdeacons, upon whom this rule had been enjoined by Pelagius II., he freed from it, if they would give up their priestly character, retaining only the functions of a notary. He strengthened his authority in his own diocese, and in the metropolitan dioceses, subject to him by appointing stewards of the Roman patrimonies (*rectores patrim.*), Roman deacons and subdeacons, and official attorneys of the Roman possessions (*defensores*), whom he employed as the agents. In thus favoring hierarchical institutions he erred, but not from any ambitious motives. It was the spirit of the age, to pay less regard to personal piety than to the organic development of the Church.

He was a great friend to monastic institutions. He loved to build and to endow cloisters, and to watch over their purity. No youths under 18 years of age, no untried strangers, no husbands applying without their wives' permission, no secular officers without an honorable dismissal were to be received. The novitiate was to last two years, for soldiers three. Monastic discipline was upheld even by force. Monks elected to the ministry must leave the cloister, priests must never enter a cloister except for ministerial functions, lest the quietude of the monks should be broken. When some cloisters were abused by violent and rapacious bishops, he granted first a special, and finally, at the 3d Lateran Synod, a general exemption of all monasteries from their episcopal government. Here it was decreed, that no Bishop has any right to the property of cloisters, that all difficulties between cloisters and churches are to be settled by their abbots, all the abbots are to be elected by their own congregations, etc. The Bishops have only the right of installation and of a general superintendency. (*Opera Gr. d. Bened. II., App. 1294, ep. 8, 15, 34*). Gieseler, I., 2, 426. Gfrörer, Kirchengesch., 1087-1088. Schröckh, Kircheng., 17, 299. Lau I., c. 128-31, 240.

His care for the monks gave rise to his surname, *Pater Monachorum*, his care for ceremonies, *Pater Ceremoniarum*. But as his liturgical works are lost in the original, it becomes difficult to ascertain which of the liturgical forms ascribed to him, really owe their origin to him. So much is certain, that he forbade the use of any other but the Latin language. In restoring and correcting the Gelasian *Sacramentarium*, he followed in the footsteps of Leo I. and Gelasius I. The *canon missæ* in its present form owes its origin mostly to him (*Opp. III., 1-5*). The antiphones, sung at mass, were also collected by him (*Joh. diac. I., c. 2, 6*). His authorship of the *Liber responsalis* is doubtful. Contemporaneous with his liturgical institutions we find the *cantus firmus* or *planus*, slow singing instead of the rhythmical, metrical *cantus figuratus*. He is also said to have added the four Plagalian tones to the four Ambrosian ones, and to have changed the musical characters. Finally, he founded the *Orphanotrophium*, an institution in which orphans were educated for church-music. (Cf. Forkel, Gesch. d. Music, I., 164-186. Antony, Lehrbuch d. greg. Kirchenges.: Münster, 1829. Lau I. c. 244-298).

Upon the estates belonging to his See (Patrimonium S. Petri) he bestowed much care, and had them administered in a spirit of justice as well as mildness (cf. *Ep. 1, 44*. Gfrörer, l. c. 1093. Neander, l. c. 138).

Besides the Roman diocese his patriarchal See comprised the metropolitan bishoprics of Ravenna, Aquileja, Milan, Valentia, Thessaly, Macedonia, Epirus, and the so-called *Justiniana prima Achaia*. These he ruled in the same manner. These Bishops had to respect his vicars, to appear at his Synods and to reside in their dioceses. True, he respected their rights, but he also enforced his own authority, especially the right of appealing to Rome. In demanding all appeals to be conducted at Rome instead of in their own dioceses, he even overstepped his predecessors' assumptions. How well he understood to subdue all opponents, he showed in the case of Maximus, who had been elected Bishop of Solona against his papal will. Although Maximus at first tore to pieces his mandate, he had finally to do public penance. Gregory felt convinced that he had the right to superintend the whole Church, and of course also the Greek Church (*Ep., 9, 12*), and expressed himself concerning a Constantinopolitan Synod, that *sine apostolicæ sedis auctoritate nulla quæque acta fuerint vires habent* (*Ep. 9, 68*). When the Constant. patriarch, John, deposed two presbyters who appealed to Rome, he had the matter inquired into at a Roman Synod. But it remains uncertain how far he succeeded in this movement. Of more importance is his dispute with the same Patriarch about the title *Episcopus Universalis*, adopted by the latter. He demanded that this title should not be used, and broke off all intercourse with him. When the Emperor advised peace, he yielded only so far as to make the same demand in milder terms (*Ep. 5, 19*). To assume such a title, he said, would be to imitate the devil's high aimed ambition (*Ep. 5, 18*). Although the Chalcedonian Council¹ had offered the same title to the Roman Bishops, these, he said, had never accepted of the honor. At the same time he tried to persuade the Emperor (*Ep. 5, 20*) and the Patriarchs, Eulogius of Alexandria and Anastasius of Antiochia, of the justice of his course (*Ep. 5, 43; 9, 68*). But having received no satisfactory answers, the difficulties continued even after the death of John (595) with his successor Cyrinus. The Emperor now advised Gregory to receive the bearer of Cyrinus' *Synodica* in a friendly manner, and the Pope yielded, though reluctantly, so far as to admit the delegate to his own mass (*Ep. 7, 33*), but continued forbidding his apocrisarius to attend the Patriarch's mass, and as late as 599 he exhorted several Bishops, invited to attend a Synod at Constantinople, in no way to acknowledge that title (*Ep. 9, 68*). After the death of the Emperor *Mauritius* (602) these negotiations were renewed with Phocas, his successor, who is said finally to have divested Cyriac of the title, and to have transferred it to Boniface, the Roman Bishop. Gregory's obstinacy about a simple title was but partly the result of his con-

¹ This statement is erroneous (cf. WIGGERS, *de Gr. M.*, 21-23; Gieseler, K. G., 1, 2, 228).

viction, that so ambitious a title did not become a Bishop, he preferred to assume the title, *Servus Servorum Dei*, and when the former title was offered him, he declined it. But undoubtedly his chief motive was to gain the confidence of the other Bishops, and thus to prevent the Byzantine Patriarch from receiving a title, which, in future time, might form a basis to more substantial claims (*Gfrörer*, l. c., 1046-50; *Schröckh*, l. c., 79-82, is partial against Gregory; *Neander*, l. c., 160, sqq.).—In secular matters he acknowledged the Emperor as sovereign. True, in the political troubles of Italy, he sometimes took an independent course, but in that he was justified by circumstances, and when he, in some cases, corrected the imperial officers, he acted only as the patron of the oppressed. In defending the independency of the Church, he often came in conflict with the Emperor and his officials, who were not accustomed, in Greece, to respect the rights of the Church. In such cases he chose to take a mild or a violent course, according to circumstances. Generally his language towards the Emperor was very humble, sometimes servile, as in the case of Phocas, who murdered Mauritius, and having ascended the throne, was addressed by Gregory in such language: "Glory be to God on high, who rules the ages and transfers empires! who put an end to oppression and filled with joy many mourning souls," etc. (*Ep.* 13, 31). And to the Empress he writes (*Ep.* 13, 39): "Praise be to the Creator in heaven, and to all the glorious choirs of the angels, and thanks from all mankind, that the commonwealth has found consolation and aid." This joyful flattering language may be explained by the fact, that his relations to Mauritius had not been friendly, because the Emperor did not always yield to his claims, and failed to protect Italy against the Lombards; but this explanation is no justification (cf. *Pfahler*, *Gregor u. s. Zeit*, p. 49).

We now turn to the Occident, to see what Gregory did for upholding Catholicism against schisms and heresies, for the spread of the Christian religion, and for the development of the Papal supremacy.

The Istrian schism, which his successor had commenced to heal, continued to claim his attention. He obtained an order from Mauritius, the Emperor, summoning the Istrians to a council in Rome. But they objected, and owing to the Lombard wars, nothing further could be done. The King of the Lombards was, through his wife Theodolinda, a Bavarian princess, converted to the Roman faith, but few of his people followed him. In Spain, however, Arianism was suppressed. The Donatists in Africa had been living in peace with the Catholics at the time of Gregory's ascent; they were admitted to the ministry, to bishoprics, and even to the metropolitan See. Gregory succeeded in expelling them gradually from all offices, in reviving the former persecutions, and almost extinguishing the sect. In effecting these and other conversions he employed mildness as well as severity (cf. *Neander*, l. c., 17, &c.; *Marggraff*, *de vita Gr.*, 41, sqq.). Against heretics he employed secular powers as much as possible. The Manicheans in Sicily were to be

forced into the Roman Church by continued persecution (*summopere persequi*, *ep.* 5, 8). Paganism yet existed in Great Britain, in France, even in Sicily, Corsica, Campania, and especially in Sardinia. Here Paganism was even on the increase, the Bishops and the secular government tolerating it in consideration of a fine or tax. Pagan peasants were found even on papal patrimonies. Gregory succeeded in suppressing Paganism in Sicily, the Pagans were loaded with heavy taxes (*Ep.* 4, 26), punished corporeally and imprisoned (*Ep.* 9, 55, 8, 18). The Jews were treated less severely, sometimes even protected; yet he was not opposed to forced conversions in an indirect way, hoping that their children thus would at least grow up good Christians.

He laid the foundation to the restoration of the Roman supremacy in the Occident, which had been interrupted by the Fall of the Occidental Roman Empire, by the migration of nations, and by the use of various heresies. He brought Spain under Roman influence. The Catholic Bishops in Africa were connected more firmly with Rome by their common warfare against the Donatists. His connections with Gaul, through their Queen, Brunhilda, served to make him less dependent on the Lombards, and on the Byzantine Emperors. By converting England he did not only gain new territory for the Church, but was also enabled to subject the ancient Britannic Church, and to increase his authority in other directions. In Gaul the King, Childebert, requested him to appoint the Bishop Vigilius, of Arles, as his vicar, and through him Gregory tried to put a stop to simony, and to the Episcopal consecration of laymen. Soon after he commenced addressing Brunhilda, the influential Queen, in letters repulsively flattering. He also granted exemptions to several cloisters, especially to the one at Autun (cf. *Neander*, l. c., 127, sqq. *Lau*, l. c., 179, sqq. *Gfrörer*, l. c., 1063, sqq.).

Gregory died March 12, 604, having been Pope thirteen and a half years. He was canonized, and his festival day was celebrated with great pomp even in Greece. His miracles are of later legendary origin. The chief traits of his character are: common sense, constancy, prudence, cunning, unremitting care for the welfare of the Church, justice, clemency, benevolence. His piety was a strange mixture of living faith and purity of heart, with much superstition and formalism. His learning was praised exorbitantly by the ancient Church, yet he knew neither Greek nor Hebrew. The classic literature, speculative and systematic sciences, were foreign to his practical mind. His theological standpoint is that of Augustine, though leaning to Semipelagianism. He represents original man as of a weaker nature than Augustine does. Consequently his fall appears in a milder light; fallen human nature is not dead, as with Augustine, but sick; free-will, not lost, but weakened, able either to accept or to reject and resist grace. Predestination is based upon prescience—there is no *decretum absolutum*, no certainty of salvation for man (*Neander*, l. c., 202; *Lau* l. c., 493). Christ's death does not extinguish the human debt of sin, but serve only

to pay the ransom due to the devil, and his incarnation served to deceive the devil (cf. *Baur, Geschichte der Versöhnungslehre*, p. 68, &c.; *Lau, l. c.*, 447). Man's happiness corresponds with his acts. Penance and good works console his spirit. Sometimes grace is mentioned, but it is represented as rather unsafe ground. There is a difference between commandments and evangelical advice, therefore pious people may do better than is necessary, and thus gain an extra reward available for others. Saints, relics, masses are very efficient. Thus Gregory laid much to lay the foundation for the penal asceticism, for justification by works and other superstitions of latter ages (cf. *Ep.* 9, 52, 122; *Ep.* 3, 33; *Ep.* 4, 30). The doctrines of transubstantiation, of purgatory, of repeated sacrifices in mass, of masses availing for dead people, were planted and fostered by him. His ethics were unobjectionable, except that he lacks the evangelical view of Christian life and sanctification.

Gregory's literary works: 1) *Expositio in Iobum s. Moraliū*, I., XXXV., contains no treasures of philology or historical interpretation: Gregory believes a threefold sense of Scripture language. His allegorical interpretations are airy. 2) 40 *Homiliae in Evangelia*. 3) *Homiliae in Ezechielem*, more of an edifying character than deep or eloquent. 4) *Regulae (curae) pastoralis liber*, a purely practical exposition of pastoral duties, which has for centuries been a standard work, translated into most European languages. 5) *Dialogorum libri IV, de vita et miraculis patrum Italicorum et de aeternitate animi*. A rich fountain of superstition and miracles, it was early translated into the Greek and the Arabic. 6) *Registri Epistolarum libri 4*, contain nearly 900 very important Letters of Gregory. 7) Liturgical works passing under his name—*liber sacramentorum*; *Benedictionale*; *liber Antiphonarius*; *liber responsalis*; cf. *Bähr, l. c.*, 450–453. Finally his *Hymns*, 8 of which are generally ascribed to him (cf. *Bähr, die christl. Dichter und Geschichtschreiber Roms: Karlsruhe*, 1836, p. 79 (N. B. Bähr's remark, that the hymns are wanting in the Benedict. edition, is erroneous, they are found Tom. III., 177).—The last edition of Gregory's works is: *S. Gregorii I. M. Opera omnia, studio et labore monachorum ordinis St. Benedicti e congreg. S. Mauri*: Paris, 1705, Vol. 4, fol.—His life was early written by Paulus Diac., the historian of the Lombards, † 799, and by John Diac., a monk at Cassinum, in the 9th cent. (*Gregorii opera ed. Bened.*, Tom. IV.). Concerning later biographies by Maimburg, Denys de St. Marthe, Bayle, Dupin, and others; cf. *Bähr, l. c.*, 38, and *Schröckh, K. G.*, 17, 353–361; *Neander, l. H.*, I., 11, &c., and *Memorials of Chr. life* (Bohn's ed.), p. 386, &c. Modern biographies are: *Wiggers, de Gr. M. ejusque placitis anthropologicis, comment*: Rostock, 1838–40. *Gfrörer, K. G.*, II., 2, 1051–1100. *Margraff, de Greg. I., vita dissertatio historica*: Berolini, 1845. *Lau, Gregor. I., nach seinem Leben u. Lehre*: Leipzig, 1845. *Pfahler, Greg. M. u. s. Zeit*: Frankfurt. M., 1832, I. Bd. (not finished).—*KLAIBER*.—II., May 19, 715—Feb. 10, 731.—His former name was Sergius, he was a Roman

by birth and a Benedictine monk. He persuaded the Lombard King, Liutprand, who had already advanced as far as the Tiber, to return: tradition even affirms, that the King on his knees begged his pardon. He was the first Pope who asked for the assistance of the Franks against the Lombards. Though unsuccessful in this movement, he kept his eyes on the Eastern Empires. He subjected to himself the newly founded Church in Germany through Boniface (see Art.) and strengthened the papal influence in Ireland and England. His canonization is probably owing to his zeal for the worship of images (see Art.). The 13th of Feb. bears his name.—(*JAFFÉ, Regesta Pontif. Rom.*; *Vita Greg. II. in VIGNOLII Lib. Pont. II.*; *BARONIUS, Annal. ad. h. a.* *PAGI, Breviar. Pont. Rom.* I.—III. (Feb. 11, 731—Nov. 28, 741) a Syrian by birth, in all respects a successor of Greg. II., e. g. in his opposition against the Byzantine courts, and its course against images. His Roman Council, in 732, solemnly sanctioned the idolatry of the Occident. He also went to the victor of Tours for assistance against Liutprand, sending him the keys of the tomb of St. Peter, with some relics and titles. Boniface was by him made Archbishop (see Art.). His work, written by him, according to Anastasius, in defence of the worship of images, seems lost.—*Sources* as above.—IV. (827—Jan. 844), though elected by the clergy and by the people, was not consecrated before his election was sanctioned by the Emp. of the Franks, whose empire soon after fell to pieces. In 833 he went to France to settle the quarrels of Louis the Pious with his sons, but deceived by Lothar, he earned distrust and hatred, and excited a spirit of insubordination in the French Bishops, which finally led to the downfall of the Franco-Papal Theocracy. Ansgar was by him appointed legate of the North, and the Episcopal See of Hamburg was established.—(*JAFFÉ, l. c. Vita Gregorii IV.*, in *VIGNOLII Libr. Pont. III.*; *BARONIUS, PAGI, II.*, c. c.; *GFRÖRER's* and *FUNK's* works on the Hist. of the Franks.—V., his former name was Bruno, a chaplain and near relative of King Otto III., was, at his peremptory advice, April, 996, elected Pope by the clergy and the people. He was a son of Otto, Duke of Carinthia, only 24 years of age, full of reformatory and ambitious ideas. But as soon as the Emperor, after having been crowned by him, had departed, the Roman nobility expelled him (Sept. 996) and elected John XVI. in his place. The Emperor returned victorious. John was, in punishment, lead through the streets of Rome on an ass, and then incarcerated in a cloister. Crescentius, the chief of the rebellious nobility was beheaded; German strength prevailed. Nevertheless Gregory V. displayed a papal spirit even in Germany; he ordered Robert, King of France, to do penance, because, in his marriage with Bertha, he violated the canonical inabilities. Although he could not annul the marriage, he subdued the French clergy. In three Councils he tried strictly to follow the footsteps of Nicholas I. He freed the bishoprics and the abbeys of Italy from burdensome encumbrances. He died suddenly in Rome, Feb. 18, 999, rumor says, poisoned through the hatred of the people.

(JARRÉ, *l. c.*; Höfler, *d. deutschen Päbste*, I., p. 195, &c.; Giesebrecht, *Gesch. d. deutschen Kaiserzeit*, I., p. 761, &c. — VI. (antipope), elected to this office by a party of the Roman nobility against Benedict VIII. (see Art.); but not being recognized by Henry II., it seems he resigned and died unknown. — (Only source, TRIETMARI, *Merseb. Chron. in Monu. Germ. Script.*, III., p. 835. — VOIGT. — VI., 1044–1046, his former name was Job. Gratian, he was an honest priest at Rome, greatly honored by the people because such were scarce. Thus he became rich, and bought out Benedict IX. (see Art.), who had become tired of the hatred of the Romans. He governed wisely and successfully for one year and a half, but the Roman nobility did not like this, and recalled Benedict. Henry III., being called, came to Sutri, where a Synod was held. Here Gregory acknowledged his sin, to have bought the papal chair, excusing his conduct with the necessity of the times, resigned and went with the Emperor to Germany. He died in 1048 in Cologne. H. FLORO. — *Ruetenick*.

Gregory VII., 1073 to 1085, or *Hildebrand*, was born of plebeian parents; but it is uncertain whether at Siena or Rome. It seems certain that he was at Rome from childhood, was chaplain to Gregory VI., and accompanied him to Cologne. After Gregory's death he became monk of Clugny, but was brought back to Rome, about 1049, by Leo IX., who made him subdeacon and cardinal. — The reformation of the Church, and the emancipation of the papacy from the secular power, are his work, although he did not live to see the issue of his undertakings. — 1. He destroyed the influence of the *Rom. nobility upon the papal elections*. After the death of Stephen X. (1058), the Roman nobility had elected Benedict X. against the will of the Cardinals. H. and the cardinals had, with the consent of Empress Agnes, elected Nicholas II. He placed Nicholas on his chair by bribes and arms; and, to put an end to the intrigues of the nobles, he framed the law of Nicholas concerning papal elections, ordering that in future the cardinals (with the Emperor) should have the first vote in them. To break down the castles of the nobles, he invoked the aid of the Normans of S. Italy, and induced their two chiefs, Richard of Capua and Robert Guiscard, to become vassals of the Pope. He thus secured for the papal seat an independent and commanding position in Italy. Nicholas made him archdeacon of the Roman Church. — 2. He destroyed the influence of the *German court on the papal elections*, in which he was remarkably favored by circumstances. In 1061 Nicholas had been deposed by Agnes (mother of Henry IV.), and had died before the matter had been settled. The party crushed by H. now sent the papal insignia to Agnes, requesting the appointment of a new Pope. She chose, Oct. 28, 1061, Cadalus, Bishop of Parma. The cardinals and H. had elected, Oct. 1061, Alexander II. Cadalus approached Rome with an army, and would have prevailed if Agnes had continued in power. But many German princes had conspired to deprive her of the regency; they carried off Henry IV., and Hanno, Archb. of Cologne, who had assumed the regency of

the empire, confirmed Alexander at the council of Augsburg (Oct. 1062) and Mantua (May, 1064). The party of Cadalus maintained itself in Rome until 1066, when it yielded. Thus H. had achieved the reign of a Pope elected by the cardinals against the will of the German court. — H., also, became Pope without the consent of King Henry. Alexander, shortly before his death, had excommunicated several of the King's counsellors, and requested their removal from the court. Before the matter had been settled A. died (April 22, 1073); and Hildebrand, who on the same day was elected Pope by the clergy and people, and called Gregory VII., took up the quarrel, demanding that Henry should yield to the Apostolic chair. The revolt of the Saxon princes (1073) forced Henry to write an humble letter to G., and on Easter, 1074, to do penance before his mother and two cardinal bishops for his connection with the excommunicated counsellors. Nor did G. ask Henry's consent to his election; and from this time the papal election was exclusively in the hands of the cardinals. — 3. Gregory endeavored to *abolish the marriage of priests*. From the time of Leo IX. former laws prohibiting the marriage of priests had been renewed, but the Bishops had not enforced them. The means to be used in order to carry through his law of celibacy, G. first discovered at Milan. In this city some fanatical priest had, 1057, incited the populace to compel the clergy to dismiss their wives. In 1074, G. commanded the laity to refuse the sacraments at the hands of married priests, and to compel the latter to dismiss their wives. The command was gladly obeyed: knights and rabble rejoiced that they could safely vent their rage upon the clergy, whose consequent sufferings were indescribable. Burning hatred of the Pope filled the secular clergy; and the bishops complained bitterly that their jurisdiction over canons and priests had been transferred to the rabble. They invoked Henry's aid against the Pope (1075). — 4. G.'s grand effort was to restore the *freedom of the Church in the investiture of bishops and abbots*. He objected to the "execrable custom," as he called the customary investiture, because it was a desecration of the ring and crosier, the official insignia of bishops and abbots, to receive them from the Emperor: an injustice and disgrace that bishops and abbots were mostly appointed arbitrarily by the Emperor, without the consent of the clergy and the people; and that bishops and abbots were thus instituted, who were totally unacquainted with their flock. He thought also that so long as this custom existed, simony could never be extirpated. — His idea was that clergy and people should elect their bishop, and the monks their abbot, with full liberty, and regardless of all except the competency and worthiness of the candidate. The Archbishop was then to invest and ordain the Bishop elect, and the Bishop the abbot elect. Merely this was G.'s idea of the freedom of the Church (*Ep. an alle Gläub. aus Salerno*, 1084, in Hugo von Flavigny, II.). — This matter had, no doubt, been for a long time discussed in the Lateran: but G. did not announce his law of investiture until the spring Synod of 1075. It provided that no clergyman should thereafter

cept any clerical office from a layman; nor could any layman present a clerical office. But he did not proclaim this law until 1078. It seems that he wished to confer previously with Henry concerning it. He regarded this law as the cause of all his subsequent conflicts with Henry (*Ep. Quum veritas*. Mansi, XX., 381). It must not be overlooked, however, that G. did not intend by this law to abolish the *feudal service* which bishops and abbots owed the King (p. to the Church of Aquileja, Sept. 17, 1077). Gregory entertained some other schemes; which, though sufficiently remarkable, were without results. He sought to reduce nearly all countries of Christendom to fiefs of the apost. St. Peter. He asserted direct claims to Spain, Corsica, Sardinia, and Hungary. An exiled Russian prince received from him Russia as a fief. He challenged the Kings of Denmark and England to take the oath of fealty. Some Spanish granees, counts of Provence, Savoy, and Arrelat, all took the oath. William of England refused in pretty short words. Gregory asserted that Charlemagne had conquered Saxony for St. Peter; but he did not found any claims on this, since at this time (1081) he already claimed the entire German empire as a papal fief.—He was also busily occupied (1074) with a scheme of a crusade to deliver the holy pulchre, and with another to reunite the Greeks and Armenians with the Cath. Church. At this time also he threatened to deprive Philip of France of his crown.—But all these schemes were forgotten in his great struggle with Henry V. of Germany, which broke out in the beginning of 1076. Agnes, the King's mother, who, since 1065, had resided at Rome, and Beatrice of Tuscany had made, since 1073, incessant efforts to preserve peace between the Pope and the King. But there were powerful men in Germany, who hated the Pope and desired his degradation. There were also sufficient materials for quarrels. G. had become Pope without the King's consent; he had with his strange prohibition of lay-investiture interfered when the King, according to ancient custom, had rewarded his adherents with the domains of imperial abbays; and he had reduced Upper Italy to deep distress by exciting the rabble to excesses against the clergy. Since 1075, Godfrey, the powerful, wise and just, Duke of Lower Lorraine, had stood high in favor with Henry, and he hated the Pope bitterly; for his wife, Matilda, refused to remain in Germany and returned to her mother, Beatrice of Tuscany. The cause of his troubles he found in the Pope; and not unjustly, for Gregory wished to retain his former influence over Matilda, and strove with all his might to confirm her in her ascetical tendencies. The calumnies concerning his amatory intrigues with her, do not deserve refutation.—Meantime the occurrences at Milan, in 1075, made the rupture inevitable. After the death of Archb. Guido (1071), Henry had appointed Godfrey, a priest of Milan, Archbishop, whom, in 1073, the Lombard bishops had ordained. Alexander II. refused and excommunicated him. The rabble, on the other hand, the partizans of the Pope, had elected a priest named *Hatto*. But neither of the two met with general favor. Godfrey had

retired to an archiep. palace, and Hatto had been in Rome since 1073, where he was confirmed by Gregory. The Pope had often remonstrated with Henry, who had also promised to yield. But the troubles at Milan were such, that peace could be restored only by a conference of the King and Pope. During the summer of 1075 the better citizens of Milan determined to put an end to the disturbances of the rabble. They accordingly slew their leader, a certain knight, Herlembald, and begged the King to restore the glory of the Church of Ambrose, by giving it a worthy Archbishop. Henry appointed a Milanese priest, named *Tedald*. There were now three Archbishops of Milan, two of them appointed by the King. Gregory was justly highly incensed.—In Nov., 1076, two messages reached Gregory; one from the King, whose object was probably a request to be crowned Emperor; the other from the rebel Saxon princes, charging the King with receiving his excommunicated counsellors at court, and with being guilty of unparalleled vices. The latter were calumnies to which Gregory never attached any credit subsequently, but for the present he did not reject them. He wrote, probably Dec. 8, 1075, an angry letter to Tedald, and despatched the embassy which brought on the outburst of the rupture. The embassy consisted of papal legates bearing Gregory's last letter to Henry (*Reg. III.*, 10, Dec. 8), and the three servants of the King, who brought his letter to the Pope, and were now sent back with a verbal reply. They were to remonstrate, as Gregory tells us (in *Ep. Andin. quoad.*), with Henry on account of his vices; for the Pope wished unjustly to use those calumnies against the King. The three servants were charged to tell their master that the Pope would deprive him of his kingdom and salvation.—When the embassy arrived at Goslar, Jan. 1, 1076, H. committed the imprudence of deposing Gregory, and thus giving every advantage into his hands. The decree of deposition, assented to by a large portion of the German bishops (Worms, Jan. 24), and subscribed at Piacenza by the Lombard bishops, was answered by Gregory with the anathema. In July already G. was victor. Henry's party was nearly dissolved; Duke Godfrey had been assassinated in February; and the Saxons and S. Germans, who wished to reduce the royal authority, declared that H. should render satisfaction to the Pope. They requested the Pope to be present, Feb. 2, 1077, at Augsburg, where H. was to be tried. The King himself was forced to consent to this.—Gregory started on his journey in December, rejoiced to act as arbiter between the King and the German princes; a position never before occupied by a Pope. In the beginning of January he reached the Po, but heard with terror that H. was in Italy. For H., determined to prevent the meeting at Augsburg, had, in December, secretly crossed the Alps, and was now among the Lombards, who rejoiced in his arrival, hoping that he would put an end to the reign of the hated Pope. But H. had the affairs of Germany in view; and came, therefore, to be absolved from his excommunication in order to remove every pretence of proceedings against him. He fol

lowed Gregory to Canossa, where he spent three days in a penitent's garb. The Pope would assuredly not have absolved him, if Matilda and other princes had not vehemently urged him. For it was of great importance to him to be arbiter between the King and the Germ. princes; and he knew that he should enrage the latter if he should absolve the King, and thus expose them to his mercy. In this dilemma he concluded to absolve the King, but also to insist upon a diet, where affairs should be finally settled. Henry was now absolved; but he was fully determined that the diet should never assemble.—The German princes, enraged that Gregory had absolved the King, and fearing that H. would call them to account, elected, March 15, 1077, a rival King in Rudolph of Suabia. Henry now returned to Germany, assembled his adherents, and made war upon the rebels until 1080. During all this time Gregory endeavored to bring about a diet, in which his legates were to settle affairs. Both parties, meantime, joined in preventing it. Seeing this, Gregory in the spring of 1080 again excommunicated H., and recognized his rival. The King's party heard the news with derision. During the summer H. appointed Clemens III., a rival Pope, a man whose excellent qualities Gregory had always praised. The rival King was killed, Oct. 15, in battle, and in the spring of 1081 H. was advancing against Rome.—The Romans promised fidelity to Gregory. In June, 1080, he had absolved Rob. Guiscard from his long excommunication, but received from him no effectual aid. Jordan of Capua, the other Norman prince, was Gregory's enemy. Matilda aided G. with money; but her knights declared resistance to the King to be madness. Meantime the army of the King was small, so that only after a siege of three years he could take a part of the city. March 21, 1084, he installed the rival Pope in the Lateran: G. had taken refuge in the castle of St. Angelo, refusing the requests and unheeding the threats of the Romans. In 1083 Rob. Guiscard brought aid to the Pope. Henry, hearing of the vast army which was advancing with the Duke, evacuated Rome, May 21, 1084. In June Robert entered the city, and carried off Gregory to Salerno. Gregory once more called upon all the faithful to come to his relief; but in vain. After he had spent eleven months at Salerno, he died there, May 25, 1085.—Gregory was undoubtedly a great man. His plans were not executed until after his death; and yet for the history of the West, they opened entirely new channels, and they continue to operate to the present time. In preparing the accomplishment of his designs, he took very skilful advantage of the favorable circumstances of the times, and used means which cannot always be defended, though they accomplished his purpose. He sincerely believed, too, that his plans were for the good of Christendom. Whether they really were so, may well be doubted. He made the papacy independent of the imperial authority, and laid the foundation for its later omnipotence; but this very omnipotence accomplished its fall. He prohibited the marriage of the clergy; and the consequences were such that

we dare not describe them. The view of some, that without celibacy the clergy would have become a cast, is a mere hypothesis; facts prove that married priests formed a noble, dignified class; and that the enforcement of celibacy has for the most part demoralized the clergy. By the prohibition of lay investiture he wished to secure the freedom of clerical elections; but more widely than ever before the door was opened to bribes and intrigues.—(STENZEL, *Gesch. d. fränk. Kaiser*, 1827; VOIGT, *Hilke*, als P. Greg. VII., 2 Aufl., 1846; SÖTL, *Greg. VII.*, 1847; FLORO, *Kais. Heinr. IV.*, u. s. Zeitalt., 2 vols., 1855–56.—VIII., anti-Pope, elevated March 8, 1118, by Henry V., maintained himself with German aid against Paschal II., but was degraded by Calixtus II., and died in 1125 in a dungeon.—(VIT. BURDINIUS, *BALUZZ. Miscell.* III.; JAFFÉ, *Regesta Pontif.*.)—VIII., a pious man, of whom great things were expected, was elected Oct. 21, 1187, at Ferrara, but died Dec. 17, after having paved the way for a new crusade.—(BARONIUS, *Annal. ad an.*, 1187; JAFFÉ, *l. c.*; BOWER, *History of the Popes of Rome*).—IX., a nephew of Innocent III., and inheritor of his ideas and firmness, was an experienced and meritorious old man when, March 20, 1227, he became Pope. During a cardinalship of twenty-eight years he had seen various phases of the great struggle of the papacy with the Hohenstaufens, and with his own hand had crowned Frederick II. The latter, before his conflict with the Pope, had called him a man of unblemished character, of distinguished piety, learning, and eloquence. He showed to his death an uncommon resoluteness in action. He has often been charged with pertinacity and priestly pride; but the charge is more just against the struggling hierarchy, than his person. Of the mildness of his predecessor, he possessed, of course, nothing.—Soon after his coronation he sent a menacing admonition to the Emperor to undertake his promised crusade. Frederick embarked, but after three days returned on account of sickness. The Pope, regarding this as a mere pretence, excommunicated him on St. Martin's, 1227, absolved his Apulian subjects from their allegiance, and twice renewed the anathema and interdict, although, expelled from Rome by the Ghibellines, he had to fly to Viterbo and thence to Perugia. Frederick, notwithstanding the threefold anathema, now started on his crusade, Aug. 11, 1228; found the templars and knights of St. John, the Syrian clergy and patriarch of Jerusalem highly embittered against him by papal missals, but crowned himself in the Church of the Holy Sepulchre, and by a treaty with the Saracens reopened Jerusalem, Bethlehem, and Nazareth to pilgrims. Hearing that Gregory had excited the Lombard cities against him, and sent marauding soldiers into his kingdom in Lower Italy, he returned to Europe, drove the hirelings from his dominions, but was again excommunicated. Hermann of Salza, master of the German knights, now effected a peace between the heads of Christendom, and they had a conference at Anagni, Sept. 1, 1230. But this proved a mere truce; the conflict of prin-

les urged on the catastrophe. When Frederick with success, but also with fearful rigor, punished the rebel towns of Lombardy, over whose rights Gregory claimed the office of arbiter; when he made his son, Enzo, King of Saragines, which Gregory regarded as an apost. fief; he was excommunicated, Palm Sunday, 1239, for the fifth time, and the quarrel now became one for life and death. Frederick caused his orthodoxy to be proven at Padua by Peter of Vinea, advanced against Rome, drove the papal army into the city, and everywhere inflicted punishment, often cruelly and with scornful hatred of priests. Shut up in Rome, Gregory died Aug. 31, 1241, from the effects of grief and the great heat, aged nearly one hundred years, but preserving to the last the freedom of the Church. — There remain of him five books of decretals, gathered and arranged by Raymond le Pennafort. He canonized SS. Elizabeth, Dominic, Francis, Anthony of Padua, and others (see notes). — (MURAT., *Script. T.*, III., pts. I., II.; LAYNARD, *Annal.*; BÖHMER, *die Regest. d. Kais. reichs unt. Phil.*, Otto IV., u. Friedr., II.; v. LAUMER, *Gesch. d. Hohenst.*, Bd. 3, 4; HÖFLER, *L. Friedr.*, II.) — **X.** was elected by a commission of cardinals, Sept. 1, 1271, when the papal chair, owing to the quarrels of the Italian and French cardinals, had been vacant three years. In order to a crusade he strove to reconcile the Guelfs and Ghibellines, and at the 2d Council at Lyons he sought, though vainly, to reunite the Greek with the Roman Church. In Germany he won high praises by aiding in the election of Hapsburg emperor. He died, highly esteemed, at Arezzo, Jan. 10, 1276. — (MURAT., *Script.*, T. II., P. I. II.; v. BONACCI, *Roma*, 1711; BÖHMER, *Regest. Imp. inde ab a. 1256–1313*; BOWER, *list. of the Popes*, VIII., p. 145). — **XI.** was elected Dec. 30, 1370, at Avignon. He was made cardinal in his 17th year, and was nepotistic like his uncle, Clemens VI. His efforts to reunite the Greek and Roman Church, and to make war against the Turks, were without results. A skilful canonist and theologian, he violently controverted the Wickliffite doctrines. Urged by the prayers of the Romans, and the arguments of St. Catharine of Siena, he entered Rome Jan. 27, 1377, amid the acclamations of the people. He died March 28, 1378. — (FILLIP. *Aven. ed.* BALUZ., I.; BOWER, *Hist. of the P.*) — **XII.** was elected Nov. 30, 1406, by the Rom. cardinals; and, like his Avignonian rival, Benedict XIII., held on to his schismatic dignity, with an odious astuteness and pertinacity. He was forsaken by even those cardinals who had elected him. His degradation by the Council of Pisa he answered with an anathema. At Constance, however, he voluntarily laid aside the papal robes, and lived two years yet in honor as card. bishop of Porto. He died Oct. 8, 1417, aged 90 years (for sources, see Art. *Constance, Council of*). — **XIII.** had, for eight years, taught canonical law at Bologna, and was an active, lively, jovial man. Before entering the clergy he had an illegitimate son. His learning and activity at the Council of Trent gained for him the Cardinalship. He became pope, May 13, 1572, through the agency of Granveilla. The rigor and fiery energy of the

Catholic reaction now gave such an elevation to his life and character, that he was a pattern to his court. His world-wide labors corresponded with the extensive aims, which the youthful vigor of the Jesuits pointed out to the Church. The latter was arraying its forces against Protestantism. Gregory signalized the massacre of St. Bartholomew's with processions and medals, and zealously supported Henry III. against the Huguenots, but could not subvert the liberties of the Gallican Church. The Spanish armada gave him strong hopes of the extirpation of the Anglican heresy, but he did not live to see the issue. — In other quarters he gathered forces more successfully; for he instituted 22 Jesuit Colleges, and spent two millions scudi in educating young men. Whilst adorning Rome with magnificent churches, he sent Possevin to Russia to effect a reunion of the Greek with the Roman Church, and sent missionaries to India and Japan. As cardinal already he had labored in the correction of the *decretum Gratianum*; in 1582 the new folio edition of the *corpus juris canonici* was issued. So he also effected the improvement of the Julian calendar. But through all these expenses the papal finances became involved; and his judicial measures incited the barons of the Church States to robberies, which he could not suppress. He died April 10, 1585, aged 83 years. — (See his works in *Ecc's Pontif. doct.*; Lives by CIAPPI, 1591; BOMPLANI, 1685; MAFFEI, 1742; BOWER u. RAMBACH, *Hist. d. röm. Päbste*, Th. X., P. 1, p. 225; RANKE, *die röm. Päbste*, Bd. 1, p. 419). — **XIV.**, from Dec. 5, 1590 to Oct. 15, 1591, elected to end the party rancor dividing the conclave, was pious and moral, but very insignificant, and wholly in the hands of the Spanish and leaguists of France, which latter he aided with money and troops. His anathema against Henry IV., aided no little in bringing the latter back to the Cath. Church. — (See his bulls in *Bullar. Magn.*, ed. CHERUBINI, T. II.; his Biogr. by CICARELLA, in the successive editions of PLATINA; RANKE, *die röm. Päbste*, Vol. II., p. 221). — **XV.**, Feb. 9, 1621–July 18, 1623, was a sickly, feeble old man when he became Pope. But his nephew, Ludovico, acted for him, which he did so entirely in the world-embracing sense of Gregory XIII., or rather of Jesuitism, that his short pontificate achieved unparalleled results. The Catholic reaction gained the most brilliant triumphs in Bohemia, Austria, and Hungary. Ferdinand II. and Maximilian of Bavaria were led by the Jesuits. In France, even in the Netherlands, and at the English court, the restoration of Catholicism advanced rapidly. The founding of the *Congr. de propag. fid.* gave immense energy to foreign missions. Gregory also gave to the conclave its present organization: the secret *scrutinium* was wholly new. — (See bulls in *Bullar. Magn. ed.* CHERUB., T. III.; RANKE, *ut supr.*, II. p. 454). — **XVI.** — If the Popes of recent times may be classified as Popes of the Church or Popes of Italy, according as the idea of the head of the Catholic Church, or an Italian prince predominated in their labors, Gregory XVI. belongs undoubtedly to the former class. In times as dangerous as those which followed the French

Revolution of July, 1830, none of the statesmen in the Cardinals' College would accept the pontificate. It was accepted Feb. 2, 1831, by *Mauro Cappellari*, an aged monk, general of the Camaldulensians; and the name Gregory, which he assumed, gave promise of a strictly churchly, and not Italian pontificate. This was fulfilled to such a degree, that during his reign of 15 years the Church-State was reduced by neglect and disorder to almost insupportable distress; though at the same time the Cath. Church achieved elsewhere very important advantages. He was born Sept. 18, 1765, at Belluno; entered in his 18th year the Camaldulensian monastery of St. Michael, near Venice; and was sent, after 12 years, to Rome as companion of the Procurator-General of his Order. At Rome he wrote, in 1799, his work: "The triumph of the holy chair and the Church, a refutation of the attacks of innovators with their own weapons" (Ital., Rome, 1799; Germ., 2d ed., 1848). In 1800 he became member of the *academia ecclesiastica* at Rome; 1801 abbot of S. Gregorio, the monastery of the order at Rome; 1815, consultant to several of the most important congregations, the inquisition, index, etc.; 1823, general of his order; 1826, cardinal and prefect of the propaganda. The duties which the latter office imposed upon him he discharged as Pope, and namesake of the founder of the propaganda, with such extreme fidelity, that in this sense he has often been called, perhaps too early, the last of the Popes. — The beginning of his reign was calculated to confirm him in this direction. The entire Church-State was deeply agitated; Bologna, Spoleto, and Ancona had renounced their allegiance. In Feb., 1831, more than a million had declared themselves independent. But the insurgents had not sufficient soldiers and arms; many were intimidated by the resolute conduct of some prelates; Austrian troops also were sent to the rescue: this, with promises of a reformation in the administration, the shutting up of the investitures for the space of a year, and numerous imprisonments, restored a certain degree of quiet. But in 1832 the disturbances again broke forth so violently in the north, in Forli, Bologna, etc., that they could be quelled only by Austrian and French intervention. Apparent quiet and insurrections, short amnesties and measures of violence, alternated with each other for some time. At the end of the pontificate there were 2000 political prisoners and convicts. The finances were in the most distressed condition: the public debt amounted to 38 million scudi, with a yearly deficit of half a million. All branches of industry were at a low ebb; and whilst the attention of the police was only directed to political delinquents, public security was wholly neglected. — But though indifferent to this distress, Gregory with his secretaries was very active in the great and general affairs of the Catholic Church. Perhaps no other Pope did so much in founding new bishoprics and apost. vicariates. A statistical report, published by the propaganda in 1843, gives, from 1800–43, 34 newly erected apost. vicariates, 32 of them erected by Gregory; 40 new bishoprics, 27 of them erected by G. (several years later, the *Dizionario* of MONORI,

enumerates only 15 missionary bishop. founded by G.); 43 colleges and orders were occupied in training and sending missionaries. The College *urbanum de propag. f.* was transferred by Gregory, in 1836, to the Jesuits. These missions were very liberally supported by independent associations. The French *Assoc. de la fa* alone had a revenue in 1843 of 3,562,088 francs. In the same statistical report the entire Catholic population of the world is stated to be 160,842,424; of which 155,748,540 were subject to the completely organized hierarchy, and 5,093,884 to apost. vicariates and prefectures. For this community Gregory did not fail to issue regulations of unequal value; such as the prohibition of the slave-trade, of Bible dissemination, and Bible societies. He also appointed more than 80 cardinals. In almost every country the position of the papacy became very advantageous. Even outside of Europe the Cath. Church gained large increase by new dioceses and vicariates in America and Asia, especially in China, and some also in Africa and Australia. In European countries the same Church was found, of course, in somewhat dissimilar relations. In Portugal in the conflict between the brothers Don Pedro and Don Miguel, G. had recognized the latter as King, because he sought to maintain himself by the more churchly party. After 1841 G. inclined more to the party of Queen Dona Maria da Gloria, daughter of Don Pedro; for he sent to her the Golden Rose, and stood sponsor for her son. Affairs were similar in Spain: in the civil war which arose after the death of Ferdinand II., because the latter had abrogated the salic law in favor of his daughter Isabella to the prejudice of his brother Carlos, the regent and her advisors made considerable encroachments upon the revenues of the Church, whilst Don Carlos declared the holy Virgin the patroness and generalissima of his army, and thus gained the favor of the clergy and the churchly party. Gregory also declared in Carlos' favor; and in his allocution of Feb., 1841, declared the abolition of monasteries and sale of their property; the restrictions of the bishops in filling church offices; and the law concerning the salaries of the clergy, as null and void. After 1845 affairs took another course, and the Pope before his death had the pleasure of seeing this old Catholic country returning to obedience. In France Louis Philippe, like Napoleon, sought to secure his reign by attaching himself closely to the Pope and favoring the hierarchy in France, but left it to fight its own battles with its enemies, who also were tolerated. The charter of 1830 secured freedom and protection to all religions; but it also said that the Catholic religion being the religion of the great majority of the French, had a special right to this liberty and protection. The four articles of the Gallican Church liberties were no longer insisted upon by the bishops, and were even attacked by men of talent; as in 1844 by Count Montalembert. The public recognition of the Jesuits, of whom there were already 200 in the country, was also demanded, though at this time without success. In England nothing new was undertaken against the government; but the experiments ventured upon by Pius IX.

were made possible by the extraordinary increase of the Catholic population in the three British kingdoms, under Gregory. According to the statistics of the propaganda, there were 65,030 Catholics in London in 1843, and during the last four years the number had increased by 26,236. In 1840 four new apostolical vicariates had been established. In 1849 there were in England alone 622 Catholic churches, 11 colleges, 8 monasteries, 34 nunneries, and 818 priests, whilst in 1792 there had been in England and Wales only 35 small chapels. The Catholic population in England and Scotland, which, in 1821, had been 500,000, increased under Gregory to nearly four millions; in 1842 there were 2,500,000; and in 1845, 3,380,000. — Even in Denmark, where, as late as 1827, conversions to the Catholic Church had been punished with exile, the native Catholics, about 1000, received somewhat more liberty. — In Austria the Church was still subordinate to the State, and free communication with Rome forbidden, according to the statutes of Emperor Joseph. Bavaria, from the 16th century, the most faithfully papal of German countries, became under Gregory for a time the centre of a theological and historical school, which was widely influential through its courage, zeal, talent, and learning; and which disseminated far and wide the idea of a Church government administered by a powerful spiritual sword and emancipated as much as possible from all secular authorities; and which, finally, commended a willing subserviency to the Pope. — In Prussia the differences of the government with its Catholic Bishops and the Pope led only to further concessions and liberties in favor of the Catholics. In Russia alone the papal measures were without results. A Synod of Feb. 24, 1839, had proclaimed the reunion of the united Greeks in Russia; in consequence of which 1600 priests and monks, and several millions of laymen, united with the Russian Church. At an allocution of Nov. 22, 1839, Gregory could utter only ineffectual complaints concerning this, which were answered by Russia with stringent prohibitions of proselytism to the Roman Church. In his last years G. sought to obtain greater concessions from the Emperor Nicholas personally, when the latter, in Dec. of 1845, visited the Pope at Rome. The Emperor is said to have answered favorably. The Pope died half a year thereafter, June 1, 1846. His effects were so poor, that the designation of apostolical poverty is not inapplicable in his case. — (See MORONI's *Dizionario di erudiz. storico-ecclesiast.*, 32d vol.; O. MEYER, *die Propaganda*, etc.: Gött. u. Lpz., 1853, 2 vols.; L. C. FARINI, *lo stato Rom. dell' anno 1815, al anno 1850*: Turin, 1841, 3 vols.)

HENKE. — *Reinecke*.

Gregory, of Heimbürg, was born of a noble family at Würzburg, at the beginning of the 15th cent., where he also studied law, and was made L.L.D. about 1430. We meet him first as a public character at the Council of Basle, where he became connected with Æneas Sylvius (afterwards Pope Pius II.), who availed himself of Gregory's learning and eloquence by appointing him his secretary, and with him ener-

getically resisted the encroachments of the papacy on the civil power. Heimbürg, however, could not maintain his position, and he therefore went to Nuremberg, where he was made syndic, and soon gained so great a reputation as jurist, that he was consulted in all the important civil and ecclesiastical questions of his time. In 1446 he was sent as the chief of a commission, which was appointed by the German electors, to Rome, to protest against the deposition of the Archbishops Theodoric of Cologne and James of Treves, to insist upon a legitimate Council, and the abolition of all innovations (see *Müller*, *Reichstagstheatrum*, I., p. 278). The Pope, Eugene IV., gave the commission no satisfactory reply, and soon after its return to Frankfort, Gregory wrote one of his most remarkable treatises against the papacy, bearing the title: *Admonitio de injustis usurpationibus Paparum Rom. ad imperatorum, reges et principes Christianos, sive Confutatio Primatus Papæ* (*Goldast*, *Monarchia S. Rom. Imperii*, T. I., p. 557). He now entered the service of the Archduke Sigmund of Austria, and continued his attacks on the papacy—immediately on Pius II., his former friend. This Pope convened an assembly of the princes at Mantua, to bring to pass a crusade in Germany. He appeared here as the ambassador of Sigmund, and successfully opposed the design of Pius, for which the latter determined to avenge himself. An opportunity soon presented itself. Cardinal Nicholas of Cusa, a former friend of Heimbürg, was made Bishop of Brixen against the will of Sigmund, who finally imprisoned him. For this act Pius II. excommunicated the Archduke (June 1, 1460); he appealed, through Gregory, to a general council (Aug. 13, 1460; *Goldast*, l. c., T. II., p. 1576), and had the appeal nailed to the church-doors of many cities in Italy. Gregory nailed it on the church-door of Florence, for which Pius now also laid him under the ban. Gregory opposed the ban with an appeal to a future council (*Goldast*, l. c., p. 1592), in which he exhibits the abuse of papal power, and defends the position that the council is superior to the Pope; that, therefore, the appeal to a general council was justified. The apostolic referendary and bishop of Feltri, Theodore Lilius, it is true, replied to this appeal (*Goldast*, l. c., p. 1595), but he was powerfully refuted by Gregory in his *Apologia contra detractiones et blasphemias Theod. Lælii* (*Goldast*, l. c., p. 1461). Gregory also wrote a treatise against Nicholas of Cusa, *Invectiva in Rever. Patrem, Dom. Nicolaum de Cusa* (*Goldast*, l. c., p. 1626), and in defence of Archbishop Diether of Mayence, whom Pius arbitrarily deposed. Not long after this, he was forsaken on all sides; Sigmund was reconciled with and absolved by Pius (1464), and Diether succumbed and resigned his archbishopric. Gregory now went to Bohemia, and carried on his attacks on the papacy under the protection of King George Podiebrad (see *Eschenlör*, *Geschichte von Breslau*, herausg. von Kunisch. Breslau, 1827). He took up his residence at Dresden, and after the death of Pius, obtained absolution from Sixtus IV., through the mediation of Duke Albert (1472). He died shortly after this (Aug., 1472)

in Dresden, and was buried in the church of St. Sophia. His writings appeared under the title: *Scripta nervosa justitiæque plena, ex manuscriptis nunc primum eruta*: Freft., 1608. Comp. Hagen, in der Zeitschrift Bragn: Heidelberg, 1839, II., p. 414, sq.; Ullmann, Reformatoren vor der Reformation I.: Hamb., 1841, p. 212, sq.

NEUDECKER. — Beck.

Gregory, called, by the Armenians, Lusakoritsch, the *illuminator*, the founder of Christianity in Armenia, was the son of the Parthian prince, Anacus. He was born c. 257, and received a Christian education at Cæsarea in Cappadocia. He it was who converted the King Tiridates to Christianity, whose example was followed by the nobles and a great part of the people. Gregory proceeded in this with great wisdom and judgment. He allowed the heathen priests their former income. At his suggestion schools and cloisters were founded in all the towns of Armenia. In these schools he received the sons and relatives of the heathen priests, and sought to win them to Christianity. In 302 he was consecrated patriarch of the Armenian Church at Cæsarea, in Cappadocia, by Bishop Leontius. Gregory was married and had several sons, of whom Aristax was the most distinguished. Towards the close of his life, Gregory transferred his office to Aristax, and retired to a mountain-cave in the province of Darnalia, where he also died (*Moses Choren.*, II., c. 88). — Gregory was not only the founder of the Armenian Church, he was also a writer. Of his writings there is yet preserved: Sacred sermons or homilies, first published at Constantinople, 1737; in a larger work titled, *Haschachapadum*, i. e., *stromata*, lately, according to the Greek translation, by the Mechitarists at San Lazaro, near Venice, 1837. See Catalogue des livres de l'imprimerie Arménienne de S. Lazare, Venise, 1848. It is questionable whether these homilies are genuine. Several prayers in the Armenian breviary are also attributed, and several canons of the Armenian Church discipline (comp. Neumann, Geschichte der armenischen Literatur: Lpz., 1836; *Moses Chorenensis, historiae Armenicæ, libri III.*: London, 1736).

HERZOG. — Beck.

Gregory, of Nazianzus, one of the three distinguished Cappadocians, who represent the Greek theology towards the end of the 4th century, was born about 330 (according to other reckonings 326–29), either at Nazianzus, or in the neighboring town of Arianzus. His mother, Nonna, was a very pious woman and zealous deaconess. Young Gregory, being early inclined and devoted to the ministry, strove after a thorough theological and scientific education. He visited Cæsarea in Syria and in Palestine, then Alexandria, and finally Athens. At this latter place, he with his friend Basil (see the Art.), devoted himself for years to the study of grammar, mathematics, rhetoric and philosophy. At 30 years of age (360) he, with his brother, Cæsarius, left Athens, and returned to Cappadocia. He was now baptized; and the way to ecclesiastical honors was opened to him, but his natural disposition held him back. He accepted an invitation from Basil to an asylum in Pontus, in order that, with him, he

might find the highest contentment in religious seclusion, pious self-examination and scientific reading. A fruit of their joint labors is the collection of extracts from the writings of Origen, which we still possess under the title of Philocalia. The next following period of his life was not so tranquil. Gregory had long ago, perhaps during his residence at Alexandria, come to a decision on the religious questions of his day. Although an admirer of Origen, he, in a measure, accepted the views of Athanasius. When, therefore, the semi-Arian views were favored and spread in Cappadocia by the Emperor Constantius, he went there (perhaps 361), received consecration as presbyter from his father at Nazianzus (who was Bishop here), and devoted himself for a time to his office. Basil also came to Cappadocia and was made presbyter of Cæsarea; his friend supported him and amicably settled a difficulty between him and his Bishop, and also secured the election of Basil to the bishopric of the same city. On the other hand, by the management of Basil, the bishopric of Sosima was offered to and almost forced upon Gregory. He at first declined it, fled to the wilderness, and only at the request of his aged father did he return to Nazianzus, where he administered the bishopric as vicar until the death of his father, 374. We omit here several minor events, which are found in Ullman's monograph. The frequent alternations of official labors and monkish seclusion, threw a light upon his character. His education and disposition, as well as the ecclesiastical party distractions of his times, disposed him to a retired religious life. On the other hand, however, he was too vain and ambitious, to renounce ecclesiastical honors once for all. His whole life was distracted by these diverse tendencies.—Meanwhile, Providence destined him for the first work among the early champions of the Church, in the latter part of his life.—At Constantinople, at this time, those who accepted the doctrines of the Council of Nice, were few in number and oppressed, being surrounded by all other factions of the Macedonians, Apollinarians, Novatians, and Eunomians. This oppressed party called Gregory to their defence. He came, and the Church of Anastasia soon became the scene of his eloquence and the centre of dogmatic agitation. The result of his sermons was great, the more so, perhaps, because no one expected much from the little, sickly-looking man. Even heathens heard him gladly, and churchmen, such as Jerome and Evagrius sat at his feet. He met the mockery of his enemies with mildness, and manifested a pacific spirit amid the scandals of the Meletian schism. In 380 the Emperor Theodosius defeated the Arians, and Gregory was permitted to enter the first Church of the metropolis as victor. His zeal, however, soon abated, and his old love for solitude revived. He could not, it is true, after the second oecumenical synod (381) decline the nomination to the bishopric of Constantinople, and was therefore consecrated to it by Meletius; but he soon after resigned it. After 381 we find him again at home, first at Nazianzus, where he still participated in ecclesiastical matters, then in rural seclusion, engaged in personal

affairs. He died about 389 or 390. — Gregory is *author* or *theologian* deserves yet a brief notice. In all his sermons, letters, and poems we find the same versatile and eloquent writer and practised thinker; his language is glowing and figurative, his feeling warm and lively. His rhetorical gifts never forsake him, but they should have been oftener more discreetly applied. His numerous letters to Basil, Gregory of Nyssa, Eusebius, Cæsarius, Sophronius, *et. al.*, are full of sentences, points (τὸ μὴ ὁμολογεῖν τὴν φιλοσοφίαν σφοδρὸν φιλοσοφόν, — οὐ δόκιμον τὸ ἀπειρασθόν, τὸ δὲ βασανισθὲν ἐν τοῖς πράγμασι δοκιμώτατον, *Epist.* 121, 215, *Bill.*), and are often cheerful and ironical. None of Gregory's poems attained to ecclesiastical use; they betray generally the high age and the decreasing freshness of their author, and where he relates his life in *extenso* (*Carmen de vita sua*), or runs into reflections, his poetry is worthless. Nevertheless, we possess from him several beautiful hymns, many striking epigrams, and short poetic apophthegms. The worthless dramatic production *Χριστὸς πάσχων*, was not written by Gregory. His sermons, however, deserve the first rank, and were already in antiquity expounded by Elias Cretensis, Nicetas and Psellus, and partly translated into Latin by Rufinus; only a few of the latter (especially *Tractatus de fide Nicena Opp.* I., p. 869, *Ben.*) do not with certainty proceed from Gregory. The first 45 sermons treat on various subjects, the memory of distinguished martyrs, commemoration of friends and relatives, of his father and brother, ecclesiastical festivals, etc. — they contain very little that is scriptural and exegetical. The glory of monastic life (*Epist.* 76), the nature of the ministry and the difficulties of pastoral duties, are subjects which he frequently treats of. But deserving of special distinction are the five sermons (*Orat.* XXVII.—XXXI., *Ben.*, also in *Biblioth. dogm. ed. Thilo*, II., p. 348) defending the doctrines of the Council of Nice, which obtained for Gregory the honorary title, *the Theologian*. They contain the development of the idea of the one and consubstantial deity, which carries in itself the hypostatic difference of the unbegotten or causative, of the begotten and proceeded, together with a description of this three-fold hypostatic peculiarity. In reply to the objection, that by the distinction of these divine subjects God is resolved into an abstract idea; Gregory replies, that the unity of the divine essence is concrete and real; but he does not inquire further, whether and how his substantial *μία ὁρμή* again leads back to the personal image of the *εἰς θεός*. As regards his *christological* views Gregory opposed the Apollinarians, and asserted the completeness of the human nature of the son of God (*Epistolæ ad Cledonium*; also in *Bibl. dogm.*, l. c., p. 538). His *anthropological* views move altogether in the sphere of Greek theology, and betray the influence of Origen. As Gregory held the view of creationism in regard to the propagation of souls, so he beheld in the union of the physical and spiritual that which is properly wonderful in human nature, which also, at the same time, furnishes the true explanation of the moral frailty of man (*Orat.* II., p. 49–54, *Ben.*). Besides he

also taught plainly the doctrine of *original sin*, and derived from the fall the morality of the race, and even a darkening of the understanding (comp. especially *Orat.* X., *ab init.* XXXVIII., p. 670; XLIV., § 4, *Ben.*). However, he neither gives the doctrine a precise, theoretic form, nor does he seek to harmonize it with his other anthropological views. He certainly wished to think of the need of salvation only synergistically, and therefore did not deny even to the sinful man the power of choice and ability to do good. It is remarkable, however, that G. reckoned the unequal distribution of earthly lots, the disproportions of riches and poverty, as well as of servitude and freedom, among the consequences of the first sin (*Orat.* XIV., p. 275, *Ben.*; XVI., p. 256, *Bill.*). His views on *Baptism* and the *Lord's Supper* finally, are entitled to consideration.

Among the more ancient editions of his works, the most important is that of Jac. Billius, Paris, 1609, 1611 (the first by Joh. Hervagius appeared at Basle, 1550), then *aucta ex interpretatione Morelli*: Par., 1630, II., Tomi. His poems appeared separated first in the remarkable edition *Venetis ex Aldi acad.*, 1504, then greatly enlarged, *cum notis J. Tullii Traject. ad Rhen.*, 1696, and again enriched in *Muratorii, Anecdota Gr. Pat.*, 1709. The Benedictine edition is based on these previous editions. The first collected volume of sermons of this edition was published, after the death of several co-laborers, by Ch. Clemencet, Par., 1778, fol. The completion of the second was delayed by the French Revolution. The genuine Maurinian MS. seems to have been lost, and was found only long afterwards, so that it could finally appear in print *Post operam et studium Monachorum O. s. B. edente et accurate D. A. B. Caillau Par. curis et sumptibus Parent Debarres*, 1840. This volume contains the most complete collection of the letters and poems according to Paris MSS., with explanatory remarks and extracts from the commentaries of Nicetas, Elias, and Psellus.—(Comp. besides, *Fabric., Bibl. Gr., ed. Harl.*, VIII., p. 383, sq.; *Clemencet, Vita S. Gregor. Opp.*, I. I.; *Baur, die Lehre von der Dreieinigkeit*, I., p. 648; *Dorner, Lehre von der Person Christi*, I., p. 904, 1016, and especially *Ullmann's Monograph: Gregorius von Nazianz, der Theologe: Darmst.*, 1825. *Gass.—Beck.*

Gregory, of Nyssa, a younger brother of Basil the Great (see Art.), to whom, chiefly, he owed his education (*Ep.* X., in *Zach.*; *Socr., H. E.*; cf. *Opp.*, II., 192). Of his youth nothing is known. He first comes into notice as one who, being an Anagnost, followed a disreputable calling, then abandoned the office, and wished rather to be called a rhetorician than a Christian (*GREG., Theol. ep.*, 37). Through the reproofs and urgent appeals of Gregory of Naz., Gregory was led to resume his ecclesiastical profession; and in 371 or 372 Basil consecrated him, against his will, *B. of Nyssa* (*Opp. GREG., Naz. or.* 6, p. 136; *BASIL, ep.*, 225). His controversial rather than administrative talents may have led to this appointment; and his marriage with Theosebia (*GREG., Naz., ep.* 95; *GREG., Nyssa de virg.*, 3) seemed no hindrance. When he became Bishop the hostilities of Va-

lens against the Nicene party had already commenced. In Cappadocia, indeed, Basil had hitherto frustrated the attempts of Valens. But now the governor of Pontus, Demetrius, became a ready tool of the Emperor's plans. He accused Gregory at a Synod in Galatia (375) of official improprieties, and banished him. G. escaped from the escort of soldiers to a place of retirement. Hence, probably, the allusions in *Ep.* 6, in *Zac.*, which Roman Catholics consider proofs of his having been an anchorite. Basil appealed to Demetrius in vain on his brother's behalf (*ep. Bas.*, 237). Gregory continued in exile, harassed by the heretics, who were allured from their hiding places by imperial favor (*Gr.*, *Nas.*, 34, 35; *Opp.* II., 192). At the death of Valens, 378, matters changed, and Gregory returned to his See (*Ep.* 3, in *Zac.*). In 379 the death of Basil deeply afflicted him. In the fall of 379 he attended a Synod at Antioch, where he witnessed the death of his sister Makrina (see his *de vita Makr.*, *opp.* II., 177, &c., and *de anima et resurr.*, *opp.* III., 181, &c.). At the second general Council Gregory was prominent, even though he did not draw up the changes and additions to the Nicene creed, as *Niceph. Coll.* XIII., 13, reports. His influence at that time appears from the position assigned him by the Council of Constantinople (*can.* 2), and a law of Theodosius (*Cod. Theod.*, I, XVI., t. I., 1, 3; cf. *Soz.*, *H. E.*, 7, 6; *Socr.*, *H. E.*, 5, 8, and G.'s *opp.* III., 645, &c.). G. hardly attended the Council of Constantinople in 382, having then most probably gone to Arabia on an ecclesiastical mission, during which he visited Jerusalem. This led to his *Ep. de euntibus Hierosol.*, in which he warns against the moral dangers of pilgrims. In Jerusalem he tried to adjust Church dissensions, but had his own views assailed (*Ep. ad Eustathiam Ambrosiam et Basilissam ed. Casaub.*: Lut., 1606). In 383 he seems to have returned to Constantinople, and delivered his discourse *de deitate fil. et sp. s.* (III., 494, &c.); and he there also preached, 385, the funeral sermons of Pulcheria, and of the Empress Placilla. Thenceforth dates are wanting until 394, when we meet him for the last time at a Council in Constantinople, in attendance at the consecration of the Church of the Apostles in Chalcedon, and probably preached the sermon falsely entitled (*Opp.* II., 40, &c.) *εἰς τὴν ἑαυτοῦ χριστονομίαν*. — Both in a religious and a speculative view G. was fitted to be a pillar of the mysteries of the Trinity and the incarnation. He saw well, with Athanasius, that the Nicene creed avows the absoluteness of salvation in the divinity of the Son. Whatever other traces of Origenism his system may betray, he decidedly adopts the Christian idea of the Godhead and redemption (*c. Eun. Opp.* II., 320, 390, 455, 473, 624; *Serm. de spir. adv. Maced.*, p. 18 in *Maj. cf. ep.* 2, *op. Zac.*, 360). — His works, exegetical, homilies, &c., were edited by *Front. Duc.*, 2 Tom., Paris, 1615, with an appendix by J. Gretser, 1618. A later, but very defective, edition is that of Paris, 1638, 3 Tom., fol. The *antirrheticus adv. Appollin.*, and the *testim. adv. Judæos* (falsely ascribed to Gregory, and previously known only in a Latin translation) are found

in *ZACAGNI*, *Collect. Monum. vet. eccl. græc. Rom.*, 1698. These and seven other letters and smaller writings (first edition by Carraciolus, Florence, 1731) in *GALLANDII, Bibl. vet. patr.* t. VI. Subsequently were added the *sermo adv. Arium et Sabell.*, and the *de spir. s. adv. Maced.* which A. Maius appended, with Cyril's writings, to t. VII. *Scriptor. vet. nova coll.*, then published in the *Nova Patr. Bibl.*, t. IV.: Rom., 1847, with a Latin translation. — Good critical editions: KRABINGER, *dial. de an. et res.*: Lips., 1837; *orat. catech. acced. orat. funebr. in Meld.* (1835), *Monach.* (1838); *de precatone (orat. domi.) orr.* V., Landish. (1840). A critical edition of his entire works is still wanting. — (See TILLEMONT, *Mémoires*, t. IX., 561, &c. FABRICIUS, *Bibl. gr.*, t. VIII., ed. *Harl.*, t. IX. SCHRÖCKH, K.-G., Th. XIV., 1-147. RUFF, *Gr. d. B. von Nyssa, &c.*: Lpz., 1834. HEYNS, *disput. histor.-theol. de Gr. Nyss.*: Ludg. Bat., 1835. MÖLLER, *Gr. Nyss. doctr. de hom. natura et illustravit et cum Orig. comparavit*: Halis, 1854). W. MÖLLER.*

Gregory, *Thaumaturgus*, was born in Neocæsarea, Pontus, of noble and wealthy heathen parents. His original name was Theodorus. Having, in his 14th year, lost his father, he embraced Christianity. He resolved to study law at Rome, but domestic events led him to Cæsarea, where Origen then was. Captivated by Origen's teaching he remained at Cæsarea, and became an ardent advocate of his doctrines. In 235 he went with Origen to Alexandria, there under him to prosecute his studies. In 239 he parted from Origen at Cæsarea, after having first pronounced a eulogy (still extant) upon him, in his presence. Gregory thought of living as an anchorite in Pontus. But Phædimus, B. of Amisus in Pontus, consecrated him B. of Neocæsarea (244), where there were then but 17 Christians; at Gregory's death (270) there were but 17 heathen. It is said that he was instructed for this office in a vision by the Apostle John, at the command of the mother of Christ, and that he at once wrote down the instructions, which are found in Gregory's writings as his confession. The confession refers to the doctrine of the Trinity. Gregory of Nyssa says he saw the original in Neocæsarea, but additions seem to have been made to it during the Arian controversies. The same writer relates many wonders performed by Gregory, especially in subduing demons. Hence his surname. He well nigh annihilated heathenism in that region. He fled from the Decian persecution. Afterwards he instituted a general festival of the Martyrs, at which he allowed all manner of heathen amusements, in the hope of thus leading more persons to embrace Christianity. The effect was bad, for on the invasion of (probably) the Goths (262), the inhabitants seem to have rivalled the barbarians, in cruelty and rapacity towards their fellow believers, as the canonical epistle of Gregory, presented at the Council of Constantinople, reports. A plague, foretold by Gregory, which broke out in that region, was stayed by his intercession, and those who embraced the faith, were healed. Numbers were thus added to the Church. He earnestly combated the views of the heretic Paul of Samo-

sata; but Gregory himself was afterwards accused of Sabellianism, because he did not use the expressions which were subsequently established as orthodox.—We have, alas, but little information of Gregory's life, the panegyric of Gregory of Nyssa not being reliable. He endeavored to secure currency for Origen's views, in a practical form, in the regions of Pontus and Cappadocia.—(His works were published by G. Vossius, *Mogunt.*, 1604, 4to. They are also in *Biblioth. Gallandii*, T. 3. The *Paneg. ad Orig.* was issued by Bengel, Stuttg., 1722, 8vo. There is a biogr. of Gregory by Nic. M. PALLAVICINI, Rome, 1644, 8vo., and J. L. BOYE, *Diss. de Greg. Thaum.*: Jen. 1703, 4to.).

KLOSE.*

Gregory, Bishop of Tours, was born c. 540, at Averna (Clermont), in Auvergne, of a distinguished family. His original name, Georgius Florentius, was exchanged in honor of his maternal grandfather, B. Gregory of Langres. His father died young, and he was educated by his uncle, B. Gallus of Clermont. His restoration from a dangerous sickness led him to devote himself to the Church. Whilst still a youth his uncle also died, and his mother went to live with relatives in Burgundy. He was placed under one Austin, in Averna, a priest well versed in the Scriptures. Another illness (c. 563) led him to visit the grave of St. Martin in Tours, where he was restored. King Sigibert inducted him into the See of Tours (c. 573) after his election by the clergy. He not only discharged his episcopal duties with zeal, but actively promoted the political interests of the city. This service was rendered the more difficult by the war between Sigibert and his brother, Chilperich, which afterward involved the possession of Tours. By favoring the friends of Sigibert at a time when Chilperich held the city, Gregory excited the enmity of the other party. One of these, Ludast, to avenge himself upon Gregory for having had him deposed from the office of a Count of Tours, accused Gregory of slandering the Queen. Gregory was cited for trial, and purged himself by an oath of the accusation, and so impressed Chilperich that he sought to conciliate him. But Gregory would not yield. After C.'s death his brother Guntram, until then King of Burgundy, seized Tours, and gave Gregory new proofs of his confidence. Guntram, however, did not become the heir of Sigibert, but the son of Chilperich, who, with his mother, Brunhild, held Gregory in high esteem, and often called him to the court for counsel. Gregory died Nov. 17, 594.—His first work was a history of the miracles of S. Martin, in 4 books (written 576–94). Then followed a Hist. of Saints; the Miracles wrought at the grave of St. Julian; the Renown of the Martyrs; Lives of the Fathers; the Renown of Confessions; Biographies of 23 distinguished Gallic priests. These would probably all have been forgotten had he not added—Ten books of Frankish history, which are the chief source for that period. This work was first printed in Paris, 1511–12. In 1599 Ruinart published a critical edition. In 1610 it was translated into French by Claude Bonnet, and subsequently by others. It appeared, 1847–49, in a German

translation in Würzburg, and, in 1851, in a collection of early histories, faithfully translated by Wm. Giesebrecht, with a full introduction. Gregory's material has been well worked up by *Aug. Thierry* in his *Recits des temps merovingiens*: Paris, 1840.—(See LÖBEL, Gr. v. Tours u. seine Zeit: Lpz., 1839). KLÜPFEL.*

Gregory, of Utrecht, a pupil of Boniface, after whose death Gregory took charge of the See of Utrecht, without being Bishop. He descended from the royal Merovingian house, and was born c. 707; his father's name was Albricius, his mother Wastrade. He had several brothers, two of whom were murdered by robbers. His grandmother, Addula, was prioress of Pfalz, where, c. 722, he attracted the attention of Boniface, and in turn became so attached to the strange preacher that he resolved to join him on foot if his grandmother refused him a horse. Thenceforth he untiringly followed B. After the martyrdom of B. and Bishop Eoban, the See of Utrecht remained vacant for a time, and Gregory took charge, with the approbation of Stephan II. and Pipin, of the Friesland mission. He had an English priest, Alubert, ordained to perform episcopal functions. He established a school in Utrecht, which was attended by youth of all the adjacent tribes, and yielded many able teachers and bishops for the German Church. Gregory died in 781. In 778 his left side was disabled by paralysis, but he continued his labors in the school. He breathed his last in Salvator's Church, where, probably, he was buried. His nephew, Alberich, was his successor.—*Liudger*, his pupil, wrote an affectionate biography of Gregory, which, however, tells us more of Boniface than of Gregory.—(Cf. BROWER, *sidera illustrium et sanctorum virorum, qui Germ. ornarunt. Mogunt.*, 1616. MABILLON, *Acta S. B.*, III., 2, p. 319. *Act. S. Boll. Aug. V.*, p. 252. RETTBERG, K.-G. Deutschl., II., 531–4. NEANDER, Ch. H.).

DR. PRESSER.*

Grotius (Hugo de Groot).—This renowned Dutch statesman, philologist, and jurist, was born at Delft, April 10, 1583. His father was Burgomaster at Delft, and a curator of the University of Leyden. He gave early proofs of superior talents; in his 16th year published an edition of Marcianus Capella. The Remonstrant Uytenbogaard was his religious instructor, Francis Junius and Jos. Scaliger his tutors in the sciences. The great statesman, Oldenbarneveld, took Grotius with him, 1598, on his embassy to France, where Henry IV. honored him with a gift of his portrait and a gold chain. Subsequently James I., of England, received him kindly. Grotius especially distinguished himself as a jurist, and was early appointed to high offices of State. But he soon became involved in the theological disputes of his country, taking sides with the Arminians (see Art.). After the victory of the Gomarists at the Synod of Dort (see Art.) Grotius was sentenced to imprisonment for life in the castle of Lowenstein (1519). The ingenuity of his wife effected his escape thence in a book-chest (1521). He travelled in disguise to Franco, where Louis XIII. welcomed him, and bestowed on him a pension of 3000 livres. But in France also he

suffered from the hatred of the Calvinists. The church at Charenton refused fellowship with him. On the contrary learned Romanists in Paris treated him with great kindness. Before long, however, Richelieu became offended at Grotius' refusal to engage fully in the service of France, and had him dismissed. Grotius returned to Holland, trusting to the influence of the new regent, Henry Frederick, but the Gomarists compelled him to leave again. At the solicitation of Christina of Sweden he went, 1634, to Stockholm, where he was appointed counsellor of State and ambassador to the French court, where he remained ten years. Returning to Sweden by way of Holland, he was honorably received at Amsterdam. Party animosity had abated, and amends were made for previous wrongs. Grotius resolved to spend his last days in his native land. Accordingly, after rendering an account of his mission at the Swedish court, he begged and obtained leave to retire. But exposure during a shipwreck on his way home brought on sickness, and he died at Rostock, Aug. 28, 1645. His corpse was taken to Delft, and interred in the family vault.—The theological merits of Grotius (which alone we can notice here) are considerable. Especially deserving mention are his *exegetical contributions*. His *Annotationes in libros evangeliorum*, &c. (Amst., 1641, fol.); *Annot. in Ep. ad Philemon*. (ib. 1642, 8vo.; 1646, 8vo.); *Annot. in Vet. T.* (Paris, 1664, III., fol.), and *Annot. in N. T.* (Paris, 1644, II.), were long shunned by Calvinists. G. J. L. VOGEL and J. C. DÜDERLEIN, first drew them from their obscurity. They proved acceptable for their liberality, and philologico historical method, in which latter respect G. was the forerunner of *Ernesti* (see Art.). His *de veritate relig. chr.*, 1627, and often afterwards, found most favor with all parties, it was translated even into Arabic, Chinese, Malay (see *Apologists*). Some of his historical works are valuable sources for Eccl. History (as the *Hist. Gothorum, Vandal. et Longob.*, 1655, and the *Annales et hist. de rebus Belg. ab obitu Philippi*, &c.), and he discussed some questions in canon law (*de imperio summarum potestatum circa sacra. Comm. posth. Opp. theol.*, III., 201, &c.). His theological works were collected and published under the title: *Opera theologica*: Amst., 1679, III., fol.; and Basil, 1731., IV., fol.—(See BAYLE, *Dict. and Bibl. univers.* BOUGINÉ, *Handb. d. Lit.-Gesch.*, II., 375, &c. SCHRÖCKE, *K.-G.*, V., 246, &c. BRANDT, *Hist. van het Leven d. Heeren Huig de Groot*: Amst., 1732, II. BUTLER, *Life of Grotius*: Lond., 1827. II. LUDEN, *Hugo Gr.*, &c.: Berlin, 1806).

HAGENBACH.*

Grynæus.—The distinguished theologians of this name were of Suabian origin, but natives of Basel.—1. *Simon Grynæus*, born at Vehrigen, 1493, was the son of Jacob Gryner (Latinized into Grynæus.—Cf. *Virgil, Aen.*, IV., 345; *Ecl.*, VI., 72). Having early exhibited fine talents, he was placed in the renowned school of Simler and Gerbel, in Pforzheim, then entered the University of Vienna, where he graduated with credit as *M. A.* From Vienna he went to Buda and taught school. But his leaning to the views of Reuchlin and Erasmus soon

roused the Dominicans there against him. From 1524–29 he was Professor of Greek at Heidelberg, where he lived in straightened circumstances, and excited the enmity of the other professors by his attachment to the sacramental doctrine of Zwingli. In 1529 he went to Spire to meet Melancthon at the Diet, and obtain another situation. There Dr. J. Faber had almost effected his imprisonment; his escape was thought very providential (*Melan. on Dan.* 10; *Camerar. Biog. of Melan.*). In 1529 he was called to Basel, through Burgom. J. Meyer, and Oecolamp. (*Herzog, Oecolamp.*, II., 176), to take the place of Erasmus. The agitations of the times gave him an opportunity of visiting England, where he was requested to prepare the opinion of the Reformed theologians in the matter of the divorce of Henry VIII. He prepared this paper after his return to Basel. At first he coincided with the Swiss theologians in favor of the divorce, but afterwards changed his views, through Bucer's influence. During the eventful year, 1531, Grynæus witnessed the death of Oecolamp., whose successor in office he would have been, but for his unwillingness to compete with Myconius. In 1534 Ulrich of Würtemberg sought his assistance in introducing the Reformation in his country; unhappily his labors there were hindered by Schnepf. G. took an active part in the first Helvetic (2d Basel) Conf. (see Art.), and in the Conferences held to induce the Swiss to accept the Wittenberg Concord of 1536. His last public service, worthy of mention, was his participation, as the only Swiss delegate, in the Conference of Worms, 1540. He died of the plague in 1541, deeply lamented. As a Greek scholar he had few equals, and in character he was modest, courteous, and peaceable. He sustained intimate relations with all the leading men of his day, and was a bosom friend of Bucer. He was the shining star of his family, which flourished in Basil for three centuries (cf. *Six. Gr., clarissimi quondam academice Basil. theol. et philol., Epistolæ. Accedit index auctorum ejusdem Gr. Opp. et studio edit. Coll. et ed. GUIL. THEOD. STREUBER, Basil.* 1847. A biogr. sketch by Streuber in the *Basil. Taschenb.*, 1853. MELANCHTHON in the *Corpus Ref.*, T. IV., No. 2418–19; JOACH. CAMERARIUS in the pref. to *Theophrasti opp.*: Basil, 1541).—2) *John Jacob Grynæus*, son of Simon's nephew Thomas, born Oct. 1, 1540, at Berne, where his father was professor of theology. In 1546 the family removed to Basel, where John was persuaded by Simon Sulzer to embrace the Lutheran view of the Lord's Supper. After occupying other stations he became, 1575, Prof. of the Old Test. at Basel, having become convinced of the error of the ubiquitarian dogma. His situation in Basel having become unpleasant through the animosity of Sulzer and others, he gladly accepted a call, 1584, from John Casimir of the Palat. to Heidelberg. In Jan. 1586, after Sulzer's death, he returned to Basel, and became Antistes of the church there. His activity in this, and the offices therewith connected, was highly commended. In 1588 he attended the disputation at Berne, as the delegate from Basel. In 1612 he became blind. He died Aug. 13,

1617. He was the author of several exegetical works on the Old and New Test., and many smaller theological treatises (cf. *Athenæ Ravennæ*, p. 33. Ochs, VI., 449. *J. J. Gr. vita et mors, &c.*, ed. a JOH. JAC. ET HIERON. A BRUNN: Basil, 1618. *Epistolæ familiares, &c.*, ed. Apinus: Norimb. et Altorf., 1720).—3) *John Grynæus*, born 1705, † 1744, a distinguished Orientalist, and co-founder of the Free Grynæan Institute in Basel.—4) *Simon Grynæus*, born 1725, † 1799, the last of the family, and known as the translator of several French and English antideistic works. STREUBER.*

Gualbert (*Giovanni*) of Pistoja, founder of the Coenobite order of Vallombrosa, in the Apennines, near Florence, lived in the 11th century. He entered the monastery of St. Minias, and took orders in 1038. But desirous of living by a more rigid rule he went to Vallombrosa, 1039, and became an anchorite. Others soon joined him, and an order was founded, consisting of religious, serving brethren, and laymen. This introduction of the last class, designed to relieve the religious from all secular cares, was among the earliest instances of the kind. Other monasteries adopted G.'s plan, and joined Vallombrosa under Gualbert as abbot. He died 1093, and was canonized by Celestine III. in 1193. The order never spread extensively, having numbered but 50 monasteries in Italy, and scarcely found entrance into France. The original dress was gray—hence the members were called Gray Friars. Under Abbot Blasius of Milan, 1500, they assumed a brown dress, and in 1662 they united with the Silvestrians and wore a black garb. In 1681 they again separated from the Silvestrians.—(See *Joan. G. vita in Mabill. Acta SS.*, II., 273. HURTER, *Gesch. Pabst Innoc. III.*, Th. IV., 133, &c.). NEUDECKER.*

Guardian, the name of the superior of a Franciscan monastery. In mediæval Latin the word signifies *custos*, from *guardia*, *warda*. As the Franciscans humbly assumed the name of *fratres minores*, so they declined high-titled offices, such as abbot, prior (see *Du Cange, s. v.*). HERZOG.*

Guibert.—After the death of Victor II. the Empress Agnes appointed Guibert, a talented and influential priest in Parma, Chancellor of the kingdom of Italy. His first business was to assert the King's rights in the election of Nicholas II. (Dec., 1058), who was under Hildebrand's control. This placed Guibert in bitter antagonism to Hildebrand. Guibert succeeded in having the law of election so framed, that the King's consent was necessary; but at the next election, Alex. II. was chosen without regard to Henry II. or Agnes, and inducted by the Normans. Guibert now sought to withstand this, by taking advantage of the hatred which prevailed in all upper Italy against the rigoristic party, and thus inciting the Lombards to demand a Pope approved by the King and Upper Italy. Cardinal Hugo the Wise, and Prefect Cencius opposed Hildebrand's Pope. Thus it happened that Cadalus was chosen Pope at Basel (Oct. 1061), and invested with the crozier by the King, as Honorius II. Subsequently his election was annulled, and Guibert was deprived of his office. But after the death of Honorius

(1069) he again came forth and succeeded in being chosen the Archb. of Ravenna, partly through Agnes, who then had influence at Rome. This See was regarded as a step towards the pontificate. Perhaps it was thought at Rome that such a favor would most effectually conquer Guibert's hostility. Guibert indeed feigned submission to Alexander II. (who did not trust him), and took the oath of allegiance. But whether he did this in the hope of thus securing further advancement, and so the ultimate success of the principle for which he had been contending, or from a real change of sentiment, cannot be decided. If the former motive predominated, it was unfortunate for his scheme that Alexander died so soon after Guibert's consecration (April 12, 1073), and during his absence from Rome. Hildebrand did not refuse the tiara himself. Guibert returned to Rome, and acknowledged Gregory VII. His only chance now was to succeed Gregory. But his impatience found early occasion to excite the Lombards against the Pope, who was seized with a dangerous illness. Had Gregory died then, his scheme would have perished, and Guibert would have introduced his measures. But the Pope recovered, summoned Guibert to a Synod (Lent, 1075) to answer for his course, and on his not appearing suspended him. The enemies of the Pope now gathered around Guibert. In 1080 thirty bishops met at Brixen and elected him Pope; in 1084 a Synod convoked at Rome by Henry IV. confirmed this choice. He was consecrated as Clement III. The goal of his ambition was now reached, but at the same time he excited the implacable hatred of Gregory and his party. Gregory's death, in 1085, did not avail him now; he never had peace in Rome. Anathema after anathema was hurled against him. In 1089 he was compelled to leave Rome under a promise never to resume the papal chair. Still we often find him visiting the city, and the Emperor remained true to him. In 1099 Paschal II. drove him from his refuge at Alba. Clement fled to a castle and died in Sept. 1100. He was buried in Ravenna, but to put an end to wonders said to occur at his grave Paschal ordered his corpse to be dug up and cast into a stream.—(See STENZEL'S *Gesch. Deutschl.*, &c. JAFFÉ'S *Regesta pontif. Rom.*, 443–7). A. VOGEL.*

Guido, of Arezzo, a Benedictine monk who flourished under John XIX. (1024–33), who invited him to Rome on account of his skill as a musician. But the climate disagreeing with him, he returned to the monastery of Pomposa, whence envious monks had expelled him, and remained there until his death (c. 1050). His celebrity as a musician rested upon his supposed contribution to the science—the invention of notes, of different parts, of pianos; but these are of an earlier or later date (FORKEL, *Gesch. d. Musik.*: Lpz., 1801). His real merits consist in his having reduced existing materials to a practical method.—(See GERBERT, *de cantu et musica sacra*, T. II., 42, &c. BUSBY, *History of Music*. BRENDL, *Gesch. d. M.*, &c.: Lpz., 1855). PALMER.*

Guido (*Guy, Wido*), des Bres, the evangelist and martyr of the Holland Walloon Church,

was born c. 1540, at Mons, in Hennegau, and trained in the Roman Church, until by reading the Scriptures he learned evangelical truth. Persecuted at home he fled to London, and joined the Walloon Church established there. Thence he returned home to labor as an itinerant evangelist, preaching wherever he could find hearers, especially in Lisle. When the congregation there was exterminated, Guido fled to Ghent, and there published "*le bâton de la foi*," a polemic work gathered from the C. Fathers. In order to prosecute classical studies he went to Geneva, and became a decided adherent of Calvin's doctrine. Returning home again he resumed his former labors, and established several congregations. After the conquest of Geneva (1667) Guy was taken captive in flight, and after seven weeks imprisonment was put to death. He met his end with Christian fortitude, and even joy. La Grange, who had been captured with him was his companion in martyrdom.—Guy's prophecy, that his blood would water the seed of truth sown, was largely fulfilled. The gospel was indeed suppressed in his native land, but the scattered witnesses of it spread it in other countries.—(See *Histoire d. Martyrs*: Gen., 1617. LE LONG, Kort hist. Verhaal v. d. oorsprong d. nederl. gereform. Kerken, &c.: Amst., 1741, 4to. G. BRANDT, Hist. d. reform. in en ontrent d. Nederl.: Amst., 1671. YPEY EN DERMOUT, Geschiedenis d. Nederl. Hervormde Kerk: Breda, 1818, sq. Especially the reply to this last: VAN D. KEMP, de Eere d. nederl. hervormde Kerk: Rotterd., 1830. The histories of the Netherland Evang. Church by JACOBSON, and M. GOEBEL. M. GOEBEL.*

Guilbert, St. (born 1083), founder of the order of Guilbertines, was the son of Josselin, lord of Sempringham and Tyrington, of which, after completing his theological studies, he took charge. He built a house designed for seven young women, resolved to remain virgins, where they lived in the strictest seclusion. Other similar houses having been established, Guilbert besought Pope Eugene to place them under the Cistercians. Eugene refused, and Guilbert wishing to provide other means for managing his institutions, established houses for canons, but strictly separated from the others. The women lived according to St. Benedict's rule, the men after St. Augustine's. The society soon numbered 2200 men and several thousand women. Asylums for the poor, sick, infirm, and for widows and orphans were added. G. died in 1189. Innocent III. canonized him in 1202. At the Reformation the order embraced 21 houses, and 11 double-monasteries. But it did not spread beyond England.—(HURTER, Innocent III., &c.; IV., 230). HERZOG.*

Gundulf, the originator of what was condemned as a heretical movement, c. 1080–1130, in the dioceses of Cambrai and Arras, and of Liege. Of Gundulf himself nothing is known but that he was an Italian, and moved to Upper Italy probably to find work at his trade, weaving. The followers whom he succeeded in winning over to his views declared, on being summoned before the Bishop of Liege, that they were disciples of Gundulf, but held no doctrines at variance with the Church. On being sum-

moned before Bishop Gerhard of Cambrai, however, they were accused of teaching flagrant heresies, denouncing the visible Church, its sacraments, and all the peculiarities of the Roman Church, especially infant baptism, marriage, the priesthood, &c. They did not attempt to refute these charges, but recanted, and so were released.—(See D'ACHERY, *Spicil. ed.* II., T. I., 607–24. MANSI, *Concilia*, T. XIX., 423, &c. HAHN's *Gesch. d. Ketzers im Mittelalter*, I., 39, &c.). A. VOGEL.*

Gustavus Adolphus, King of Sweden, and the preserver of Protestantism in Germany (born Dec. 9, 1594, at Stockholm, and reigned from 1611 to 1632), was the son of Charles I., whose grandfather, Gustavus Vasa, had established the Reformation in Sweden, and Christina, a princess of Holstein-Gottorp. He had natural abilities of a high order, and received a careful education. In military affairs especially he took a deep interest; so that when only 15 years of age, he begged his father, but without gaining his point, to give him the chief command in the war with Russia (1610). However in 1611 he took part in the campaign, and successfully carried out several expeditions. His father died in the same year (Oct. 30), and Gustavus Adolphus assumed the government of Sweden, having been declared of age by the Diet. He brought the wars which his father had commenced to a more or less successful termination; the war with Denmark in 1613; that with Russia in 1617, after gaining considerable advantages by the peace of Stolbowa; and that with Poland, through the intervention of France, in 1629, having made extensive conquests in Prussian-Poland. In the management of the internal affairs of his kingdom, he earned for himself the reputation of a wise and energetic ruler, in spite of his many wars. He had the good fortune to be assisted by the judicious counsel of his chancellor, Axel Oxenstiern, a distinguished statesman, who served him with self-denying faithfulness. The ecclesiastical importance of Gustavus Adolphus rests on the part which he took in the 'Thirty Years' War. Of late years much has been written concerning the motives which induced him to engage in this war, and his plans connected with it; and the views on this subject have undergone essential changes. It was customary, formerly, among Protestant historians, to magnify Gustavus Adolphus with undue partiality and great naivete, as the champion of Protestant faith, who had come to Germany solely and alone in order to save the evangelical cause from destruction; now men like Gfrörer, Leo, and Barthold, conceive him to have been an ambitious conqueror, who hypocritically had assumed a religious mask, and as a foreigner forcing his way into Germany, deserves to be put on a level with the French. These new views, as is generally the case, have been carried to extremes. Taking into consideration the antecedents of Gustavus Adolphus; remembering that he was continually engaged in wars and conquests; that he strove to gain the Polish crown, the dignity of Russian czar, the Danish kingdom; and that the great end of his ambition was to secure for Sweden the position of a first class

European power — it cannot be denied that his participation in the German war must likewise appear in the light of the policy of a conqueror. It was, however, no sudden resolution which induced him to take this step; but a purpose that gradually ripened and attained its maturity on occasion of the siege of Stralsund. In May, 1628, Gustavus Adolphus sent ammunition to this city, and offered further assistance; in June he entered into an offensive treaty with the burghers, and detailed many of his soldiers to their aid, who remained in Stralsund after the siege had been raised. From this time on he took an active part in the war. As early as the month of January, 1628, he had prepared his Diet for such an event; in the summer of 1629 he took counsel with Oxenstiern in reference to it, and in October formally laid the subject before the Diet, which at first strongly opposed his plans. But Gustavus Adolphus soon succeeded in gaining over to his views a committee appointed on the occasion, and this committee issued a memorial refuting the objections that had been brought forward against the war. Meanwhile Richelieu had set his eye upon the King of Sweden, as a fit instrument to humble Austria; and hence helped him to conclude the peace with Poland mentioned above. Further negotiations in view of the pecuniary assistance offered by France, were, at this time, without result. But soon the opportunity for carrying his plan into execution, appeared to Gustavus Adolphus to have arrived. The German princes grew more and more dissatisfied with the rule of Wallenstein, and his fall could be foreseen; and so the King, although he did not know in what manner he would be received, left Stockholm (May 19 to 29, 1630), with an army of scarcely 15,000 men, after having solemnly bade farewell to his Diet, and called on God as his witness that he did not engage in this expedition out of love for war, but chiefly in order to free from the papal yoke his oppressed co-religionists. On June 25th he landed on the island of Usedom; near Peenemünde. A pamphlet written by his directions, and circulated in Germany, set forth his motive in undertaking the enterprise. His progress was rapid. The old Duke of Pomerania, Bogislav, was compelled to open to him the gates of Stetin, and to promise his Dukedom in the event of his death. His brother-in-law, the Elector George William of Brandenburg, and the Elector John George of Saxony, hesitated, at first, to aid him, and tried to remain neutral. But having succeeded (Jan., 1631) in effecting a treaty, at Bärwalde, with Charnacé, the French ambassador, according to which France for five years was to pay a subsidy of 400,000 rix dollars, and Sweden to carry on the war against Austria with an army of 16,000 cavalry, and 30,000 infantry, he forced the two Electors to enter into an alliance with him. The Saxon army now joined that of Sweden, and on Sept. 7, 1631, the battle of Leipsic was fought, which, in spite of the shameful flight of the Saxons, resulted in the total defeat of the imperialists. That Gustavus A., after this victory, did not immediately hasten to Vienna, and compel the Emperor to conclude a peace favorable to the Protestants, is regarded

by Gfrörer and others as an evidence that the Swedish King was more anxious to secure for himself a fruitful part of Germany, than to save the evangelical cause. Gustavus Adolphus now overran Würzburg, where he established a Swedish government, and in four weeks conquered Aschaffenburg, Frankfurt, and Mayence. Then efforts were made by Brandenburg, Saxony and Hesse, to bring about a peace; but without success. It was at this time that Gustavus A. made certain demands, so it is said, of Bavaria and the Catholic powers of the empire (compare the account of Khevenhüller, Vol. XII., p. 85, 86); declaring, amongst the rest, that since he had saved the German empire from destruction, he ought to be elected Roman King. However, it is highly improbable that Gustavus Adolphus made a declaration of this kind. The only cotemporary historian who mentions the circumstance is Khevenhüller; and he confesses that the demands of which he speaks, had become known merely by common report. In Protestant works there is no intimation corroborating Khevenhüller's account. It is true that Gustavus Adolphus, at an interview with the ambassadors of the city of Nuremberg, expressed himself to the following effect: "What he had conquered, he intended to keep; he would not be satisfied with a few months' pay, like a strolling soldier; and if he returned any part of his conquered possessions, he could claim the same *jura superioritatis* over them, which the Emperor formerly had; moreover the old constitution of the empire was worthless; the Protestant league ought to separate from the Catholic, and choose a head of its own, especially for the war." The position taken by Gustavus A., as here set forth — provided that his sentiments have been correctly reported — was a necessary consequence of the enterprise which he had commenced, and could not be found fault with in the then state of affairs, especially as there was not a single prince in Germany capable of directing the Protestant party. After having defeated Tilly, on the Lech (April 3, 1632), the King entered Bavaria, caused an oath of allegiance to him and his heir to be taken at Augsburg, and reached Munich, where he made himself very popular. In November of the same year, the command of the imperial army having once more been entrusted to Wallenstein, the celebrated battle of Lützen (in Saxony) was fought. The Swedes were victorious, but Gustavus Adolphus was slain. His death was a great misfortune for the Protestant cause. Dissensions paralyzed the efficiency of the League, and in consequence of the catastrophe it suffered at Nördlingen, the war was protracted for fourteen years longer. Whatever may be thought of the motives which brought Gustavus Adolphus to Germany, it is certain that he was no stranger to religious enthusiasm, that he began his enterprise in a magnanimous spirit, giving by his interference a favorable turn to the evangelical cause, and that the preservation of the Protestant party in Germany has secured the liberty of intellectual development. — Sources for the history of Gustavus Adolphus are: *E. G. Geijer, Geschichte Schwedens*, Vol. III.: Hamburg, 1836. A.

Gfrörer, Gustav Adolf, Koenig von Schweden u. s. Zeit: Stuttgart, 1837 (3d ed. 1852). *H. Leo*, Lehrbuch d. Universalgeschichte., Vol. III., 3d revised edition: Halle, 1853. *F. W. Barthold*, Geschichte d. grossen Deutschen Kriegs: Stuttg., 1842. *K. G. Helbig*, Gustav Adolf u. d. Kurfuersten v. Sachsen u. Brandenburg: Leipzig, 1854. KLÜPFEL.—*De Schreinitz*.

Gustavus Adolphus Society.—This is unquestionably one of the most important movements of the modern Evangelical Church. The immediate occasion of it was the assemblage of a vast concourse of people at the Sweden monument at Lützen, the spot where Gustavus Adolphus fell, on Nov. 6, 1832, the 2d centennial anniversary of his heroic death. Schild, a merchant of Leipsic, proposed making a six-penny collection throughout Germany, for the purpose of erecting a suitable memorial of the hero. A committee was appointed with Dr. Grosse mann of Leipsic as chairman. He conceived the plan of the institution as it now exists, desiring that a monument more enduring and appropriate than any of brass or stone might be reared in commemoration of the virtues and services of Gustavus Adolphus. The committee accordingly issued an appeal, Dec. 8, 1832, soliciting six-penny contributions for a society "to aid needy fellow-believers, and relieve Protestant congregations in distress, both at home and in other countries." A similar committee to that in Leipsic was formed in Dresden, with Dr. Käuffer as chairman. Both met and adopted statutes which were sanctioned by the government, Oct. 4, 1834. The management of the institution rested with the societies of those two cities, each presiding in turn, but that at Leipsic administering the funds. Thus the *Gustavus Adolphus Society* sprang into existence. But it did not meet with expected sympathy. The contributions from Southern Germany were very slender; and although annual reports were published, it was scarcely known beyond Saxony. The Kings of Prussia and Sweden indeed took interest in its success, but on Nov. 6, 1841, its capital amounted to only 12,850 thalers, an insignificant sum in comparison with the wants of the society. Increasing demands for help suggested the necessity of some changes in the statutes. But before these were made *Legrand* had urged, at a conference of clergymen in Basel, the formation of a society to aid needy Evang. churches; and whilst this matter was agitated, *Dr. Zimmermann*, court-preacher in Darmstadt, issued an appeal, Oct. 31, 1841, in behalf of a similar object—neither knowing of the earlier movement in Saxony. The appeal of Dr. Zimmermann, which was widely circulated, called forth warm responses both in Germany and Switzerland.—After an understanding between Dr. Zimmermann and the Saxon Society, a general meeting was held in Leipsic in Sept., 1842, when the friends of the new movement and the old society were consolidated into "The Evang. Society of the Gustavus-Adolphus Institution." Its seat of government and central-point should continue in Leipsic. At the second meeting in Sept., 1843, delegates attended from 22 auxiliary societies, and others were present from countries beyond Germany, which wished

to unite with the Society, especially from Switzerland, where *Legrand's* movement had succeeded. At Frankfurt the rules of the Society were discussed and adopted. Its object is stated to be, a union of Protestants to aid their brethren in and beyond Germany, who are unable to provide themselves with the means of grace, and so might be lost to their Church. A Central Board, located in Leipsic, was at the head of the Society. In each country or province a society was established with branches and auxiliaries. The general society hold meetings at least every three years, and at different places, to which national or provincial societies send delegates. Its means consist of the annual income on investments, contributions, bequests, and church collections. Of the receipts of the national society one-third is appropriated by them to needy congregations; one-third either to be sent to the Central Board in Leipsic for congregations in non-Protestant districts, or to be remitted directly to such, by the National Society; one-third to be paid into the treasury of the Central Board, either for investment or disbursement, as the society may desire. The Board makes an annual report on Nov. 6, the anniversary of the death of Gustavus Adolphus.—Thus the old society was merged in this new arrangement, and its funds were accordingly transferred. The society now prospered. The King of Bavaria, indeed, forbade the organization of auxiliaries there, or even the acceptance of aid by any of his subjects (decree of Feb. 10, 1844), and denounced the movement; but the interest of the King of Prussia in the society increased, and he favored the union of the Prussian Soc. with the general Soc., which was effected at Göttingen, in Sept., 1844, when the existence of more than 150 associations was reported.—The first three general meetings were necessarily occupied, mainly, with the constitution of the society. But at that held in Stuttgart, 1845, the wants of suffering brethren claimed more earnest attention. The Central Board reported that 42,000 thalers had been given to 62 congregations.—In Sept., 1846, the society met in Berlin. A period of trial now commenced. Dr. Rupp in Königsberg had left the National Church and organized a free congregation. And yet he attended the Berlin meeting as a delegate from the Königsberg society. It was decided in a preliminary meeting that he could not be allowed a seat. This decision gave rise to a violent controversy. It was denounced as a violation of Christian love. Many left the society, and still continue estranged. But multitudes also joined it in order to oppose Rupp's exclusion. The decision was hailed as an evidence of vigorous life. At Berlin 66,000 thalers were reported as having been appropriated to 134 congregations.—At the next meeting in Darmstadt, 1847, peace was restored. It was resolved that the title of a delegate to a seat should be determined by the assembly. This year 73,000 thalers were reported to have been paid for the maintenance of 169 congregations. During the next two years, however, the zeal of many cooled, and the receipts of the society fell, in 1848, to 37,000 thalers, and in 1849 to 21,000. This discouraging prospect served a good pur-

se. It chastened the rejoicings of the true ends of the cause, and inflamed their zeal.—The 8th general meeting was held in Eisenach, 1850. Although new life inspired the members of the society, more effectual aid was needed; for the applications increased weekly. It was then resolved that this society should cooperate with the work of the Inner Mission, without an amalgamation of the two. The receipts had risen again to 40,000 thalers, and 9 congregations were assisted.—At the 9th meeting in Hamburg, 1851, the society in Old avaria was admitted; 47,000 thalers were received, and 218 congregations aided. In 1852 nine churches built by the society were consecrated. The society that year met in Wiesbaden, and each day's business was preceded by public worship, a rule observed ever since. The receipts were 58,000 thalers, and 236 congregations were aided.—In 1853 the society met at Coburg. A general awakening to the importance of its mission was reported. New societies had been formed in various places, including ladies' societies; 63,000 thalers were received, and 293 congregations aided. A course of prosperity had now opened. At the 13th meeting, at Heidelberg, 1855, the receipts reported were 7,000 thalers, and 290 congregations assisted. During the previous year a Swedish society had been organized at Gothenburg. The speakers, indeed, drew sad pictures of existing destitutions, but the blessing of God was attending the society's efforts.—At present the union consists of 46 main, and 1000 branch societies, and extends its labors to all parts of the world. It has a vested capital of 35,000 thalers.—Besides accomplishing so much in the instances named, this society has aroused evangelical Christians to a sense of their duty to their destitute and suffering brethren, and so given an impulse to other beneficent movements.—In conclusion we mention some of the periodicals published in the interest of the Society.—The "Darmstädter Bote," ed. by Dr. Grossmann, and Dr. Zimmermann. The "Märkische Bote," ed. by Belermann. The "Thüringer Bote," ed. by Schmid. The annual reports of the Society also form a running history of its operations. The Society for the publication of cheap religious works for the people, has issued a history of the Gustavus Adolphus Union; and another by Dr. Zimmermann has appeared. DR. K. ZIMMERMANN.*

Guyon (*Guion*), *Madam*, her writings, followers, and confessors, *Bertot* and *Lacombe*.—*Jeanne Marie Bouviere*, (born April 13, 1648, at Montargis in Orleans, † June 9, 1717, in Blois), was the most distinguished among all modern mystics. Her married name was *de la Mothe-Guyon*. Chiefly through her did the mystic quietism of *Molinos* (see Art.) spread among the French, Hollanders, English, and Germans, and also into the *Evangelical Church*. Although she ever remained a strict Rom. Catholic, and wished to be an *orthodox* one, she seems to have esteemed all who had true Christian love and faith. Her superior talents and deep piety, however, were mixed with the infirmities of her sex and age. The piety of her day and people consisted mainly in an observance of external forms of devotion, and full submission to the

directions of confessors of the Roman Church. To become a monk or nun was synonymous with conversion and religiousness. This sort of piety predominated in *Mad. Guyon* during the first half of her life, as she herself wrote in 1688 (*La vie de Mad. de la M.-G., écrite par elle-même*: 3 vols., Cologne, 1719).—The wealthy noble parents of *Madame Guyon* put her, a sickly and much neglected child, in the *Ursuline Couvent*. There her character was formed under strictly ascetic influences. And yet vanity and coquetry filled her heart. She read romances, the Bible, the *Imitat. of Christ*, and saints' legends. The life of *Francis of Sales* (see Art.), and his daughter, the *Lady Chantal*, made the deepest impression upon her, so that in her twelfth year she sought to imitate that woman in the severest self-inflictions. Having failed in a fraudulent attempt to get into the convent of the *Visitation*, she attempted to practice ascetic severities upon herself outside of it. Thus she inflicted upon her body the sorest chastisements, and continued this sanguinary discipline even after she had become a beautiful and gifted young woman. In her sixteenth year she married *M. Guyon*, though without loving him. The misery of this union was aggravated by the bad temper of her mother-in-law. And yet her temptations to vanity and coquetry continued. But after trying, unavailingly, to find peace by outward works, a pious Franciscan directed her to look within, and strive after spiritual communion with God. She did so, and the result was an immediate and thorough "*conversion*" (1668). Thus she found in mysticism what she had sought in vain before. Now she more decidedly renounced the world and its pleasures, and rejoiced that her beauty was marred by the small-pox. Increasing domestic troubles she bore with meekness, so that her husband thanked her on his death-bed (1676) for her self-sacrificing faithfulness. The young widow, in view of his death, cried out: "O my God, thou hast loosed my bands; I will give thanks unto thee." She immediately resolved never to marry again, although she did not take the monastic vow until 1681.

Her Franciscan counsellor had reluctantly taken the place of her former confessor, who was enraged at her conversion to mysticism. He directed her to the prioress of the *Benedictines* in Paris, *Genevieve Granger*, "a most devoted handmaid of the Lord." Following her example and advice, *Mad. Guyon* had, in 1672, on the anniversary of her "*conversion*" betrothed herself to Christ as her bridegroom, by signing an agreement, with her own blood. She also, at her friend's suggestion, made *Bertot*, an enlightened mystic, her confessor. A sacred intimacy sprang up between them, and yet she was in such a state of spiritual gloom from 1673–80, that she could not fully open her heart to him, so that *Bertot* could never fully understand her case. After his death, 1681, she inherited his spirit, so that she might aid his spiritual children. She edited his mystic writings, in 4 vols.: *Le Directeur mystique*, containing also twenty letters by herself. Now, too, her darkness was dispelled, and after providing

for her two sons, she yielded to a restive missionary impulse, under which her fanaticism reached its height, but which also opened the way for her extraordinary subsequent labors. Primarily she felt herself called to strive to convert Geneva, and secretly fled from Paris in 1681, taking, by the advice of spiritual counselors, her little daughter with her to the newly-erected establishment of *converted Catholics* at Gex, near Geneva. But she could not rest there, and was, besides, concerned for the health of her child. So she wandered forth for five years, through Savoy, Piedmont, along the Rhone to Marseilles and Genoa, without any definite aim, or apparent outward rest, and yet meanwhile attaining to the highest pinnacle of mystic perfection—to complete inner tranquillity and apathy. Lacombe, the superior of the Barnabites, who was now her spiritual adviser, exercised most influence over her. She had become slightly acquainted with him in 1671, through her brother, the Barnabite, La Mothe, and on meeting him again at Gex felt herself strongly drawn to him. Lacombe was also a disciple of Francis of Sales and Peter Molinos, and well qualified to guide her into the mystical joys of Quietism. Subsequently the pupil set an example to her teacher. Madame Guyon now discovered that her proper work was not the conversion of the Reformed, but to lead those already converted into the mysteries of the inner life. Having seen in a vision the woman mentioned in Rev. 12: 1, 2, she felt that she was to become a *mother of believers*, and to bring forth spiritual children. This vocation she thenceforth followed under severe outward sufferings, and still more painful inward struggles, during all which she was exposed to the peril of vanity and spiritual pride. During a night prayer at Gex, God revealed to her “that she was Lacombe’s spiritual mother, and he her son,” whereupon she presented herself to him as such. Thenceforth their inward communion was so close, that it operated sympathetically, or magnetically, even when they were far apart. This naturally gave rise to suspicions, although they may have been guilty of no impropriety. She calls their “union an indissoluble unity, in which she can no longer distinguish him from God himself.”

During this fanatical period Madame Guyon also felt herself suddenly impelled to teach others by voice and writings, and this in the manner of all mystics, without premeditation—under the influence of inspiration, or at least of a spiritual intuition. It was thus she composed (1683) that truly poetical work: *les Torrens*. About the same time she wrote the treatise upon the purification of the soul after death, in which she represents the woe of the damned as caused not by pains inflicted from without, but by an unsatisfied longing after God. “The fire of purgatory is no other than God himself purifying the soul by his divine righteousness.” In 1684 she wrote, in the same transported, almost unconscious magnetic state, her mystical exposition of Canticles and Revelation, and her other explanations of the Scriptures, in which, without touching upon the literal sense, she constantly finds an allegorical mystical

meaning. The “*Moyen court et très-facile de faire oraison*,” which acquired such importance, she had composed previously; it was published in 1684, and, with her “*les Torrens*,” led to her subsequent persecution. In it she commends the silent prayer of the heart, as the highest form of prayer.—Madame Guyon like her model, Mad. de Chantal, founded, shortly before her return to Paris, a congregation of the “*childhood of Jesus*,” for which she prepared a special rule. In this rule, also, she exalts the virtue of silent meditative prayer, and requires that man shall in all things become as a child, a holy simpleton. “A truly tranquil person cannot sin, so long as he maintains his tranquillity: for sin is without, not in him,” a declaration which, as was natural, was grossly misinterpreted by many of her adherents. During this period she had many revelations in transports and visions, of which, however, she spoke more cautiously in later life.—After her five years’ wanderings, either circumstances, or her heart, led her to seek L., and to his terror she found him in Vercelli, Piedmont. He accompanied her to Paris, 1686, whither she had been called. Sufferings awaited them both there. In 1687, urged by the French court, the Pope condemned Molinos and the quietistic doctrine, and a persecution of its adherents broke out. Lacombe was seized and kept in various prisons distant from Paris until his death. Madame Guyon, through her enraged brother, La Mothe, was confined, Jan., 1688, in a monastery in Paris, and rigidly examined concerning her doctrines and writings. Although resigned to her doom, and that of Lacombe, with whom she maintained a wonderful spiritual communion, and occupying her time in writing her own biography, &c., she still used all means to regain her liberty, and actually succeeded in 1689, through the influence of Mad. Maintenon. She then lived some years with her unmarried daughter, and by herself in Paris, much respected at the court and by mystical friends, whose increasing number seemed a fulfilment of her prophecy. Among these was Fenelon (see Art., and Bossuet), to whom she addressed, July, 1689, her short treatise: “The way to God and the reunion of the soul with Him.” Meanwhile, in consequence of Bossuet’s strife with Fenelon, a new persecution assailed her; neither could she refrain from efforts to multiply her spiritual family. In vain she vindicated her writings in the “*Apologie du moyen court*,” etc., 1690, and *Justification*, 1694. In 1695 she was compelled, before a court of inquiry, to retract thirty quietistic doctrines, and at the end of the year she was again seized and imprisoned for ten years in Vincennes, Vaugirard, and the Bastille. Even the wretched Lacombe was used against her, by getting him to write letters, some expressions of which bore a shameful interpretation against Madame Guyon, and in which he called on her to confess and renounce the mistakes which both had committed. When these were read, she calmly replied that Lacombe must be insane. He really became so soon after, and died in 1699, in the insane house at Charenton. In 1700 Bossuet himself declared that in the whole controversy the *consequences* of Madame Guyon’s

doctrines had nothing to do, she herself having always deprecated them;—hence, after Fénélon's overthrow, 1701, she was released from confinement. But at first she was sent into the country, to her daughter's, and then to Blois, where she spent the rest of her life, in peace and quiet, honored and admired by all around her, for her patience and resignation, and visited often by her son who lived near by, and the Bishop of Blois. No word of reproach against her enemies ever escaped her lips, but she rather vindicated them as having acted according to conviction. She lay most of the time sick, but daily attended mass in her chapel, and every other day took the sacrament. Many friends from France, Germany and England visited her, and she kept up an active correspondence with all.

A collection of her smaller works was published in 1704 by Wetstein, Amsterdam: *Opusculæ spirituales*, edited perhaps by P. Poiret (see Art.), who, 1713–22, published her entire works in 39 vols., Amst. Most of her works were also translated and published in German. Some of her poems were translated by Cowper.—The circle of her adherents was continued after her

death, including persons of rank, some of whom were Germans. Poiret, G. Arnold, and Tersteegen were of the number. Stilling, in his *Theobald*, describes the great influence of her writings (see also *Berleburg-Bible*).

M. GOEBEL.*

Gyrovagi were wandering monks, who, unwilling to submit to the restraints of a fixed abode, or to the toil of laboring for their sustenance, travelled around among the monasteries and cells of their more earnest brethren, taking each in rotation (hence their name. Isidore of Sev. calls them *circumcelliones*, see *Donatists*). The evils of such a class are obvious. They disturbed the meditative quietness of those on whose hospitality they intruded, and proved a dangerous medium of circulating slanders and heresies. Augustine (*de opere monach.* c. 28) and Cassian (*collatio* 18) in vain denounced these vagabond monks. Not until the rule of Benedict, in the 18th cent., became ascendant, was occidental monasticism reduced to cenobite regulations.—Unsettled, roving clergymen are also sometimes called Gyrovagi.—(See MARTENE, *Comm. in Regulam S. P. Bened.*: Paris, 1690, p. 53, &c.).

A. VOGEL.*

H.

Habakkuk.—In the brief book of this prophet, more than in any other, we find an energetic rebuke of sin, a noble indignation, combined with profound piety and love, at the apostasy of his beloved people. He treats his theme, also, in a manner peculiar to himself, rather placing scenes before us in the outlines of a living reality, than depicting them. In the present he sees only spoiling and violence, "strife and contention." Every sphere of social life is desolate, like a country blasted with the poisonous breath of sin. Peace has fled; anarchy prevails; law is despised; and righteousness has become a mockery (1: 3, &c.). And yet the people stop their ears against the warnings of the prophets. Therefore, the Lord must punish his people in order to break up their hardness of heart. The Chaldeans shall be the rod in his hand; they shall fall upon his people like springing leopards, and devour them like ravaging wolves (1: 8). But it is worthy of notice, that, as the prophet proceeds, he represents God himself as appearing to overthrow the reckless and sacrilegious invaders (1: 12, &c.; 2: 1, &c.). As a forerunner of the apostle he utters that great sentence of humiliation and exaltation: "the just shall live by faith" (2: 4). The condemnation of idolaters is pronounced, and the spread of the glory of God triumphantly proclaimed (2: 5, &c.; 14, &c.). The book closes with "a prayer." But only the 1st verse has the form of a prayer. The rest is intimately connected with the preceding prophecy. The fearfulness of the speedy judgments he invokes upon the Chaldeans, fills his own heart with

terror, and he implores the Lord in the midst of wrath to remember mercy. Still he cannot withhold a description of the terrible execution of vengeance. The theophany here exhibited is the most glorious to be found in the Old Test. (3: 3, &c.). And yet Habakkuk closes the scene with words full of hope and comfort (3: 17, &c.).—From the closing words it has been inferred, justly, that Habakkuk was a Levite; a fact which is clear, also, from the lyric tone and form of the last chapter. For H. wears the mantle both of a prophet and a poet; he is at once a Jeremiah and Anaph.—We know no more of him than his name, excepting an uncertain tradition has adorned his life (see DELITZSCH, *de H. vita*, &c., 1844). Luther gives his name the tender signification of "taking to one's heart," in reference to his cordial concern for his people. There is not even an inscription to indicate under whose reign he prophesied. But whatever may be advanced in favor of another period, it seems most probable, from internal evidence, especially from the great dread expressed of an *immediate* invasion of the Chaldeans, that Habakkuk prophesied under Jehoiakim.—(See UMBREIT, *Einl. zu Hab.* 276–7; the commentaries of Ewald, Hitzig, and Delitzsch; and that of Umbreit, or the minor prophets).

UMBREIT.*

Hadad.—1) The eighth of Ishmael's twelve sons, 1 Chron. 30.—2) and 3) The fourth and eighth Kings who reigned in Edom before they had one in Israel; Gen. 36: 35, 36, 39; 1 Chron. 1: 46, 47, 50–51.—4) A prince of Edom who got to Egypt when David exterminated the men

of Edom, became the brother-in-law of the King of Egypt, and after David's death attempted to recover Edom, 1 Kings 11: 14-22. — 5) A King of Zoba, surnamed *Ezer* (excepting in 1 Kings 11: 25). Twice defeated by David, he also involved his auxiliary, Damascus, in ruin, and had to raise the siege of Hamath. The flight of one of his bravest generals, Rezon, by which H.'s force was weakened, nevertheless proved advantageous, for David overcame the fugitives, and Rezon was slain. Hence Hadad was enabled to wage war against Solomon (2 Sam. 8: 3-12; 1 Kings 11: 23-25), having become King of Syria. This is the most natural interpretation of the Hebrew text. DR. PRESSEL.*

Hadad Rimmon, named in Zech. 12: 11, as the place of a great lamentation, over the death of some great person, as the type of the greatest of all lamentations in Jerusalem over its dead. The reference is not, as some say (Hitzig) to the Adonis worship, but to the death, most probably, of King Josiah, who died after the battle of Megiddo. RITTER (Erdk. 2 Aufl. Th. 16, p. 699) says that it cannot be determined whether Hadad Rimmon is identical with Megiddo or Lejjûn, until those districts have been more accurately examined and measured. Robinson and v. Raumer hold opposite opinions on the subject. This variety of opinion is owing mainly to the different distances given by different itineraries.—(See HIERON., *ad c. 12, Sach.*, who says—“*Adad Remmon est juxta Jezraelem—hodie vocatur Maximianopolis in campo Mageddon.*—RELAND, *Palestine*. ROBINSON, *Palest. Bibl. sacra*, Vol. II., 1, p. 220-21. v. RAUMER, *Pal. 3 Aufl.*, 402-3. RITTER, *Erdk. 2 Aufl.*, XI., 552). DR. PRESSEL.*

Hades.—At first, *Αἰδης* among the Greeks was the name of Pluto, the God of the nether world, but it was afterwards applied to the nether world itself, the abode and estate of the departed, and corresponds to Orcus or the *inferna* of the Latins, and *לֵוְנִשׁ* of the Hebrews.

To a greater or less degree it was regarded as a place of final reward and punishment and contained its Elysium and its Tartarus. The life led there was closely analogous to that of the upper world, the only difference being that the inhabitants were *shades*, forms without substance.

From this heathen view of the future state that of the *Old Test.* differs less than might be supposed. Life and immortality had not yet been brought to light. *לֵוְנִשׁ* can scarcely, as

some moderns think, come from *לָוַשׁ*. It is derived rather from *לָנִשׁ*, *to demand*, and signified the place that demands all (Prov. 27: 20), the common receptacle of the dead, the righteous as well as the wicked. Gen. 37: 35; 1 Sam. 28; Hab. 2: 5; Ps. 6: 6; 89: 48. In Ps. 94: 17; 115: 17, it is represented as a silent place: in Job 10: 21, as dark; in Numb. 16: 30, 33, and Job 11: 7, 8, as a place of rest, deep down in the earth; in Ps. 6: 5; 89: 48; Is. 38: 18; Eccl. 9: 10; Job 3: 17-19; 14: 7; Is. 14: 9, as without charm, uncomfortable, where all who go thither lead a dull, joyless, shadowy

existence. Hence *לֵוְנִשׁ* is sometimes used as a synonym of *לָוְנִשׁ*. Meanwhile, as the expectation of a Messiah became more and more clear, hope of an awakening from the slumber of death, of a coming to God, arose (Ps. 17: 15; Eccl. 3: 21; 12: 7; Is. 25: 8; 26: 19; Hosea 13: 14), and Dan. 12: 2, 13 speaks of a resurrection “at the ends of the days,” an awakening of some to everlasting life, and of some to everlasting shame and contempt.

In the *Apocrypha* the same view prevails. The Book of Sirach shows no advance, and even retrogression (17: 28, 30), whilst 2 Macc. (2: 9 and 12: 43-45) speaks both of the rewarding of the pious dead and of a resurrection. The Book of Wisdom, too, proclaims in animated style the blessedness of the righteous and the punishments of the wicked at “the day of decision” (2: 22; 3: 1, 10, 18; 5: 15, 16; 6: 19). In what relation they stood to *αἰδης* is not so clear. Still it seems that by *αἰδης* was meant the whole sphere beyond the grave, and that *ἀφθαρσία* (Wisdom 6: 19) had much the same meaning as *ἀνάστασις* (2 Macc. 12: 43). What elucidation, finally, the doctrine of the resurrection received from the school of Pharisees, can be learned in part from Josephus and in part from the New Test.—(Comp. *Fr. Böttcher, de inferis rebusque post mortem futuris ex Hebræorum et Græcorum opinionibus*: Vol. I., Dresd., 1846).

In the *New Test.* various terms, borrowed from the language of the age, are used to designate the other world. Their exact meaning is difficult to ascertain. Especially is this the case with *αἰδης*. Twice it occurs in quotations as a translation of *לֵוְנִשׁ* (Acts 2: 27; 1 Cor. 15: 55). With the exception of Matt 11: 23, and parallel passages, where the *ὡς αἰδης καταβιβάζεσθαι* must be understood as referring metonymically to total perdition, it appears throughout in direct connection with *θάνατος*. Even the *πύλαι αἰδου* (Matt. 16: 18) can only refer to the annihilating powers of death. We meet the rich man also, after his death, in *hades*. In Rev. 6: 8 Hades follows Death on the pale horse, showing that death causes a removal into *hades*. At the final judgment (Rev. 20: 13, 14), the sea, death and *hades* give up the dead contained in them, whereupon—not the latter, but death and *hades* will be cast into the lake of fire, i. e., cease to exist. To Christ, the ever-living One, who was dead, Rev. 1: 18, assigns power over death and *hades*, and his resurrection (Acts 2: 27, 31) is to be regarded as a coming forth of his soul out of *hades*, or what (according to v. 24) is the same thing, as a loosing of the *ωδίνες τοῦ θανάτου*. In like manner the resurrection from the dead is styled in 1 Cor. 15: 55, a victory over death and *hades*.

From all this it is clear, that by *αἰδης* we must understand the place and condition into which man falls at death, and from which the resurrection and final judgment set him free. Such was the universal idea of the Jews, and the New Test. expressly assigns *the soul of Christ*, no less than that of the rich man, to *hades*. Neither *φθαρσίς* (1 Pet. 3: 19; comp. 11: 6), nor *ἀβυσσος*

(Rom. 10 : 7) can be distinguished from hades ; and it must not be overlooked that both φυλακή (Rev. 20 : 7) and especially ἀβύσσος (Rev. 20 : 1-3 ; 9 : 2, 11, and probably 17 : 8, and Luke 8 : 31) are applied also to the Satanic region, the place of damnation in the full sense. It is the same likewise with γέεννα. Whilst there is no passage that forbids us from including the place of future punishment, according to the language of our Lord in the three Gospels, under the idea of hades, other passages represent as burning there the *everlasting* fire (Mark 9 : 43 ; Matt. 18 : 8, 9) prepared for the devil and his angels (Matt. 25 : 41, 46). According to these expressions γέεννα would be synonymous with the κάμινος τοῦ πυρός (Matt. 13 : 42, 50), into which, at the end of the world, the wicked will be cast, to which also reference is made in the phrase σκότος τὸ ἑώτερον. On the other hand, the κόλπος Ἀβραάμ (Luke 16 : 22), according to the prevailing linguistic usage of the Jewish theology, can only exist in hades, although it is separated from the place of torment by an impassable gulf. It forms the sphere reserved for the followers of the *faithful* Abraham (comp. Matt. 8 : 11 ; Joseph. Macc. 16). And since there is no ground to suppose an internal contradiction between Luke 23 : 43 ; Acts 2 : 31 ; and 1 Pet. 3 : 19, we must include παραδείσος also in hades, and regard it as only another name for κόλπος Ἀβραάμ. Thus it fares with παράδεισος as with φυλακή, ἀβύσσος and γέεννα, since the word, at least in 2 Cor. 12 : 4 (v. 2, ὁ τρίτος οὐρανός), and Rev. 2 : 7, stands for heaven or the place of happiness.

To this result then we come. Ἄλδης in the New Test. is an eschatological name of a very general character, like the phrase *other world*. Although the idea of place is inseparably connected with it, it is to be considered mainly as *the state that follows death*, which may be one of happiness or one of misery. A careful analysis shows, however, that the terms used to express this must not be exclusively confined to the time which precedes the second coming of Christ. Indeed, the New Testament does not draw a clear line between the state of individuals *before* and *after* the ἐσχάτη ἡμέρα, though it makes everything depend on the decision of the last day. It seeks rather to show men that salvation and perdition are conditioned by a communion of life with Christ Jesus. Doctrinal precision was less necessary in the apostolic age, since the end of all things was supposed to be very near at hand.

A cursory glance at *dogmatic history* reveals a strange diversity of opinions concerning hades. Regarding it simply as a transient abode of all the departed until the resurrection, the glorified martyrs only excepted, the primitive Church did not succeed in keeping itself free from the current ideas of the heathen world and of later Judaism. The doctrine of the immediate reception of the believers into heaven Justin rejects as heretical (*Dial. c. Fr.*, § 80). Tertullian (*de anima*, c. 55) attempts to demonstrate that, *omnem animam apud inferos sequestrari in diem Domini*. It is doubtful, however, whether Cyprian held to the doctrine of a middle state. The Gnostics, since this earth

was considered as their nether world, taught that at death the *pneumatici* were taken up into the πλήρωμα. From the time of Origen, and chiefly through his influence, the view, according to which the devil had by the seduction of man acquired the power of death and with it dominion over the kingdom of the dead, from whose gloomy realms he would not suffer souls to ascend to God, gradually gained ground. Hades comes thus to have much the same meaning as the word hell now. In the *Greek Church* the view was finally adopted, that by the descent of Christ into hades it was despoiled, and believers removed into Paradise, so that since the coming of Christ the temporary punishment of hades can no longer be distinguished from that which is eternal. In the *Western Church* the doctrine took another form. As soon as the dogma of purgatory, developed by Gregory the Great, was promulgated, it met with universal approbation. In the midst, between heaven and hell, though nearer the former, were situated two regions, the *limbus infantum*, and the, now empty, *limbus patrum*. In the latter, the same as Abraham's bosom, the pious of the Old Testament had, on account of original sin, to undergo the *pœna damni*, yet without feeling any suffering. The Church of the *Reformation* at once rejected purgatorial fire and *limbus*, but holding simply to heaven and hell for the departed of *all* ages, failed to give satisfaction. Hence in the middle of the 17th cent., and in the course of the 18th cent., the doctrine of a *status medius* was revived and defended on scriptural grounds by Lightfoot, King, Burnet, and Pearson of England, and later by a number of Pietists, till now it meets with very general favor.

In fact, if evangelical theology teaches, that the completion of the personality of the creature can only take place in the resurrection, it is impossible not to admit a *middle state* for all who pass out of the present world by death—call that state what we may, Sheol, Hades, Middle Place, Nether World, or Kingdom of the Dead. A correct view of death and the necessary identity of the person both before and in death, renders it clear that the condition of the individual in that world stands in full harmony with his personal worth, measured by the divine standard. For believers this makes the middle state a being with the Lord, a dwelling in the many mansions of the Father, whilst unbelievers only find there the beginning of eternal perdition. Lazarus is carried by angels into Abraham's bosom, and is comforted : the rich man suffers torment in hades.

For a full discussion of the subject, and questions connected with it, see *Güder's Lehre v. d. Erscheinen Jesu Christi unter d. Todten*: Berne, 1853, where the literature pertaining to it is also given. GÜDER.—Porter.

Hadoram—one of the thirteen sons of Joktan (Gen. 10 : 27), whose descendants migrated to southern Arabia before the Abrahamites (*Ewald*, *Isr. Gesch.*, I., 337 (1st ed.)). He represents also a tribe of that great Arabic race, which *Ptol.*, 6, 7, 10, 25, 26, and *Plin. Hist. Nat.* call Adramites. These historians say they dwelt partly adjacent to the Chatrammites or Chatra-

motites (Gen. 10 : 26), and partly among them. Eratosthenes calls them the S. E. Arabians, with Sabata for their chief city, and says the Sabeans dwelt 40 days' travel from their borders. According to others their country extends to the Persian gulf.—2) *Adoram* (2 Sam. 20 : 24 ; in 1 Kings 4 : 6, it is written *Adoniram*) had charge of the tribute collected from conquered nations. If we assume that he was appointed in the last years of David, these names may easily designate the same person. He lost his life in attempting to quell the rebellion of the ten tribes.

VAHINGER.*

Hadrach (Zech. 9 : 1) was long regarded as the name of a country, lying E. of Damascus. *R. Jose*, a Damascene, says it was a large city, of which but a small village remains. But this view lacks support. The opinion of *Alphees*, that the name is associated with that of the Syrian deity Atergatis, Derceto, is more probable. This view approximates that of Gesenius (*Thes. I.*, 449) and Bleek (*Ullmann's Stud.*, 1852, 2, p. 268) that it is the name of an Aramaic King, whom Gesenius connects with Adores (*Justin*, 36, 2). Kings often took the names of deities (Micah 5 : 5 ; Neh. 9 : 22). — If Hadrach was a Syrian King—which of them was he? We know of 1) Hadadezer, 2 Sam. 8 : 3 ; 2) Rezon, 1 Kings 11 : 23 ; 3) Benhadad I., 1 King 15 : 19 ; 2 Chron. 16 : 1, 2 ; 4) Benhadad II., 1 Kings 20 : 1 ; 2 Kings 6 : 24, &c. ; 5) Hazael, 2 Kings 8 : 9, 12, &c. ; 6) Benhadad III., 2 Kings 13 : 24, c. 839, B. C. After this only Rezin is named, Is. 7 : 1, c. 740, B. C., after whose time no prophecy could have been uttered against Syria, which was absorbed by Assyria (Is. 7 : 8 ; cf. Jer. 49 : 23–27 and Amos 1 : 4) early in the time of Isaiah. Hamath (Zech. 9 : 2) was first united with Assyria under Hezekiah (Is. 36 : 19 ; 37 : 12, 13). And as Zech. 9 : 2 represents it as still flourishing, with Damascus, it must have fallen before the time of Hezekiah, and (v. 10, 13) before the dissolution of the kingdom of the ten tribes. Hadrach, therefore, must have been that Syrian King who reigned between Benh. III. and Rezin, about the time of Uzziah and Jeroboam II.

VAHINGER.*

Hadrian (*P. Aelius*) Emperor, of Italica in Spain, a relative of Trajan, his ward, brother-in-law, and successor (117–138, A. D.). He found Judea still agitated by the spirit of insurrection, and attempted to put an end to disturbances by forbidding circumcision, and so destroying the nationality of the Jews (*SPART.*, in *Hadr.*, c. 14). Having simultaneously attempted to restore Jerusalem by founding a Roman colony there, under the name of *Aelia Capitolina*, the Jews rallied under Bar Cochba (see Art.) and inflicted great losses upon the Romans, until they were subdued by Julius Severus (*Dio*, 12, 14 ; *EUSEB.*, *H. E.*, IV., 6 ; *Chron. Pasch.*, 474, ed. Rom.). On the ruins of Jerusalem arose *Aelia Cap.*, but the Jews were forbidden under penalty of death, to approach it. The prohibition of circumcision was again annulled by Anton. Pius. Hadrian was a zealous worshipper of the *sacra* of his native land, but adopted, also, the Egyptian cultus, besides that of Rome and Greece. Though

the statement of Ael. Lamprid. (*Alex. Ser.* 43), that Hadrian wished to dedicate temples to Christ in several cities, is not worthy of credit, he treated Christians more favorably than some other Emperors. Under him the people began to demand the execution of Christians at public festivals. The Proconsul of Asia Minor complained of this to Hadrian, who issued a rescript forbidding it, and requiring that all complaints against Christians should be made in legal form. It was rather his love of justice, than regard for Christianity, that prompted this. The edict, however, failed of its object, and the fourth persecution occurred under his reign, though neither Melito, Tertullian, nor Eusebius count him among the persecutors of Christians. On the whole his reign was favorable to Christians. — Hadrian's private character was disfigured by voluptuousness, vanity, and irritability, though he was a liberal patron of learning. He died of consumption and dropsy at Baya, July 10, 138. Antoninus was scarcely able to procure divine honors for him, so insensured were the people and senate at the abomination which he perpetrated at the close of his life.

TH. PRESSER.*

Hadrian.—Popes.—I., 772–95. At the time of his elevation the papacy had succeeded in gaining efficient aid in extension of its power, from the Frankish King ; although it was just then threatened by the Lombards. Pipin le Bref had checked the Lombards, and made the Pope Patricius of the exarchate. They still, however, kept the Pope in terror, and his peril increased when Charlemagne married the daughter of Desiderius, King of the Lombards, and thus the Franks and Lombards were reconciled. The papacy knowing that its interests demanded it, excited hostilities again between the royal houses ; when Desiderius made a new attack on Hadrian I., the latter called Charlemagne to his help, who overthrew the Lombards (774), and not only confirmed the grants of his father, but enlarged the papal domains by adding Ancona and Benevento. Hadrian, in a letter to Charlemagne, calls him "*novus Christianissimus Constantinus*" (see *Cod. Carol.* in *Murat. Script. Rer. Ital.*, T. III., Pt. 2, p. 73 ; and *Cajet. CENNI, Monum. Daminat. Pontif.* : Rom. 1760. I., no. 49). This letter has been erroneously supposed to refer to the *Donatio Constant. M.*, for Hadrian alludes only to the *Acta Sylvestri*, which first furnished a basis for that *Donatio* (cf. *CENNI Monum.*, 304). — Hadrian gave a collection of eccl. laws made by Dion. Exiguus (*Cod. canonum*) to C., to be introduced into the Frankish kingdom (774, cf. J. C. RUDOLPH, *Nova comm. de Cod. can.*, quas *Hadr. I. Carolo M. dono dedit* : Erlang., 1777 ; and C. obtained for the same purpose the *Sacramentarium Greg. M.* In 794 Hadrian sent Theophylact and Stephan as legates to the Synod at Frankfort, convoked by C. on account of the Adoptionism controversy. C. presided, and not only had Adoptionism, but the adoration of images rejected, although Hadrian, in a letter to him (*MANSI, Concilior. nova et ampliss. Coll.* XIII., p. 795), said : *si quis sanctas imagines Domini nostri J. C. et ejus genetricis atque omnium sanctorum secundum SS. Patrum doctr. venerari noluerit, anathema sit.* — **II.**, 867–72,

was animated by the same proud and arrogant spirit which characterized his predecessor, Nicholas I., whose political maxims he adopted, but with less success. He was married before his elevation, and had a daughter. His ambitious political measures offended the public sense of justice, and yet failed to confirm his power. When Charles the Bald divided Lorraine with Lewis of Germany, Hadrian interceded in behalf of Lewis II., declared that he alone was the legitimate King, and threatened him with the bann. Hincmar of Rheims (see Art.) denounced the Pope's interference in secular matters, as inconsistent with his office, and declared that if a Bishop excommunicated a person unlawfully, he lost the power of binding again. The Pope could send no one to perdition. But Hadrian was not the man to be moved by such appeals, or even by the failure of his schemes. He availed himself of the disputes between Charles and his son, Carloman, to oppose Charles anew, though again without effect. His shameful interference in the case of Hincmar of Laon (see Art.) had no better result (see HINCMAR, *Opp.* II., 701). Now, however, he attempted to assuage the anger of the King by flattery, and thus widened the breach between him and Carloman (MANSI, XV., 857). Meanwhile the pseudo-Isidorian principles increased papal ambition and developed the idea that the supreme administration of the divine law devolved upon the Pope as the universal Bishop of the Church. Hence the application of Lewis II., to be released from an oath which Adalgisus of Benevento had compelled him to take. The strife which led to the separation of the Greek and Latin Churches, occurred under Hadrian's reign (see *Photius*). It was under him also that the Council of Worms (868) decreed the celibacy of the clergy, and that all who entered monasteries in youth, must remain there for life.—III., reigned scarcely a year, 884-5, when the fearful contentions between the princes of Italy broke out, in which the papacy was only a party tool. Charles the Fat summoned Hadrian to him, to inaugurate his illegitimate son, Bernhard, as heir of the throne.—IV., 1154-9, was an Englishman by birth (Nicholas Breakspeare), entered a monastery, became abbot of St. Rufus, Rome, then cardinal-bishop of Albano, and successor of Anastasius. He opened the bitter struggle of the papacy against the Hohenstaufen. The hierarchy already found a powerful enemy in Arnold of Brescia (see Art.). As Frederick I. had shown his determination to maintain his authority, at the Magdeburg election for Pope, Hadrian readily supposed that he would seize the first favorable opportunity for vindicating it in Italy. This he did on pretence of settling the feuds which were embroiling the Lombard cities. F. subjected them to himself, severely chastising those which resisted. Hadrian became alarmed, but was reassured by the protection which F. afforded him against his foes, especially Arnold of Brescia. Hadrian crowned Frederick, June 18, 1155. These friendly relations were soon disturbed by Hadrian's concluding a peace with William of Sicily, and the breach was widened by an arrogant letter

of Hadrian to the German Bishops (MANSI, XXI., 789, &c.), saying: *imperialis insigne coronæ libertissime CONFERENS*, and that F. had received *beneficia de nostra manu*. F. was enraged, and appealed to the German Bishops, who accused Hadrian of having invaded the freedom of the German crown (MANSI, XXI., 792), and called on him to compromise with Frederick. Hadrian yielded to this appeal, and offered explanations. F. satisfied with these, went to Italy, held a diet on the fields of Rankal, and made jurists of Bologna define his prerogatives according to Roman law. The sum of them was—that he had the rights of the old commanders, hence, *quod Principi placuit, legis habet vigorem*. Frederick now strictly prohibited all spiritual investitures, and thus offended both the Bishop and the Pope. Serious charges were made by both parties, when the Pope was strangled at Anagni. Under Hadrian the Cathari were sorely persecuted.—V., *Ottoboni Fresco*, from July 12, to Aug. 18, 1276, he was a Genoese by birth.—VI., Jan. 9, 1522 to Sept. 14, 1523, was the son of a mechanic in Utrecht, professor at Löwen, and tutor of Charles V. In 1517 he became a cardinal, in 1519 B. of Tortosa, and on Jan. 9, 1522, elected, by 39 cardinals, successor of Leo X. He was distinguished for his knowledge of scholastic theology and canon law, for earnestness and strict morality. The corruptions of the Church were deplored by him, but he was unable to see that they were the natural results of the sacerdotal hierarchy. He was even favorable to reform, but lacked decision of character to begin the work. As he had previously avowed that he thought the Pope fallible, the friends of order expected much from his elevation. But in his bondage to scholastic theology, he supposed the existing evils were but external, and that when these were removed, even Luther would be satisfied. Hence Luther's views seemed to him foolish puerilities, which might be easily refuted (C. BURMANI, *Hadr.* VI. *sive Analecta hist. de Hadr.* VI., *Traj. ad Rhen.*, 1727, p. 447). In this view he was confirmed by a letter of Wilibald Pirckheimer (DAN. GERDESII *Hist. Evangelii renovati in the Monument.* I., 170), which blames the hatred of the Dominicans of all learning, their insolence and frauds, especially with regard to indulgences, as the cause of the disturbances in the Church. Hence Hadrian opposed simony, nepotism, bribery, and the abuse of indulgences. But in this he found decided resistance in the court itself. He desired (*Hist. du Conc. de Trente, traduite par P. T. le Courayer. à Basle, 1738, I., 41, &c.*) to issue a bull declaring that the efficacy of indulgences depended on personal amendment; but Card. Pucci objected that the revenues would thus be diminished, and the evangelical party strengthened. Card. Soderini further advised him to abstain from all attempts at reform, to win the people by granting indulgences, and to put down the heretics by violence. But Ludov. Vives recommended the calling of a general Council. Hadrian turned to Erasmus, and asked him to write against Luther. Erasmus declined, proposed to submit the points in dispute to impartial umpires, and warned him

against the use of harsh means. Still Hadrian thought the German Reformation might be most effectually suppressed by requiring the execution of the edict of Worms, and to this end availed himself of the Diet of Nuremberg, opened Dec. 13, 1522. But before its opening he sent his privy councillor, Rorarius, to Frederic the Wise to admonish him to exert himself in favor of the apostolic chair. F. replied through Melancthon, that he thought it far better to defeat the Reformers by arguments than by violence (*Corpus Ref.*, I., 585, &c.). At the commencement of the diet the legate denounced the evangelical clergymen of Nuremberg, and read a brief (*Luth. Opp. Lat. Jen.*, II., 536) which declared Luther's doctrine not only injurious to the Church, but dangerous to the State. Other briefs were handed to Elector Frederic, Duke Henry of Mecklenburg, and others, in which Hadrian threatened divine vengeance, and the pains of hell to all who would support Luther's cause. This only excited the evangelical party against Chieregati, the legate. Suddenly, at the beginning of 1523 he presented himself with new instructions, which he either received from Rome, or (as many believed), prepared on the spot at the Pope's direction. Luther was compared to Mohammed; the acts of Councils were not to be disputed; and yet the corruptions of the Church, in its head and all its members, were acknowledged, and a promise was given that steps would be taken to secure a thorough reformation—only nothing should be done rashly. At the same time the Council was urged to devise further measures for the suppression of the Lutherans. These proposals only called forth bitter denunciations from both parties. On the part of the evangelical members, the position taken is the more note-worthy, as their opposition now first assumed a corporate form. The legate's rage was unbounded. But the evangelical estates, regardless of his denunciations, prepared a statement of their complaints for the legate. The legate did not wait to receive them. They were sent to Rome, where they were rejected as destitute of an official character. Still the declarations they contained were substantially adopted as the decisions of the diet (March 6, 1523. *Walch*, XV., 2625, &c.). Hadrian's efforts had failed. Grieved and angry he applied to Charles V. for redress; but Charles was offended that Hadrian was to settle the dispute between him and Francis of France, and did not regard the Pope's complaint.—Hadrian has been denounced more by Romanists than by Protestants. At his death his enemies hung a wreath over the door of his physician with the inscription: the liberator of his country.—(*O. WESSENBERG*, d. grossen Kirchenvers. d. 15. u. 16. Jahrh., III., 100, &c.). Hadrian's correspondence with Erasmus, is especially remarkable. (See *BURMANN*, l. c., and *DANZ*, *Analecta critica de Hadr.* VI. P. II.: Jene, 1814).

NEUDECKER.*

Hagar (*flight*) an Egyptian handmaid of Sarah. Sarah, being childless, gave Hagar to Abraham as his concubine (after Eastern custom), that she might adopt the servant's child as her own. Hagar became insolent, and when Sarah chided her, fled into the wilderness of

Shur (Dfōjar). There the Lord appeared to her at the well Beer-labai-roi ("the well of the living one who beholds me," *EWALD*, *Gesch. Isr.* I., 358; *LENGERKE*, *Ken.*, I., 274; or "well to the life of seeing," where one sees God, and lives, *Tuch*), and directed her to return to Sarah (*Gen.* 16 : 5, &c.). *Gen.* 21 : 9, &c. (*cf.* 25 : 6, 11, &c.) further relates that after Ishmael had well grown up (17 : 25; 21 : 8) Abraham sent him and his mother off, because Sarah was unwilling to have the legitimate heir of the house reared with Hagar's son. She wandered in the desert of Beersheba until her bottle of water was exhausted, and then gave up in despair, when an angel came and showed her a fountain. The Arabs still show a well called *Muweilih Hadjar*, about 15 miles from Kadesh, on the way from Beersheba to Egypt (*ROBINSON*, *Palest.*; *TUCH*, *Zeitschr. d. deutsch-morgentl. Ges.* I., 175, &c.; *RITTER's Erdk.* XIV., 1086). The Arabs (see Arabia) claiming descent from Ishmael (see Art.) regard Hagar as Abraham's lawful wife, and suppose she is buried at Mecca (*HERBELOT*, *bibl. Orient.* fol. 927, ed. Par. 1697; *EWALD*, l. c., I., 369; the *Comm. of Tuch and Knobel*). In *Gal.* 4 : 24, Hagar and Sarah are employed allegorically to represent the law and the gospel,—probably from the resemblance between the sound of Hagar and that of the Arabic word for "rock."

RÜRTSCHL.*

Hagarites or **Hagarenes** were (1 *Chron.* 5 : 10, &c.) Bedouin tribes in Northern Arabia, which, with other Ishmaelitic nations, were conquered by Reuben, Gad, and Manasseh, with the loss of 100,000 men, 50,000 camels, 250,000 sheep, and 2000 asses, and driven from their country. They again appear in the post-exile period as hostile to the Israelites (*Ps.* 83 : 7; 1 *Macc.* 5). In *Baruch* 3 : 23, the "sons of Hagar" are not Hagarites, but Ishmaelites in general. Probably the "son of Hagar," among David's heroes, was a Hagarite (but see 2 *Sam.* 23 : 36). A Hagarite had charge of David's flocks, (1 *Chron.* 27 : 31), and an Ishmaelite of his camels, because the animals were pastured in districts where those nomadic people were accustomed to feed their cattle (*BERTHEAC* on *Chron.*, p. 228). Following the Hebrew traditions concerning Hagar, we may suppose that the Hagarites formerly pastured their flocks in the Arabian desert in the S. of Canaan, towards Egypt, then moved E. and N. E. towards Gilead, and, driven thence, finally settled along the Persian Gulf, where a people of that name still live, and annually sell thousands of camels to Syria (*NIEBUHR*, *Beschr. v. Arab.* p. 339). Probably it is the same race which *Erastoth.* in *Strabo*, 16. 4, 2, p. 767, and *Dionys. perieget.*, 956, call 'Αγάραιοι, in N. Arabia, and these again seem to be identical with the celebrated Gerhæans on the Persian Gulf.—(*EWALD*, *Gesch. Isr.*, I., 369; II., 319; *WINER*, *Lex.*).

RÜRTSCHL.*

Haggai.—The zeal with which the Jews who returned from exile began to rebuild the temple (*Ezra* 3 : 10, &c.), soon gave way before continued obstacles; and they became so disheartened that the most pious among them despaired of the fulfilment of the divine promise.

It was then (in the 2d year of Darius Hystapes, 520, B. C.), that Haggai and Zechariah were sent to encourage Zerubbabel, revive zeal in the building of the temple, and hope in the promised salvation. From the sixth month of the year named, Haggai prophesied. Nothing is known certainly of his personal history but what is said in his book, and in Ezra 5 : 1 ; 6 : 14. He may have been one of those old men who had (Hag. 2 : 3) seen the old temple in its glory ; though a later tradition in Dorotheus and Pseudo-Epiphanius represents him as a young man who came from Babylon to Jerusalem. The Talmud calls him a member of the great Synagogue (see *Carpzov, introd., III., 423, &c.*). His unadorned prophecy is in four parts, c. 1 and 3, 2 and 4, corresponding to each other. In 1 : 1, &c., he reproves the neglect of the work, for which there was no excuse, as the people could build fine houses for themselves ; rather was the prevailing famine a punishment of their remissness. His reproof avails, and he assures them of divine aid. — The 2d address, 2 : 1–9, presupposes that the building of the temple has been resumed, but refers to the despondency of the people in view of the greater glory of the former temple. Hence the prophet seeks to cheer them. — 3d, 2 : 10–19, occasioned, perhaps, by a repeated cessation from the work, enlarges upon the idea of part 1. Part 4, 2 : 20–23, completes part 2, with special reference to Zerubbabel. Haggai is named with Zechariah in the LXX., and in the inscriptions of some Psalms. — (See literature in *KEIL's Lehrb. d. hist. Einl. ins A. T., p. 353*). OEHLER.*

Hair among the Hebrews. — The hair of the head was worn by men among the ancient Hebrews as an ornament, but they did not allow it to grow very long (2 Sam. 14 : 26) unless under a vow (Numb. 6 : 5, 14 ; see *Nazarite*). To let the hair and nails grow was a mark of beastliness (Dan. 4 : 30). The plucking and shaving off of the hair (Ezra 9 : 3 ; Esth. 3 : 2 ; Jer. 7 : 29) was a sign of grief and captivity (Is. 7 : 20) ; hence the injunction upon priests, Ezek. 44 : 20. At the same time a certain manner of cutting the hair and beard is forbidden (Levit. 19 : 27 ; see *Beard*). A bald-head was an object of derision (2 Kings 2 : 23 ; Is. 3 : 17, 24). Young people let their hair grow in curls, or braided it (Cant. 5 : 2, 11 ; Judges 16 : 13, 19). Subsequently this was thought effeminate (1 Cor. 11 : 15). Oil was used to cultivate the hair (Ps. 23 : 5 ; 133 : 2, &c.). In women long hair was thought beautiful (Ezek. 16 : 7 ; 1 Cor. 11 : 15) ; and they usually braided or curled it (Judith 10 : 3 ; 1 Pet. 3 : 3 ; cf. Cant. 4 : 1 ; 6 : 5 ; 7 : 6). "Well set hair," Is. 3 : 24, designates braided and curled locks. To cut off a woman's hair was the greatest reproach, and a sign of slavery (1 Cor. 11 : 6 ; Lev. 14 : 8, 9). Cured lepers cut off their hair (see *Leprosy*) ; likewise Levites at their consecration (Numb. 8 : 7). — See WINER, *Lex.* ARNOLD.*

Hales, John, born at Bath, 1584, so early distinguished himself, that in 1605, already, he was admitted to a fellowship in Merton College, and engaged by the learned Warden, Sir Henry Saville, on an edition of Chrysostom, published in 1613 ; the annotations in the 8th vol. of which,

Mosheim ranks with the best on this author. In 1612 he became Prof. of Greek in Oxford, and then a fellow of Eton College. In 1618 he attended Sir Dudley Carleton to the Synod of Dort, to prepare a report of its acts. On the way Sir Dudley told H. that he would be likely to change his Calvinistic views, if not to become entirely an Arminian. Having returned to Eton, he remained there, preaching and writing, for many years, much esteemed, although suspected of a leaning to the Arminians and Socinians. Productions of the Socinians, S. Przypkowski and J. Stegman, however, were erroneously ascribed to him. His view of the Lord's Supper may be gathered from the following statement in his tract on the subject : "the bread and wine are signs indeed, but not of anything there exhibited, but of somewhat given long since. Jesus Christ is eaten at the communion table in no sense, neither spiritually, by virtue of anything done there, nor really ; neither metaphorically nor literally ; the spiritual eating of Christ is common to all places as well as to the Lord's table," as in prayer and the preaching of the Gospel. His "Tract on schism and schismatics, wherein is briefly discovered the original and cause of all schism," written for Chillingworth in 1636, was not printed for several years. His rejection of episcopal assumptions made him somewhat of a favorite with Presbyterians. Archb. Laud, however, endeavored to regain him for the Establishment, and succeeded in persuading him to accept, 1639, the canonry of Windsor, of which he was deprived in 1642. But he adhered to the Episcopal Church to his death. During his later years he suffered want, was compelled to sell his library, and spent part of his time in the house of the widow of a former servant of his. He died in 1656. His works were collected and published in 1659, entitled : "Golden remains of the ever memorable Mr. John Hales, of Eton College." Again, in 1673, by Pearson, B. of Chester. He continues to be esteemed for his independence, candor, and unassuming mildness of character. — (*Des Mui-zeaux*, an account of the life, &c., of J. Hales, &c. : Lond., 1719, 8vo. *J. Halesii hist. conc. Dordr.* J. L. MOSHEIM, *latine vertit*, &c. : Hamb., 1724. *Biogr. Britt. J. P. Lawson*, The life and times of W. Laud : Lond., 1829, 2 vols., p. 275–83. *Watt, Bibl. Brit.* : Edinb., 1824, I., 457, e. g., Hales works by Foulis : Glasgow, 1765, 3 vols., 12mo.). HENCKE.*

Halitgar became B. of Cambray, probably, in 817. In 822 Paschal I. appointed him assistant of Archb. Ebo of Rheims, in the northern mission. He seems to have accompanied Ebo to Denmark (LAPPENBERG, *Handb. Urkundenb.* Nr. 6. LILJEGREN, *diplomatarium Suecanum*, Nr. 1. ADAM. BREM., *gesta Hamb. eccl. pont.* I., c. 17, in *Pertz*, IX., 291). Subsequently he participated in several Frankish Councils, and in 828 the Emperor sent him on a mission to the Byzantine court (*Pertz*, I., 217). June 25, 831, is usually regarded as the date of his death, although the *Annales Vedastini*, gives 830 as the year of its occurrence. Additional facts are given by DION. SAMMARTHANUS, *Gallia Christiana*, III., 10–12 (1725). — Halitgar is best

known as author of a penitential (see Art.), prepared at Ebo's solicitation (FLODOARD, *hist. Remens. eccl.*, II., c. 19; *Pertz*, IX., 416).

K. MAURER.*

Haller, *Berthold*, although not the first or most powerful Reformer of Berne, still exerted the most enduring influence in carrying out the work of Church improvement there. Born in 1492, at Aldingen, near Rottweil, of parents in limited circumstances, he attended the school of Rubellus in Rottweil, and there found a friend in the chaplain, Aug. Bolster, and faithful schoolmate in Melch. Volmar, the subsequent teacher of Calvin and Beza. After prosecuting his studies under G. Simler in Pforzheim, and forming there a friendship with Melancthon, which lasted during life, he went, in 1510, to the University of Cologne, to prepare for the clerical office, and in 1512 became Baccal. of theology. Then he returned to Rottweil and taught, designing subsequently to complete his course at Freiburg in Baden. Soon he had prospects of support at Freiburg; but another way was designed for him. Rubellus received a call to the celebrated school in Berne, but advised H. to accept the post. When he went to Berne is uncertain, Kirchhofer says in 1513, Kuhn in 1518. No one thought of the consequences of this step, least of all Haller. He seemed to lack all the requisites of a Reformer; his education was defective, he knew neither Hebrew nor Greek, Latin he wrote but poorly, and the character of his theological attainments may be inferred from that of the University. He was indeed conscious of his defects, and diligently tried to remedy them. But his modest and yielding disposition gave little promise of his success as a Reformer; and yet the result proved that these traits were best adapted to the character of the Bernese. By his gentleness, and eloquence, combined with a fine person, he gained favor. He soon became an assistant of Dr. Wittenbach at the cathedral, and lived with him. Doubtless Dr. Wittenbach exerted no small influence upon Haller's views. Through Myconius Haller became acquainted with Zwingli, whom he visited in 1520, and who became his friend and counsellor in every perplexity. Early in 1520 Dr. Wittenbach resigned his post and went to Biel, and Haller was elected (May 18) his successor. He immediately commenced a faithful exposition of the decalogue, and followed this with similar lectures on Matthew, instead of treating the pericopes. A similar course was pursued by Dr. Seb. Meyer, lector of the Barefooted monks, and soon a small but influential circle of friends of evangelical truth was gathered, including Mayor Jacob v. Wattenwyl and his sons, and others (see Berne). Opposition arose, and Haller had almost left the place in despair; but Zwingli persuaded him patiently to persevere. Haller, Meyer, and Wittenbach were summoned before the smaller Council; Haller to answer a charge of having said to the nuns of the island, that if they relied upon the works of their order, they were children of the devil, and that marriage was a divine institution. By the statutes, it was said, they had forfeited their lives, but the Council, in mercy, merely passed sentence of

banishment. In the great Council, however, they were allowed to answer their accusers, and as Haller clearly showed that nothing had been said to the nuns repugnant to the word of God, they were dismissed Oct. 23, 1523, with the simple admonition to attend to their pulpits and let the nuns alone. Subsequently Anselm, Seb. Meyer, and John Haller of Amsoldingen, having quit Berne, the whole burden of the evangelical cause, rested upon Haller for two and a half years. The enemies of the Gospel were expecting, also, soon to get rid of him, especially after Wattenwyl's death. A scheme to carry him off by night was frustrated only by the vigilance of friends. The Anabaptists, likewise, caused him much trouble; Zwingli suspected even him of the error. But his moral strength grew with his burdens. Conscious of his perilous, yet important position, his courage and cautiousness increased. Through Zwingli and a commission from Zurich, he was induced, about Christmas, 1525, to cease reading mass, and to devote himself more zealously to his ministerial duties. But everything was tending to a grand stroke. Berne consented, March 28, 1526, to the Conference at Baden (see Art.). Haller and P. Kunz, of Erlenbach, were commanded to attend it, and give account of themselves; a few friends, under Bernh. Tittmann, volunteered to escort them. Haller was naturally diffident, but still discussed the 2d thesis, about the sacrifice of the mass, with ability. He made so good an impression that an honest Rom. Catholic present, said: "If only this man were on our side!" But he seems to have been exposed to danger in Baden. On returning to Berne he was asked whether he would not again read mass, as it was generally declared that the preachers had been suppressed. He decidedly refused, yet said he would rather leave Berne than cause distraction. This noble firmness had its influence. He was confirmed in his office, and well supported. Haller now preached with new zeal and increased success. Happily he obtained an efficient co-worker, early in 1527, in Francis Kolb, who after several years' absence returned to Berne. Various favorable circumstances combined, also, to lead the Council (May 25) to renew the ordinance allowing freedom to preach, even against old customs. This favorable moment was seized by Haller and his friends, to secure a general conference upon the points at issue (see *Berne Disput.*).—With the introduction of the Reformation in Berne, Haller's proper work was done. And yet aided by clergymen from Zurich, Hoffmeister, Rhellican, Megander, he continued, though sickly, to preach, and teach the less instructed clergy, and to assist in reconstructing, not only the constitution of the Church, but that of the State.—Early in 1530, he spent some weeks in Solothurn, where a portion of the citizens, and more of the country people, were inclined to the Reformation. But the adherents of the old faith became so incensed at him, that he could effect nothing. A disputation held there failed, and the Evang. cause was speedily expelled from the city.—Haller did not expect much from Bucer's attempts at concord. He cordially desired peace, but not at the cost of

implicity and truth. He feared the people would be confused by ambiguous terms, and arm ensue to the cause. The Burnese were, accordingly, kept by him from participating in these union movements; and the result rather approves his judgment (*Hundeshagen, Conflicte*, i. 61, &c.). — During the unfortunate Cappel war, Haller strove to restore peace even to the displeasure of Kolb and Megander. Haller tried in vain to get Bullinger to Berne (see *Berne, Synod of*). — His last great care was Geneva, as assailed by the Duke of Savoy; he feared a war which would involve both cities, and yet thought it wrong to let Christian brethren suffer. In 1535 his health failed perceptibly. Accumulated labors which fell upon him through Kolb's sickness, prostrated him. The Council diminished his duties, but he preached for the last time on Jan. 17, 1536. He survived the deliverance of Geneva, and died during the night of Feb. 25. The Council and entire congregation followed him to his grave. Though he married in 1526, he left no children. He published nothing, not even thinking his "Rhapsodien" fit for a scholar like Bullinger to read. — (See Haller's letters in *Zwingli's works*, ed. of *Schuler and Schulthess*, II. and VIII. *FEUSSLIN, Epist. Reform.*, p. 15, &c., 139, 156. Many are still scattered in MSS.; thus a vol. of his sermons at Zosingen, *Archiv. d. hist. Vereins d. Kanton Bern*, III., Hft. 1: Bern and Zurich, 1855. *M. Kirchhofer*, B. Haller, &c.: Zurich, 1828. *Kuhn, d. Reform. Berns*: Bern, 1828. *Ersch and Gruber*, Sect. II., Bd. I., p. 304, &c. *Vulliemin, le Chroniquer*, Lans., 1836, Nro. 6, u. 7. *Piper, Evangel. Kalender*, 1853, p. 123, &c.).

F. FRECHSEL.*

Haller, *Albrecht v.*, called the Great by his countrymen, deserves a place in a theol. Encyclopedia, since, as a great investigator of nature, and father of physiology, he furnishes, with Newton and Euler, a striking proof that faith in Christianity is not overthrown by the exact sciences, unless it has been previously otherwise undermined. Born in 1708 at Bern of an old patrician family, he manifested an early inclination to a thorough knowledge of Christianity, and in his 9th year already was able to read the New Test. in the Greek. He chose, however, the profession of medicine, which he studied first at Tübingen, and afterwards in Holland under Boerhave. In his 19th year he became M. D.; and after travelling through Holland, England, and France, returned in 1729 to his native city. In 1736 he became Professor at Göttingen, where he founded the reformed congregation. He was elected member of the most celebrated societies of Europe. He afterwards returned to Bern, where he died in 1777 as member of the Larger Council. His *Diary* (published in 1787 by Heinzmann) gives evidence of his Christian faith; his didactic poems, of his firm conviction of the truth of God and of immortality. His apologetical works and letters (published 1772, 1775) evidence his faith in the positive doctrines of Christianity. — See his *Biography* by J. R. Wyss, in his edition of Haller's poems, 1828. *Biogr. de Alb. I. par l'auteur des soirées de famille*: Laus,

1840. U. m. Vorles. üb. K. Gesch. des 18ten Jahrh. 1 Bd., 2 Aufl., p. 330).

HAGENBACH. — Reinecke.

Ham, the youngest son of Noah (Gen. 9: 24). Gen. 10 traces the inhabitants of the southern zone to his four sons Cush, Mizraim, Phut, and Canaan, so far as they are implicated with the ancient history of the Israelites. As according to *Herod*, 1, 1; 7, 89, &c.; and *Strabo*, I., 42; XVI., 766, 784, the Phœnicians (Canaanites) migrated from along the Euythrean sea, or the Persian gulf, into Palestine, the original abodes of those Hamite tribes were in that district (see *Egypt*). — The conduct of Noah's sons (Gen. 9: 20, &c.) reveals the inmost character of their descendants, and indicates their destiny. Noah, with a prophetic presentiment foretells their history as in a miniature sketch. Ham's unfilial conduct is avenged in the servitude under which Canaan's posterity shall groan. On the contrary, Jehovah, the God of salvation, is praised as Shem's God; and as Japhet joined Shem in honoring their father, the posterity of both are represented as participants in the common salvation. — Why Canaan, and not Ham directly, was cursed is explained by Hoffmann (*Weiss. u. Erfüll. I.*, 91), "Ham's sin against his father is punished in him as a father; in his youngest son he witnesses the execution of the penalty of the youngest son's guilt." But it is not clear that Canaan was Ham's youngest son (cf. 10: 6, and 12: 1, with 9: 24); and the theological ground of this interpretation is inadmissible. Hengstenberg has answered the question better: "Ham is punished in his sons, because he sinned as a son; and in Canaan, because C. followed most closely in his father's footsteps" (*Christol.* 2, I., 28). To understand this benediction as a *valiciniis post eventum*, of the occupancy of Shemitic countries by Japhetic conquerors, is historically impossible and irrational; for to Shem a blessing, not a curse, is foretold; he shall dispense salvation to Japhet, not come under his yoke.

KURTZ.*

Hamath ('Εμάθ, 'Αίμάθ, 'Ημάθ) long one of the most important cities of Syria. Its situation at the foot of Antilibanus (*Josh.* 13: 5; *Judges* 3: 3), on the Orontes, near Damascus (*i. e.*, the limits of the two were contiguous, *Zech.* 9: 2; *Jer.* 49: 23) and Zobah (*1 Chron.* 18: 3, 9; *2 Chron.* 8: 3) always made it the chief city on the highway from Phœnicia to the Euphrates. Originally it was a Phœnician or Canaanite colony (*Gen.* 10: 18), but afterwards was taken by the Syrians, and became the metropolis of a kingdom which included a considerable district of surrounding country (*2 Kings* 23: 33; 25: 21). Its king sustained amicable relations with David (*2 Sam.* 8: 9, &c.; *1 Chron.* 18: 9, &c.; see *Ewald, Gesch. Isr.*, II., 620). It maintained its independence until near Hezekiah's time, when the Assyrians took it (*Is.* 37: 12, &c.; cf. *2 Kings* 15: 19; 18: 34; 19: 13, *Is.* 10: 9; *Am.* 6: 2), though its territory may have been previously curtailed (*Numb.* 13: 22; 34: 8; *Am.* 6: 14; *1 Chron.* 13: 5; *2 Chron.* 7: 8; 8: 3; *Ezek.* 47: 16; 48: 1). — The Assyrians transplanted "people from Hamath" in the depopulated country of the ten tribes, who brought their native deity, Ashima (probably

the Phœnician *Esmun-Esculapius*), with them. Under the Macedonians Hamath was called Epiphaneia (according to Jerome on Am. 6, from Antioch Epiph.), but the natives still retained the old name (Jos. *Ant.*, 1, 6, 2; 1 Macc. 12: 26; *Ptol.* 5, 15, &c.; *Plin.*, *H. N.*, 5, 19, &c.; *Evagr.* *H. Eccl.*, 3, 34, mentions a bishop of Epiphania). — In the middle ages Hamath was the capital of a small state, among whose princes is the renowned historian and geographer, Abulfeda (see his *tab. Syrice. ed. Köhler*, p. 108, &c.; *Hertelot, bibl. or.*, fol. 427, ed. Par., 1697). Hamath is still a large mercantile city of 50,000 inhabitants. — It must not be confounded with Hammath (Josh. 19: 35). — (See MICHAELIS, *spicil. geogr. hebr.*, ext. II., 52, &c. RELAND, *Palaest.*, 119, &c. BURCHARDT, *Raisen in Syr.*, I., 249, &c. ROBINSON, *Palest. MOVERS*, *Phœn.*, II., 2, p. 161; WINER's *Lex. KNOBEL*, *Völkert.*, &c., 331, &c. PAULY's *Encycl.*, III., 195. *Ersch u. Gruber, Encycl.*, I., 36, p. 22; 34, p. 16). RÜETSCH.*

Hamburg, Archbishopric and Reformation of. — Although the archbishopric of Hamburg, of such great importance for the spread of Christianity in the North, owes its origin to Lewis the Pious, nevertheless the earliest conception of it is due to Charlemagne; who, after the conquest of the Saxons, wished to Christianize the pagans beyond the Elbe, and for this purpose selected Hamburg as the seat of a new bishopric. For the victorious Emperor had already at this place consecrated, through the agency of Amalarius (see Art.), a church which was independent of the neighboring bishops, and had appointed a presbyter, *Heridag*, to the See, when his death prevented the formal institution of the latter. The plan itself was so thoroughly forgotten, that Lewis divided North-Albingian Saxony between the Bishops of Bremen and Verden. But when the missions among the Danes and Swedes were so successful that Christianity seemed to have gained a firm footing in the North, the Emperor, advised of his father's plan by some aged men, determined at the Diet of Aix la Chapelle, after having obtained the consent of the Bishops of Bremen and Verden, to establish a new archbishopric at Hamburg, which was to embrace the churches of North-Albingen and the North in general, such as Denmark, Sweden, and the Slavonian countries. Ansgar was appointed first Archbishop, and ordained in 833 either at Ingelheim or Didenhofen by *Drogo*, Archbishop of Metz, assisted by Archbishops *Ebbo* of Rheims, *Hetti* of Trier, *Otgar* of Mayence, and others. Its charter was given by the Emperor at Aix, May 15, 834, which was ratified by Pope Gregory IV. — For five years Ansgar labored most successfully in his new field: but scarcely had his cathedral been completed, a monastery and school for the education of missionaries been erected near it, a beginning made to gather a library, and the course of affairs brought into an even channel, when H. was surprised, plundered, and mostly reduced to ashes by Norman pirates (837). The Archb. deprived thus of home and shelter, and of all sacred utensils and treasures, wandered with his clergy from place to place; until Ikin, a

noble lady, presented him with her country-seat of Ramelsloh, not far from Hamburg, where he founded a monastery. Hamburg was rapidly rebuilt, and A. visited his See very diligently: but in 845 the Normans under Erich again attacked and plundered it. This circumstance, together with the many losses sustained by the See of H. in its domains north of the Elbe, induced Lewis, the German, to endeavor, after the death of Leuderich, Bishop of Bremen, to effect a consolidation of the Sees of Hamburg and Bremen. This purpose, however, was opposed by the neighboring Bishops, especially the B. of Bremen and the Archb. of Cologne; and it conflicted also with the canon which forbade the union of several Sees. Nevertheless the united efforts of Lewis and some prominent churchmen succeeded at last; and the Synod of Mayence, Oct., 847, unanimously resolved that precedents admitted that the present See of Hamburg, which embraced only four churches, and was exposed to the incursions of pagans, should be attached to Ansgar as B. of Bremen: only that the latter should not, to the prejudice of the B. of Verden, retain that portion of the See of H. which formerly belonged to the See of Verden. Ansgar was now solemnly instituted (849) Archb. of Bremen. The sanction of Pope Nicholas I. was given in his bull of May 31, 853. — For some 200 years the successors of Ansgar were mostly excellent men, who labored zealously to carry forward the work begun by him. Among them, *Rimbert* († 888) and *Unni* († 936) are distinguished for their zeal in the spread of Christianity in the North. *Adalag* († 988) laid the foundation for the archiepiscopal supremacy over the united See and the city of Bremen; for, standing high in favor with Emperor Otto I., he obtained a charter securing to himself and his successors all the monasteries and royal domains, with the prerogatives connected with them, which were embraced in the See; as also the jurisdiction over freemen and serfs which had hitherto been exercised by a crown officer; together with many other privileges. In order to give permanency to the results of the missionary labors of his predecessors, A. also used the favor of the Emperor and his victories over the Danes and Slavonians, to establish the bishoprics of *Schleswig*, *Ripen*, *Aarhus*, and *Aldenburg*, all which were incorporated at his request with the archbishopric. In his time, also, the monasteries of *Heslingen* and *Reepesholt* were founded; so that the See counted already seven monasteries. Paganism, however, had not yet been thoroughly eradicated: credible contemporary historians say, that the country people still continued their idolatry in the sacred groves and that Archb. *Unwann* († 1029) first succeeded in destroying all traces of it by cutting down the groves and erecting churches on the site of them. — After the Archbishops had, for greater security, chosen Bremen as their regular residence, they devoted, indeed, their chief attention to this See, but did not by any means neglect H., visiting it for longer or shorter periods, although it was still annoyed by the Normans and Slavonians. At least this is stated by Adam, of Bremen, concerning Archb. *Adalbert* († 1072), a

man universally admired for beauty of person, prudence, eloquence, and restless activity, who celebrated Easter, Whitsunday, and the festival of the Virgin annually at Hamburg. It is also well known that he for a long time contemplated the erection of a patriarchate for the entire North at Hamburg (see Art. *Adalbert*). But these immense projects were the very reason why the Church of the North separated entirely from the See of Hamburg. His successor *Liemar* († 1101) gave up in consequence of this separation the archiepiscopal seat at H., and was the first to assume the title Archb. of Bremen, instead of Archb. of H. and administrator of B.; although the real transfer of the archiepiscopal dignity did not take place until 1223. From this time the chapter of Hamburg labored to make itself more independent of the Archbishop; and the city also used the absence of the latter to enlarge its powers and prerogatives, as also to make itself independent of the chapter. After it had recovered from the repeated losses sustained by the Danes, Normans and Slavonians, it became, in 1215, an imperial city, and in 1241 made a treaty offensive and defensive with Lübeck, by which the foundation of the Hansa league was laid. The Flanders transportation company, founded in 1252, also gave a strong impulse to commerce and manufactures. But with this increase of wealth and prosperity there arose also a desire for greater freedom and higher cultivation. — Prepared in this way, the Reformation found ready access to the free city from the democratic constitution, of which it obtained a character similar to the Swiss Reformation; it being brought about chiefly by colloquies, and resolutions of the council and citizens. Since the Archbishop resided in the remote Bremen, it was the Provost of the cathedral of H., who, as the virtual superior of the churches connected with the See, opposed, though more from selfish considerations than from conviction, the reformation desired by the people. *Otto Stimmel*, vicar of the cathedral and pastor of St. Catharine's, was the first publicly to oppose (in 1522) the sale of indulgences and other abuses of the Rom. Church, as also the immoral life of the clergy. Being thus exposed to the most violent attacks of the clergy, he retired, in 1524, from the scene; but he continued, nevertheless, to labor zealously, though in retirement, for the reformation of the church at Hamburg, and had the pleasure before his death, in 1551, of seeing the work begun by him advancing prosperously. Not only did a number of the clergy, among which were *Fischbeck*, *Harzwich*, and *Aldag*, follow his example; many respectable citizens also declared themselves openly in favor of the Reformation. Encouraged by such examples, the authorities of the four parishes joined, Sept. 3, 1522, with the citizens and secular authorities against the clergy in a public document, declaring that they would unitedly resist the inhibitions and anathemas of the clergy, their assumption of secular offices, their unfounded prerogative of inducting and removing pastors without the knowledge and against the will of the wardens, the improper demands of the Bishops for consecrating churches, chapels, altars, and cemeteries,

and other abuses: and that they would properly organize the Nicholas-school, and establish similar schools in the other parishes also." — How strong at that time already among the citizens was the opposition to Rom. Cath. and the desire for a better system of education, appeared plainly in 1523, when *S. Kempe*, a Franciscan from Rostock, arrived at Hamburg on business of his order. Happening to preach at Hamburg, his purer views of religion were so acceptable to the people, that they requested him to remain with them and preach to them the Word of God unadulterated with human additions. The number of preachers favoring the Gospel increased now so rapidly in the city, that, although the chapter succeeded in silencing *Fischbeck* by the offer of a vicariate in the cathedral, the citizens favoring the Reformation were the more determined that the church of St. Nicholas, vacated by the apostasy of *Fischbeck*, should be filled by a competent man of the evangelical party. *John Bugenhagen*, of Wittenberg, the intimate friend of Luther and Melancthon, was chosen; and he was already on the eve of starting for his new field, when the council, intimidated, meantime, by the clergy, and become scrupulous on account of B.'s marriage, sent to him their prohibition. Though B. now remained at Wittenberg, he nevertheless rendered essential services in consolidating the Reformation at Hamburg. — The weak vacillation shown by the Council in the call of B., emboldened the Romish party, which had in the meantime gained a new defender in *Dr. B. Möller*; and it now attacked the evangelical preachers with great violence from the pulpit. But the evangelical party also had gained a bold defender in the appointment of *John Zegenhagen*, a preacher of Magdeburg, to the church of St. Catharine. Trusting to the justice of their cause, the evangelical preachers now brought their complaints before the Council. The latter, seeing that dangerous turmoils among the citizens were impending, published, Dec. 29, 1526, an order, that all preachers should preach the pure Word of God, should be charitable towards each other, avoid matters of controversy in the pulpit, teach the people to obey the government, and exhort them to abstain from forcible attacks upon the ceremonies of the Church. But the defenders of the Cath. Church, especially *H. Rensburg* and *N. Bustorp*, continued their attacks. Bustorp, whilst he defended good works according to the Rom. doctrine, made violent onslaughts on the evang. doctrine of justification, the celebration of the Lord's Supper in both kinds, and the reading of Luther's translation of the New Testament. The Council in vain admonished him to peace, and demanded of him to recant: he continued publicly to assert his doctrines. The three ministers of the churches of St. Catharine, St. Nicholas, and St. James therefore asked him whether he would undertake to defend the doctrines which he preached. After some hesitation he, at the beginning of 1527, replied in a lengthy letter in Latin, addressed to Zegenhagen; and since the tone of this letter was both courteous and friendly, the preachers several times invited him to a friendly conference, which,

however, he steadily declined. Incensed at this course of their opponent, the evang. preachers again complained to the Council, which now summoned both parties to the City Hall, in order by a public examination of the controverted points to quiet the controversy. The heads of the Rom. party appeared without exception, whilst of the evangelical party only J. Zegenhagen, S. Kempe, and J. Fritze, chaplain at St. James, were present. Meantime the latter were once more disappointed in their expectations: for even though they gained many new friends and patrons by the manner in which they defended their cause, the controversy between themselves and the Romanists nevertheless still continued, until in April, 1528, an event occurred, which, though it might have become destructive to the city, brought about the triumph of the Reformation. About the middle of this month a happy accident discovered a conspiracy of 68 citizens, who held their meetings with Romish monks in the monastery of St. John, and had devised the plot of firing the city by night at different places, and of killing, during the confusion, the evangelical preachers and their friends. The discovery of this plot induced the Council and the citizens, after the danger had been removed, to invite the most prominent preachers of both parties to a public discussion, to be held on April 28, in order thus to put an end to all controversial preaching and persecution. Since none of the Romish clergy who participated were men of learning and skilled in controversy, and since the evangelical preachers enjoyed, besides, the favor of the people generally, the latter could not fail to gain a decided victory: and accordingly all the citizens, the Franciscans, Dominicans, and the Blue Sisters deserted the Rom. party. Meantime the priests did not yet give up all hope; but, as the only means left them, brought complaint before the imperial chamber, which produced a severe mandate against the city. The Council from this time took a decided stand in favor of the Reformation, entered upon negotiations with the Wittenb. Reformers, and prevailed upon Bugenhagen to visit Hamburg for the purpose of properly organizing the schools and the Church.—Bugenhagen arrived at Hamburg, Oct. 9, 1528, and was most honorably received by citizens of the highest standing. He began his labors by preaching daily, in order to instruct the people in the meaning and spirit of the Reformation. He next informed himself thoroughly of the affairs of the city, in order thus to devise an adequate Church constitution. This was then handed over to the Senate, by whom it was submitted to the people for their sanction. It was unanimously adopted, and subsequently proclaimed and put in force. On the day after its introduction, Bugenhagen, in the name of the city, opened a Latin school in the monastery of St. John, and provided it with competent teachers. He left Hamburg again, June 9, 1529.—Soon after B.'s departure the Council and citizens resolved to abolish all unnecessary festivals, to transfer the Apostledays to the Sundays next following, and to convert the revenues of vicarates and of some other benefices, after the death of the present incum-

bents, into a fund for the poor. The Catholic worship had been abolished in all the churches, the cathedral excepted. As in the latter it was visited only by a few old people, and as it had been the occasion of repeated disturbances, it was here also abolished by the Council in 1529. In 1530 also, the Council caused the monastery of Harvestehude, situated beyond the city, to be demolished; since its nuns refused the preachers sent to them, and held fast to the Catholic rites in spite of all admonitions. The chapter, indeed, zealously espoused the cause of the ejected nuns, and accordingly brought a new complaint against the Council before the imperial chamber, which, in 1533, ordered the restitution of the monastery; but in 1536 the city joined the Smalcald league, and thus obviated the necessity of obeying the order. After Zegenhagen and Kempe the most distinguished of the evang. preachers, was John Höck, or Aepinus, the pupil and friend of Melancthon, and heretofore rector of the school at Greifswald and Stralsund. In 1532 he was elected superintendent and first preacher of the Church of Hamburg, and in 1533 was made D. D. by the University of Wittenberg.—With the election of Aepinus as superintendent, the Reformation in Hamburg and its territory may be regarded as fully established. But his work: *Pinacidion de Rom. eccl. impost. et pap. sutelis, adv. impud. Hamb. Canonic. autonomiam*, was the first manifestation of a controversial spirit, which for several centuries found zealous adherents among the clergy of Hamburg, and stirred up many controversies; not, however, without salutary results for the Protestant Church.—Sources:—RIMBERT, *vita Anskar.* in PERTZ, *Mon. Germ. hist.*, T. II.; ALBERTUS STADENSIS to 1256; ALB. KRANTZ, *Saxonia and Metropolis*, to 1504; *Encyclop. of ERSCH u. GREYER*, Vol. 12, pp. 432–449; P. v. KOBBE, *Gesch. d. Herzogth. Brem. u. Verden*, Vol. 2; N. STAPHORST, *Hist. Eccl. Hamb. diplomat.*, Vol. I.–V.: Hamb., 1723–28; FR. MÜNTER, *K.-Gesch. von Dänemark*, Vol. 3, pp. 633–671; OTTO KRABBE, *Eccl. ev. Hamb. instaurat. Hist.*: Hamb., 1840.—See also ADAM BREMENS. I., c. 17, in PERTZ, *Mon. Tom.*, VII.; LAPPENBERG, *Hamb. Urkundenb.*, Bd. 1, p. 10, etc.; RUODOLFI FULDENSIS, *Annales*; *Prudentii Trecentis Annal.*; *Chron. de gest. Normann.*; *Annal. Xantenses*; *Chronic. Aquitan.*; *Fragment. Chron. Fontanell.*; NIT-HARDI, *hist.*, IV., c. 3; *Annal. S. Germ. minores*; ADEMARI, *hist.*, III., c. 17; KLIPPEL, *Leben des Erzb. Ansgar*, pp. 213–216.

G. H. KLIPPEL. — *Reinecke.*

Hamilton, Patrick, the first Protestant martyr in Scotland, descended from a family related to the royal house. He was born in 1503, studied theology at St. Andrew's University, where he acquired liberal views concerning the Church and its doctrines, under John Major, the teacher of Knox and Buchanan. He possessed a natural taste for what was exalted and noble, and for the pleasures to be desired from science, and the study of ancient writers. In his youth, already, James V. made him superior of the Abbey Ferne, in Ross-shire, but he preferred classical and theological studies, and early embraced Luther's views. Partly to promote his studies, partly to eschew the envy of the clergy, he went,

1526, to Wittenberg, Germany, and enjoyed for a time the society of Luther and Melancthon; then he visited Marburg, where he became intimate with Lambert, and studied the principles of the Reformers. Animated with a desire to proclaim these principles in his native land, he resolved to return home. His friends in vain sought to deter him. He was destined to be a martyr for the truth in Scotland. After some attempts to convince the people of the evil of existing customs, he was decoyed to St. Andrews under the pretence of a free discussion with the Dominicans. There he was summoned before an eccl. court under the charge of various heresies, and, in spite of his able defence, condemned to the stake. Futile attempts to get him to recant were made on him in prison. So firm was his faith, that he converted the priest (Alesius) sent to plead with him. He was executed before the gate of St. Salvador College, March 1, 1528. His death was calm; his last words: "Lord Jesus receive my spirit." His accuser, Campbell, died soon after in insanity.—(See *McCrie's Sketches of Scottish Ch. Hist.* chap. I.). WEBER.*

Hands, Laying on of.—The custom of laying on of hands, as a mystical or symbolical act, is very old. It has for its basis the high significance of the human hand, in the corporeal organism, as also in the moral life of man. The hand is the organ of the physical and moral activity of man, of his power and deed. It is hereby at the start already the symbol of his religious and spiritual activity. We can distinguish in this respect the hand of peace and the hand of war, the helping, joining, and the needy, receiving hand. To touch one with the hand, and to lay the hand on one; to hold the hand over one and to lift the hand to one: hereby the strongest contrasts are expressed. The Greeks were acquainted with the contrast: to hold the hand protectingly over one (*χεῖρα υπερίχουσιν*), and to lift the hand in supplication to one (*χεῖρας παραχρῆν*), also the contrast of a divine government and of a needy human supplication. The scriptural custom of laying on of hands is based in general upon the idea, that the hand is the organ of mediation, especially the organ of transferring in the proper, as also in the symbolical sense. This follows from the fact, that the consecrated person not only transferred his blessing to what was consecrated, but that the sinner also transferred his guilt, his curse (Lev. 1: 4; 3: 2; 8: 13, sq.; 16: 21, 24). With regard to this dark, death-propheying form of the laying on of hands in sacrifices, the views of theologians do not agree (consult *Bähr, Symbolik des mosaischen Cultus* II., 339; *Hofmann, Schriftbeweis*, II., 1, p. 155; *Baumgarten, Commentar zu Pentateuch*, 1, 2, p. 180, and *Kurtz, das mosaische Opfer*, p. 70; *Gesch. des A. B.*, p. 332), but most accept that of transfer. The laying on of hands on the thank-offering presents no difficulty for this view. In this case the thank-offering is made the bearer of the feeling of thanksgiving. This idea of a transfer becomes most prominent in the act of laying on of hands to consecrate and to bless. We are able to distinguish between the Old Test. typical and the New Test. real laying on of hands.

The former again divides into the patriarchal-typical or blessing, the legal symbolical or consecrating, and the prophetic-dynamic or healing laying on of hands. The first (Gen. 48: 14) is a prophecy in the form of the typical transfer; the second (Ex. 29: 10; Numb. 27: 18) a legal-symbolical investiture with official authority and promise of official blessing; the third the dynamic communication of a wonderful power to heal and restore life (2 Kings 4: 34). The laying on of hands in the New Test. is only a special form of the real fulfilment of the Old Test., i. e., it is, regarded in general, the real and actual communication of spirit and life in symbolical form. In its historical development it also passes through the same stages as that of the Old Test., i. e., we distinguish between the spiritual-patriarchal laying on of hands of the Lord and of his Apostles, the spiritual-legal and official of the Church, and the prophetic-blessing. The laying on of hands by our Lord, as it appears in the healing of the sick, completes the prophetic form of the Old Test. He laid his hand on the sick, and healed them all (Luke 4: 41; Mark 6: 5). The communications of corporeal life, however, which He connected with this, are already joined with the germ of spiritual life; He healed on the condition of faith (Mark 6: 5); and the more the people imagined that His healings were bound to the laying on of hands, the more He separated the two (Mark 5: 23; comp. v. 41; 7: 32). But the complete investiture with His Spirit and power, which He communicated to his Apostles, He represented in real symbolism, in that He lifted up his hands over them and blessed them, when He ascended from Mount Olivet (Luke 24: 50). This lifting up of the hands of our Lord in connection with the outpouring of the Holy Ghost, is the source of the apostolic laying on of hands. And this also is originally a living synthesis of symbol and of fulfilment (Acts 8: 17), as also of the communication of corporeal and spiritual life (Acts 9: 17). From this general laying on of hands, by which Christians received the anointing of the Spirit, proceeds the official apostolic laying on of hands (Acts 13: 3; 1 Tim. 4: 14). Meanwhile the example of Cornelius (Acts 10) shows also, that the apostolic communication of the Holy Spirit is not bound to the form of official laying on of hands. It was only with the recession of the Spirit that the ecclesiastico-official laying on of hands was changed into the legal-symbolical form,—ordination. Besides ordination the general laying on of hands also continued in the Rom. Cath. Church. Formerly it was connected with the consecration of catechumens (*August. de peccat. merit.*, 1, 2, 26), and it is still connected with the preparations of baptism and with confirmation. Already in confirmation, it is regarded as constituting a part of the sacrament, with greater certainty, however, in ordination, where it constitutes the visible sign of the sacrament. The Council of Trent determined the sacramental character of ordination (*Sessio 23, sacrament. ordi., cp. 3*). It also determined, that the Holy Spirit was communicated by ordination, and gave it an indelible character, and distinguished between the consecration of

bishops and that of priests (comp. *Klee*, *Kath. Dogmatik*, III., 338; *Winer*, *comparat. Darstellung*, p. 165).

The Protestant Church did not retain the sacramental character of ordination. The different grades of the clergy were already rejected by the Smalcald Articles (*de potestate et jurisdictione episcoporum*). The Helvetic Confession acknowledges the divine appointment of ordination, but rejects its sacramental character. The *Confessio Anglicana* (Art. 36) distinguishes between the consecration of Archbishops and Bishops, and the ordination of presbyters and deacons, and the canons of the Church confine confirmation to the Bishops alone.—The centre of Protestant ordination lies in its fundamental condition. This is an internal and external call to preach the Word of God, and to administer the sacraments rightly. According to the measure of its identity with this fundamental condition, is Protestant and evangelical laying on of hands real, i. e., a dynamic symbolical consecration with the Spirit of Christ; and as this identity recedes so does the legal-symbolical character of the laying on of hands here again become prominent. But the administration of office and the administration of the Spirit never absolutely coincide in the historical progress of the Church. Much rather does also here the prophetic laying on of hands in various corporeal healings and spiritual blessings separate itself from external official tradition, as a free gift of grace for the awakening and edification of the congregation. Thus the gift of working miracles appeared already in the apostolic doctrines. Later also an attempt was again made to regulate it ecclesiastically, by creating the office of exorcists. In our times the laying on of hands for the healing of physical diseases has disappeared from the Church.

As the laying on of hands in general has its history, so also ordination in particular. From Acts 13, we see that originally the congregation participated in official ordination. Ordination as a more limited power developed itself with the development of the Episcopacy. The idea of *Ordo* in opposition to the *Plebs* was fixed by Tertullian (*de exhort. cast.*, cp. 7), and the expression *ordinatio* is used in a technical sense by him also (*de præscript. hæret.*, cp. 41). From him it passed over to Cyprian. And if the original official laying on of hands in the congregation referred back decidedly to the Israelitish laying on of hands, then the present enlarged legal ordination with its technical designations seems to lean towards Græco-Roman political organizations. The word *ordinare* and *ordinatio* is a Roman official technical and judicial term, and *ἱερωσύνη* is also used by the Athenians when speaking of the election and installation to a public office (comp. *Augusti*, *Denkwürdigkeiten aus der christl. Arch.*, Vol. 9, p. 338, sq.).—As the different clerical grades grew out of the development of the legal episcopacy, so also the different priestly consecrations out of legal ordination. The doctrine concerning ordination must, therefore, treat in the first place of ordination in general, especially of episcopal ordination, and then of the various priestly consecrations. Comp. *Binghami Origines*, I.,

p. 156, *de præcipuis quibusdam legibus ac ritibus circa episcoporum ordinationem observatis*. *Augusti*, *Denkwürdigkeiten*, etc., Vol. 9, p. 337. *Binterim*, *Denkwürdigkeiten der christkathol. Kirche*, Vol. I., part I., p. 257, sq.; part II., p. 121, sq. *Augusti*, *Handbuch der Archæol.*, III., 222, sq.

LANGÉ.—Beck.

Hannah, a woman's name of frequent occurrence among the Hebrews and Phœnicians (like *Anna* in Virgil). Three of this name are mentioned in the Bible. 1) The mother of Samuel (1 : 2, 9, &c.; 2 : 1, &c.). 2) The wife of Tobit (Tob. 1 : 9; 2 : 1, 11; 11 : 5). 3) A prophetess (*Anna*, Luke 2 : 36, &c.), to whose honor it is said that she had remained a widow after her first husband's early death (see *Krummacker*, in *Piper's evang. Jahrb.*, IV., 43, &c.).

RÜETSCHL.*

Hantwill, *John of* (*Hanwil*, *Hauterille*, *d'Alta Villa*; *Nantwil*, *Annewil*; *d'Annarilla*, from Anneville, a village in Normandy, where he is said to have been born), was a poet who flourished in the 12th century, known by the name of "*Archithrenius*" (arch-mourner, after Jeremiah's Lamentations) which he prefixed to his chief work. That he was born in Normandy, not England, is evident from a passage in the prologue (*ODIN*, *Comm. de scriptor. eccl.*, III., 1621), although he became a Doctor at Oxford, and a Benedictine in St. Albans, in the diocese of London. The work named (9 books) was dedicated to Walter of Constance, Archb. of Rouen, under the title: *Joh. Archithrenii Opus*. It is a bitter lamentation over the miseries of human life, in all grades. It was published by *J. B. Ascensius*, Paris, 1517, 4to. This edition has become very rare. Leland pronounces the style elegant for that period, with even brilliant passages. Others pass a different opinion. But all acknowledge originality, the thoughts and vivacity of illustration. *Du Boulay* (hist. of the University of Paris, p. 458) mentions Hantwill as a teacher there, and dates his death early in the 13th cent.

S.*

Hara, a district in Assyria whither the tribes beyond the Jordan were carried by Phul and his successor (1 Chron 5 : 26). It seems to have become so completely occupied, that it is not named in the subsequent removal of the other tribes by Shalmaneser (2 Kings 17 : 6). Rosenmüller and Gesenius suppose the Persian mountain district *Irak* is meant. VAHINGER.*

Haran.—1) The name of a city in N. W. Mesopotamia, on the way from Ur of the Chaldeans to Canaan (Gen. 11 : 31, 32). It was the temporary abode of Abraham on his way from Ur, and is therefore to be sought in the N. of Mesopotamia (*Knobel*, *Völkert.*, 171). As the residence of the oldest patriarchs (Gen. 12 : 5; 27 : 43; 28 : 10; 29 : 4), as homestead of Nahor, Abraham's brother (Gen. 24 : 47), as well as that of Bethuel and Laban, and as the city of Nahor (24 : 10), Haran is otherwise known. Thus, by the Arabs, lying, according to *d'Anville*, in long. 57° 10' E., and lat. 33° 40' N. It is the *Κάρπας* of the Greeks and *Caræ* of the Romans (*Herod.*, 4, 13, 7; *Plol.*, 5, 18, 12; *Strabo*, 16, 747; *Pliny*, 5, 21; *Lucan.*, 1, 104), celebrated for the defeat of Cressus (*Dio Cass.*, 40, 25). Ammian Marcellinus calls it a

y old town. It must have been an important place in the time of Hezekiah (2 Kings : 12; cf. Is. 37 : 12). It is mentioned in Is. 7 : 2; and by Jos., *Ant.*, 1, 16, 1. It seems to have still flourished under the Arab dominion; Abulfeda (14th cent.) is the first who speaks of it as in ruins (*Mesop.* 16). It was pointed out to Niebuhr (2, 410) as a small place two days' journey S. E. of Orfa. — Abram first went alone from Haran to Canaan (Gen. 12 : 4, 5; Acts 7 : 4). Probably pursuing a S. W. course he passed Damascus, and there obtained Eliezer (Gen. 15 : 2). — 2) Ezek. : 23, associated with Canneh (*Kanē. Peripl. erythr.*, 15; *Ptol.*, 6, 7, 10; *Plin.*, 6, 26) and Cana, which lay on the south coast of Arabia, and whose traffickers, like those of Haran, are called Sabæans. Haran must have been on the same coast, probably it was founded by a colony from the Haran in Mesopotamia. — 3) The father Lot (Gen. 11 : 26, &c.). — 4) A son of Caleb (Chron. 2 : 46). — 5) A Levite (1 Chron. 23 : 9).

VAHINGER.*

Harmony of the Gospels. — It will be our duty in the present article to answer in a general way the following questions: 1. What are the phenomena of the partial harmony or partial difference of the gospels, as regards the selection of their material and its arrangement, their language and treatment of Old Testament quotations? 2. How can their surprising and often verbal *harmony* in many points be reconciled with their deviations in others? 3. Can these *deviations* be explained on the supposition that the four Evangelists are faithful, credible, and truthful reporters; or do they compel us to admit that some or all of them have reported incorrectly. Of course, the answers to these questions cannot be mechanically separated, since they interpenetrate each other. In order to arrive at a clear and practical arrangement, we must first of all briefly review the most essential *phenomena* which the gospels furnish. — There is above all a *thorough difference between the Gospel of St. John and the three others*, both as regards the selection of the material — John reports only the festival journeys¹ of Christ to Jerusalem, and but few events in Galilee — and also the character of the material — since in John the sermons of Jesus are distinguished from those in the other gospels by a peculiarly solemn and elevated tone. The first three gospels have hence, since the time of Griesbach, been called the *synoptical* ones, from their having a close resemblance to each other. — But even these synoptical gospels again deviate variously from each other. Mark reports scarcely any sermons of the Lord. Luke, compared with Matthew, reports many events and sayings peculiar to himself; so also, *vice versa*, whilst Mark

contains very little that may not be found also in Matt. and Luke. Mark has only twenty-four verses containing things peculiar to himself. Matthew reports 16 miracles of Christ; Luke 15, of which 11 are common with those in Matthew. Mark reports 15, of which 12 are the same as in Matthew, and 10 the same as in Luke. — Matthew and Luke, unlike Mark, go back to the infancy of Jesus; and yet in such a manner that they do not report the same events. — The arrangement or *sequence* (called *accolouthia*, since Chemnitz) of the events and sermons differs in each of the Synoptists: only towards the end of the public labors of Jesus they all agree. — As regards the *expressions* used, in their report of the same event or sermon, they often agree remarkably and verbally — even to strange and unfrequent words — whilst at other times they differ both in expression and material, at times even to a seeming contradiction of each other. — It will most assist our purpose first to consider the synoptists separately: 1, What concerns the selection and arrangement of the material; 2, the language; 3, the execution. We will close with their relation to John. — 1. *The selection and arrangement of the material in the Synoptists.* Even if no traditional patristic accounts concerning the origin of the different gospels had come down to us, an examination of them would lead us to conclude that their authors did not *design* to furnish us with a *complete account of the public labors of Christ, day by day, or week by week consecutively*. Such an account must have become very voluminous (John 21 : 25): we find in fact that, what the synoptists relate of the earlier half of the labors of Christ, is confined to a few fragments, which, according to their own data, embraced generally a period of only one or several days. They confess that they have omitted many things. Thus from Matt. 11 : 21, etc., it appears that Christ endeavored by "mighty works" to call *Chorazin* to repentance: but the synoptists say nothing of the labors of Christ at Chorazin, and hence must have passed over a portion of the history of Jesus in silence. That the synoptists have given us only a *selection* from the rich materials of the life and labors of Christ, is above doubt, and must also appear natural. Nor does the proem of Luke, when impartially viewed and correctly understood, conflict with this position. For, compared with the sporadic sketches which some Christians of Lower Italy had made, as well as they might, from memory, Luke could very properly call his work "perfect" and "in order," even though it did not pursue the life of Christ from day to day and week to week; but gave, like a true history, what was most important and vital in *systematic order*.² — But each of the synoptists

¹ A natural consequence of this is, that in John the events are arranged according to the scheme of *objective chronology*, which is not the case in the others.

² Luke neither praises nor censures the *καλλοι* (Luke : 1). But he does by his own work set aside their well-meant efforts (*πειρασμοι*) as *objectively unsatisfactory*. For these *καλλοι* (belonging to the circle of his readers in Lower Italy) had endeavored from memory to note down some incidents, which the heralds

of the gospel had told them. But when the first heralds had left them, they felt it necessary to assist the memory by writing down what the others had on occasion and sporadically told them. Each one wrote according to his memory. Luke tried to satisfy the necessity which thus manifested itself, but had so far been very unsatisfactorily met: for, in consequence of his abode in Jerusalem (Acts 21 : 15-27, 1,) he had opportunity to obtain "a perfect understanding of all things," and could thus write "*in order*." For a vindication

had nevertheless a *plan of his own*. Of this there is not the least doubt, although scholars still differ as regards the execution of their plan in each of the synoptists, and the principle according to which they have arranged and grouped the events. There is no doubt that *Matthew* wished to show to the Jews and Jewish Christians that in Jesus of Nazareth the prophecies concerning the seed of Abraham, or son of David (Matt. 1:1), had been fulfilled. He wishes, therefore, to portray the gospel in its *identity* with the Old Test. revelation. It is just as plain that *Luke*, moving in the Pauline sphere of doctrine and labor, has in view the struggle of the morbid, Pharisaic Jewish Christianity (comp. Gal. 1-2 with Acts 15); and — with or without design — communicates of the life and sayings of Jesus, especially that which shows that not *all* Israel according to the flesh, but that which longed for redemption, and not Israel *alone*, but all mankind in so far as it desired salvation, had a share in the work of Christ. Hence he portrays Christ as the second Adam (Luke 3:23-8), and in c. 2, v. 2, already refers to the fact that the appearance of Christ in the flesh was contemporaneous with the political subversion of Israel. It is more difficult to find a particular plan in Mark. But the oldest patristic notice (*John Presb. in Euseb.*, 3, 39) tells us that M. had written down from memory, but without a fixed plan, what Peter had occasionally related of the acts and sayings of Jesus.¹ — We cannot, therefore, from what has been said, expect a chronological sequence of events in the synoptists. Even Luke (as Dr. J. Lichtenstein, also, has lately admitted in his "Leb.-Gesch. des Herrn.," p. 73), does not by the word *κατά* *ἐξῆς* oppose his work to the fragmentary accounts of the *κολλὰι*, as one arranged *chronologically*, but only as one that was *connected* and *arranged systematically*. That in his arrangement he followed no merely chronological, but a *material principle*, is evident from chapt. 10, onward, since from chapt. 10:25, to chapt. 13, only sermons of Christ are given; chapt. 14-16 only parables; chapt. 17 only shorter sayings. In Matthew a division according to matter is just as evident (chapt. 3-4, the beginning of the labors of Christ; 5-7, the fundamental law of the kingdom; 8-9, miracles; 9:36-11, the disciples; 12-13, relation to the Pharisees; 13-14, parables, etc.). — If now this variety in the selection and arrangement of the material in each of the synoptists has its ground in the special plan which each followed, it is evident that this variety, viewed generally, implies no incongruity or disharmony; *that much rather the synoptists, notwithstanding this difference of arrangement, may still be in harmony with each other*. But the question still remains, whether this harmony can really be traced in particulars. We notice, namely, that the synoptists, although their order in general is not chronological, have nevertheless in many instances

connected particular events in an evident temporal sequence (e. g., Matt. 9:27, 32; chapt. 13, 1, etc.; Mark 1:29; Luke 4:38, etc.). Here now it might be possible that in such particular data they would positively contradict each other, since the same events might be variously connected in the different synoptists, and thus transferred to different times. The question whether this is the case, or whether these isolated "acolouthistic" data do not rather harmonize, belongs evidently to the subject of the harmony of the gospels. — In fact, investigations of this kind have been made from an early date. At first, however, this was done in the practical interest of giving a harmony of the gospels rather than in the more scientific one of giving a chronology of events in the life of Christ. Prominent among those who have occupied themselves with the subject, are *Gerson*, *Calvin*, *L. Osiander*, *Chemnitz*, and *Bengel*. Of these *Osiander* (*harm. evang.*: Basel, Frobenius, 1535) is to be mentioned only as a matter of curiosity, since the theory, in relation to the results of his age, is a mere retrograde. Holding the effect theory of inspiration, he maintained that the evangelists, though they might omit many things (!), could not depart from the chronological order. But since the same events are narrated by the synoptists in a different sequence, he was forced to take refuge in the supposition that the same events had occurred several times under precisely similar circumstances. — *Calvin*, already (*Concord. evang. sine moneta*, in Vol. IV., of the Antw. ed. of his works), had come to the correct conclusion that the evangelists did not *purpose* to write chronologically, and thus laid the *foundation* to a true and correct harmony and acolouthia, even though he was arbitrary in the application of his principle.² *Calvin*, without entering upon investigations, has nevertheless in his Commentary arranged the material of the harmony of the gospels as to show that full and sound investigations formed the basis of it. He connects those events and paragraphs, which were connected by the evangelists by unequivocal data. But what was done by Calvin, more from an involuntary, happy tact, and at times even departing from just consequences, was done by *Chemnitz* (*harm. evang.*, 1593, sqq., continued by Leyser and Gerhard) from clear and conscious principle. It is very clear that from this principle all sound investigation of the subject must proceed. Nothing is more natural and psychological than that the disciples should for many years remember the sequence of prominent and remarkable events (e. g., the sermon of the Mount and its accessories, the calming of the storm, the feeding of the 5000, etc.), especially such as happened during journeys when the memory of places assisted the memory of dates; whilst it was impossible for them to reproduce the sequence of less important events, especially if they happened at the same

cation of this interpretation of the proem of Luke, adopted also by H. J. Thiersch (*Versuch ein. Herstell.*, etc., 1845, p. 163), see my *Krit. d. ev. Gesch.*, 1 ed., 1842, p. 975; 2 ed., 1850, p. 802.

¹ Μάρκος μὲν ἐμμανεύρης Πέτρου γενομένος, ὅσα ἐμνημόνευσεν, ἀκριβῶς ἔγραψεν, οὐ μὲν τοι τάξι, τὰ ὑπὸ τοῦ Χριστοῦ

ἢ ἀκθύντα ἢ πρᾶξόντα. The character of this gospel affords no room for the conjecture of Thiersch that M. had subsequently rewritten and arranged it systematically.

² See concerning this Ebrard's *Krit. der ev. Gesch.*, 2 ed., p. 51, etc.

ie, e. g., during his long abode at Capernaum. It in the latter case they arbitrarily invented sequence, is, independently of all doctrinal grounds, improbable; since in so many cases they connect various events altogether without particular data or with vague expressions (e. g., "it came to pass when he was in one of those days:" "it came to pass on one of those days:" and "Jesus went about all the cities and villages teaching," etc.). The first object, therefore, must be to restore those series of events which were clearly connected by the evangelists before the chronological relation of these series to each other can be determined. — In relation to Chemnitz, who, however, did not always carry consistently his correct principle, Bengel notes a retrograde. He correctly admits that he did not design to write chronologically; his method of restoring the chronology of the gospels by a comparison of them, is a total failure.¹ — J. H. A. Ebrard (whilst Wieseler, in "Chronologische Synopse," took for granted the chronological order of Luke, and combined with other objective-chronological investigations), in his Krit. der ev. Gesch. § 10–34, has returned to the principle of Chemnitz, and thinks that he has proven that the scattered data contained in the synoptists regarding the sequence of single events, 1, never contradict each other, and 2, are sufficient for the restoration of series (indesms) of events, which will embrace the *entire portion* of the gospel history, and whose reciprocal chronological relation may be restored, fully from internal evidence and partly by a comparison with John, so as to effect complete satisfaction. — We will exemplify the nature of these investigations by the most difficult and intricate case; which, however, is also the only difficult one. In Matt. 9, we are told that Jesus whilst sitting at meat was asked by the Pharisees, why he did not fast. On *what day* this took place, and how closely or remotely, or whether at all, it was connected with the previously related call of Matthew, we are not told. We are distinctly told (v. 18), however, that whilst Jesus spake these things, Jairus arrived and besought Jesus to accompany him: and v. 21, that when Jesus departed from the house of Jairus, two blind men followed him into the house: and v. 32, that as they went out, a dumb man possessed with a devil was brought to him. After this follows: and Jesus went about all the cities and villages. We here obtain, therefore, fully the sequence of the events: *the question about fasting, the raising of Jairus' daughter, the healing of the two blind men, and the healing of the dumb man*. In Matt. 8: 18, we read that Jesus, when on a certain day (for the previous narrative ends in v. 16–17 with a *general* notice of the healing labors of Jesus, so that v. 18 is connected with no particular event) he saw great multitudes about him, determined to cross the sea: v. 23, etc., that he stilled the tempest: v. 28, that when arrived at the other side he healed the Gergesene demoniac: afterwards, chapt. 9, that on his return the man sick of the

palsy was let down to him through the roof: and v. 9, that Jesus, when he departed thence, called Matthew. We here obtain the sequence of four other events: *the stilling of the tempest, the Gergesene, the palsied man, the call of Matthew*. How these two series (*synochiæ*) are related to each other, we as yet know not. — Again, Matt. 12: 22, we are told (again after a general description of the labors of Christ has gone before) that Jesus healed a *blind and dumb demoniac*, and was, therefore, accused of being in *league with Beelzebub*; that (v. 38) in the course of a conversation on the matter the Pharisees demanded a sign; that (v. 46) whilst Jesus was yet speaking concerning this, his *mother and brethren* stood without; that (13: 1) "the same day" he sat by the sea and spoke the *parables of the sower*, etc. Here again a series by itself. But Mark now, following the narrative of Peter, an eye-witness, tells us, chapt. 4, unequivocally, that Jesus once spoke the *same parables* at the sea-side; v. 35, that "the same day, when the even was come" he crossed the sea and *stilled the storm*; hereupon healed the *Gadarene demoniac*; and that (chapt. 5: 21) having again returned, *Jairus* besought him to heal his daughter. It thus appears from Mark beyond all contradiction, that the three series of events, which Matt. has narrated separately in distinct portions of his work, to which, as regards their contents, they were suited, belonged, as regards time, together. We thus obtain quite naturally the following series. During his abode at Capernaum the *blind and dumb demoniac* is brought to him; his cure gives occasion to the blasphemous accusation of the Pharisees present, that *Jesus was in league with Beelzebub*. During the same conversation they demand a sign. Whilst Jesus is answering, the arrival of his mother and brethren is announced and the conversation interrupted: and since in Canaan the night was preferred for journeys, the arrival probably occurred in the morning. Towards evening Jesus departed (perhaps to accompany his mother for a part of her return, i. e., southward along the sea coast) and taught by the sea-side in *parables*. Next follows the *stilling of the storm*, and on the next morning the *healing of the Gadarene*. After his return to the western shore, whilst sitting at meat, he is asked the question, *why his disciples did not fast*. In the same hour *Jairus* arrived, on the road to whose house — according to all synoptists — the *woman with an issue of blood* touched him; returning from the house of *Jairus*, the *blind men* follow him to his house in Capernaum; when these are gone, a *dumb demoniac* is brought; about the same time — when he had returned from Gadara to Capernaum, perhaps several days after — the *palsied man is let down through the roof*. Departing thence (i. e., undertaking a subsequent journey), Jesus calls Matthew. It is now also easily understood that Peter, who had been an *eye-witness* already before, during and after the Gadarene journey, and after him Mark, remembered well the chronological connection of the three chief facts (*parables, Gadarene journey, Jairus' daughter*); whilst Matthew, on the other hand, having been called to follow Jesus only during the subsequent journey, heard these in-

¹ Richtige Auffassung der Evangelien: Tüb., 1736.

² Concerning his method, see Ebrard's Krit. der ev. Gesch., 2 ed., p. 62, etc.

idents from the other disciples, and therefore did not so clearly remember their sequence — perhaps he did not even hear them accurately — and could, therefore, the more readily distribute the particulars of this journey among different portions of his work. He could remember clearly only one thing, that his call was subsequent to the Gadarene journey, the healing the palsied man being immediately precedent to it. But then he also still remembered that about the time when he was received among the disciples, much was said about the raising of Jairus' daughter; and hence — not knowing its precise relation to the Gadarene journey — mentioned it, though without an exact date, immediately after he had mentioned his call — Luke, who among the synoptists has the *fewest* acolouthistic data, in chapter 5, confirms the fact that the call of Levi followed the cure of the palsied man; chapter 8, that the raising of Jairus' daughter took place after the return from Gadara, but the stilling of the storm on the journey thither. He gives nothing new on this series of events. — This concatenation, which we have given for illustration, is, however, as already remarked, the *only* case of such complicated kind in which several *synochia*, which in one evangelist are found separated, are united by means of a second or third evangelist into an uninterrupted chain (*syndesmos*). But if here already the *harmony* of the gospels is constructed so easily, we find in the other *syndesmos* scarcely a shadow of difficulty. Thus from the *journey of Jesus to Phenicia until his sufferings* the synoptists give thoroughly parallel narrations, and at most complete each other only occasionally in minor incidents. Between the above Gadarene *syndesmos* and this concluding one there is a third, which constructs itself quite readily from a comparison of the synoptists, and begins with the *choosing of the twelve* and the *sermon on the Mount*; takes up the healing of a leper, the effort to take Jesus prisoner, the healing of the centurion's servant, of the demoniac in the synagogue, of Peter's mother, the raising of the young man of Nain; and ends with the mission of John's disciples. Concerning the relation of this *syndesmos* to the Gadarene one, the synoptists furnish no data; but of course, Matthew could not be taken into the number of the twelve, before he was generally called to follow Jesus. — For a number of minor incidents we cannot ascertain the acolouthistic position with certainty, though at times with probability. But it is wholly in vain to try to determine the "original occurrence" of those *gnome-like sayings of Christ* which are reported by the evangelists in different connections. It is very probable that the Lord repeated those sayings with various turns on different occasions. An instance of this is Matt. 7:17; 12:33; also Luke 19:12, etc., compared with Matt. 25:14, etc. — 2. As regards *language*, the synoptists at times agree almost verbally, whilst at other times they differ widely. Their verbal concurrence is most complete where they report *sayings of Christ*, or of others. According to Norton the places in which Matthew concurs verbally with the other evangelists, forms *one-sixth*

of his gospel, of which $\frac{1}{4}$ are *sayings*. In Mark the ratio of concurrence is the same, $\frac{1}{4}$ of it being *sayings*. In Luke the verbal concurrence with the other evangelists is only $\frac{1}{10}$, of which $\frac{1}{8}$ are *sayings*. — To explain these phenomena various *hypotheses* have been offered. 1. It has been suggested that the three synoptists made use of a common source, a so-called *primitive gospel*. For a time the *Aramaic* gospel of Matthew was regarded as such a source. But this did not explain the often remarkable concurrence of the synoptists in Greek expressions, constructions, and entire periods. Still more unfortunate was the hypothesis of Lessing and others, that the Hebrew-Gospel (a corruption of the Aramaic Matthew, which originated in the sect of the Nazarenes about A. D. 70), was the original one. Utterly untenable is the hypothesis of Eichhorn and Marsh, that the original gospel was an Aramaic one composed by the apostles, but afterwards lost; that this gospel had been variously translated into the Greek; and that the synoptic gospels had been formed by combining these translations with the original and other sources. — 2. Others have maintained that the second synoptist *made use of* the first; and that the third made use of both of the others. But to which of them the priority must be given, and how they follow each other, has again given rise to a number of hypotheses. But none of them possesses a high degree of probability; since during the primitive age of the Church, when oral tradition was yet so complete and pure, the authors of the gospels would have been far from having recourse to written sources. That oral testimony was of high account in the apostolic age, is evident from Acts 15:27, where the letter of the apostles was sent by Judas and Silas, in order that the latter might establish its authority by their oral testimony. The same appears from Papias (a *Eus.*, 3, 39). From a written source the evangelists could obtain no more than it happened to contain. How could men limit themselves to these, who had the best opportunities to inform themselves concerning the life of Jesus from eye-witnesses? Mark had heard everything from Peter; and Luke was conversant with the Apostles and the entire Church of Jerusalem. — Besides this *improbability in general*, there are certain *special difficulties*. For in whatever order the synoptists are made to follow each other, each successor will always have omitted parts of his predecessor, without any assignable reason for it. Since also some sayings of Christ are reported by the synoptists in different connections, and since in these cases the similarity of *language* is most remarkable — the very thing to be explained by the supposed use of the predecessor — it must also be supposed that the successor, in order to transcribe his predecessor, must have turned forward and backward in his work. In this case, why did they not transcribe in regular order? If Luke copied Matthew, why did he not give the accurate data and sequence of the latter? Their verbal deviations are still more inexplicable on this supposition. Why does the evangelist copy half of a verse verbatim, and then suddenly, without any assignable object, use a synonyme

stead of the word given? And if the synoptists differ in their report of certain minor incidents, does not this, according to the present hypothesis, resemble a designed correction. —

These difficulties are only seemingly removed by the hypothesis that the synoptists *made use of each other from memory*. According to this mark is made to use Matthew and Luke from memory: but so as to be unable to give the longer sermons of Christ, in which, accordingly, he made use of the two evangelists indifferently. But this hypothesis is so far-fetched, that it needs no refutation. — 4. The path to the only correct and natural explanation of the relationship of the synoptists has been opened by *Gieseler*. The particular incidents of gospel history had been repeatedly narrated by the apostles, and thus a certain *type of narration* had formed itself. The particular *points*, especially sayings of Christ, were always reproduced; unusual expressions were the more firmly retained, since, when they were uttered, they had been more strongly attracted the attention of the disciples. Sermons and sayings were naturally retained with more care, and reported with more uniformity than incidents: although even in the latter, in the same degree that the incident was surprising and peculiar, a fixed type of narration had involuntarily formed itself. Thus it was that the authors had often heard the points, both of incidents and sayings, narrated; and this always in the same words. The more point there was, the more the *language itself* became fixed in the memory: naturally, however, not in the same degree with all, and without destroying the individuality of the evangelists. — This hypothesis is fully adequate to explain the relationship of the synoptists, especially if we combine with it the patristic tradition concerning their origin. — That the sayings of the Lord were above all carefully kept in the memory, the gospels themselves furnish a proof, to which the *Duke of Manchester* has lately called attention (*a chapter on the harmonizing of the gospels*: publ., by Gill, 1854). If, namely, we compare the *Old Test. passages* in the synoptists, we find that those of them which occur in *sermons* and *sayings* are always from the LXX.; whilst those of them which are quoted by the *synoptists themselves* deviate from the LXX. in favor, generally, of the Hebrew text. The reason is evident. At the time of Christ the Greek was generally spoken (see Hug, *Einl.*, Thl. II., § 10) in Palestine; especially where, as in Galilee, there was a large mixture of pagan population: hence it was natural that Christ should there speak the Greek, and quote the Old Test. according to the well known LXX. We find this to be the case in fact in all those sermons which were spoken in Galilee, as also in those spoken in the *circle of his disciples*: whilst, on the other hand, at the raising of Jairus' daughter, where Jesus spoke Aramaic with the ruler of the synagogue, the verbal harmony of the synoptists' reports of his sayings is defective; so also in the history of his sufferings the Old Test. is no longer quoted from the LXX., because at Jerusalem the Aramaic was spoken. — If Christ had generally spoken the Aramaic, it would be incomprehensible why the evangelists should put quotations

from the LXX. *only upon his lips*, whilst *they themselves* in *their own* quotations do not restrict themselves to the LXX. — If this proves that the sayings of the Lord impressed themselves accurately even as regards their form upon the minds of his disciples, we can the more readily understand how *above all in these sayings* a verbal harmony should be found in the synoptists. But that besides this harmony in essentials we find also a difference in unessentials needs no explanation. They faithfully treasured the sayings of their Lord in the heart, but did not slavishly learn them by rote. — But in the *materials* also of their reports there is at times a remarkable correspondence: at times even in quoting Old Test. passages, in which they deviate in a like manner from the LXX. This correspondence is readily explained from the natural hypothesis that the apostles, whilst yet at Jerusalem, repeatedly narrated the events to the neophytes, pointing out at the same time how the Old Test. prophecies had been fulfilled in them. In this way a fixed type of narration became established. If now we take into consideration the poverty and simplicity of the Aramaic-Greek, used by the evangelists, even by those who, like Luke, were acquainted with the classical Greek: that the evangelists did not aim at rhetorical elegance or striking contrast, but merely at faithfulness in portraying their important and holy subject, this correspondence explains itself readily without far-fetched hypotheses. — III. The partial deviation in the *material portrayal* of particular events is as readily explained, and is so far from lessening the credibility of the gospel history, that it rather increases it. The seeming deviations in the report of the same events are really *only seeming*, and such as take place daily where an event consisting of numerous minor circumstances is narrated with different degrees of vivacity by reporters who are equally well informed and truthful — deviations such as are most sure to appear, wherever there is the highest degree of harmlessness, the calmest consciousness of entire truthfulness, and an entire absence of collusion. Irreconcilable contradictions arise only, when the critic arbitrarily pronounces as identical those incidents, which from difference of actors, time, place, etc., are evidently *not identical*, in order afterwards to prove that they contradict each other in every essential point. If, however, we regard as identical *such* events only, which correspond in every *essential* point, every deviation will be reduced to a mere *seeming* one. The most important synoptic deviations may be reduced to this, that Matthew occasionally combines several similar incidents into one; or that in complex events he confines himself to what is essential. — IV. As regards the *Gospel of John*, it differs from the synoptists above all in its *later* origin (about A. D. 96), when the genius of gnosticism, and the completely changed external and internal position of the Church, had opened widely different apologetical and polemical views. Owing to this later origin, John could also take it for granted that the synoptists were already generally known; and he could thus complete them *externally*, by narrating those portions of the

life of Jesus which (being known to the Church at Jerusalem, such as his presence at the festivals; or of minor accounts, as his life previous to the imprisonment of John) the apostles had narrated less frequently, and therefore been omitted by the synoptists;—*internally*, by portraying in opposition to the false gnosis the true speculative side of Christ, as this appeared to his mystical-intuitive vision.—It may be expected, therefore, that there is a great *difference* between John and the synoptists; but also that this difference does not destroy the harmony between them. Even the synoptists mention *festal journeys*, but they do not describe them. Nor does the *sublimity* character of the sermons of Jesus in John present any difficulty to those who admit that John did not report them in their original form, but according to *his own* individual way of speaking and thinking. But to those who have an eye for the celestial brilliancy of these sermons, it will be more acceptable to suppose that John had formed his mode of speaking according to the model of his master, rather than the reverse. John, entirely receptive in relation to Christ, penetrated the inmost nature of Christ, and gathered up in his heart the finest and most delicate rays of his words. Expressions which, because less remarkable, practical and immediate in their effects, had escaped the other disciples, still re-echoed in his heart; and thus he was enabled to furnish us with a picture of Christ which would have been lost without him.—Since John has but few events in common with the synoptists (for even in the history of the passion he is altogether *supplementary*), but few *seeming deviations* from them have been mentioned, and these may be easily explained on the principles already given. Most of the *chronological deviations*, also, which have been hunted up, are rather contrived than real. The only real difficulty concerns the *time of the last Supper of Jesus*. On this point no satisfactory result has as yet been reached.¹ But this is also the *only* case where there is a real difficulty: for the seeming contradictions in the history of the resurrection can be explained in an exceedingly simple and natural way; and have their origin merely in the fact that the synoptists unite into one narrative, the incidents which occurred to M. Magdalene and the other women separately, whilst John narrates accurately the incident which occurred to the former.

DR. EBRARD.—*Reinecke*.

Harmonists (*Harmonites*, *Rappists*) a sect which attempts to live together in full harmony, or unity and equality. Its founder was a Württemberg farmer, George Rapp (born 1770), who supposed he had been blessed with special inspirations, and in his fanaticism regarded the condition of the Church and the State as so cor-

rupt that he felt himself called to purify both. He took Acts 4:32, for his model. Being opposed by the government in the execution of his scheme, he and his adherents emigrated to the United States (1803) settled on a tract of land near Pittsburg, and founded a town called Harmony. After a few years he sold out the colony to Robert Owen, and moved to Indiana, whence, however, he soon returned again, and founded another colony at Economy, on the Ohio, S. of Pittsburg, where he exercised without molestation the authority of a patriarch, high-priest, and chief ruler over his followers. His power was so unlimited that not even a marriage was consummated without his consent. The members of the union were not only required to yield implicit obedience to his authority, but they put all their property into a common fund, of which he had control. Complete equality in all things was the law. Applicants for admission to the society, were required to pass a probation of four weeks. The peace of the society was disturbed, in 1831, by the advent of an adventurous sectarist, Bernhard Müller, who had previously led a brilliant career in Offenbach on the Main, assumed the name of "*Proli*," and proposed to found a religious monarchy, but fled from legal proceedings instituted against him, to America. He came to Pittsburg, and, pretending to a princely descent, called himself Count Maximilian von Leon: also, the anointed of the Lord, and declared that he was commissioned to inaugurate the Millennium. Rapp received him as a prophet, and Proli soon won adherents among the Harmonists, especially by promising freedom in marriage, and a full community of possessions. Proli and his party soon seceded, taking their share of the property with them, and founded the New Jerusalem Society in Philippsburg, Ohio, where he ruled as Chief of the Millennium, squandered the money of his followers and then, 1833, deserted them, leaving them in extreme wretchedness. He went to Natchitoches, Ark., and soon after perished in the Missouri.—Rapp died Aug. 7, 1847. The establishment at Economy is still in operation, though not increasing.

NEUDECKER.*

Hatto (*Haito*, *Aito*, *Hetto*, &c.), Bishop of Basel at the time of Charlemagne. Born in 763 he entered the Reichenau monastery in 768, and enjoyed fine educational advantages for that age. He became principal in the monastery school there; c. 805 was appointed B. of Basel by Charlemagne, and in 806 became abbot of Reichenau. In 811 Charlemagne sent him, with Hugo of Tours and Hayo of Frisia on an embassy to Emperor Nicephorus. The mission succeeded, but on his way back he was shipwrecked. His account of the journey is lost. *Anon. Sangallensis* reports (*vita Caroli II.*, 8) various legends of his journey. About 823 Hatto resigned his office as Bishop and abbot, and lived as a private monk until his death in 836. Of his writings two remain: 1) *de visione Wettini*. Wettin, a monk, a pupil of Hatto, and teacher at Reichenau, had a vision in 824, in which three days before his death, he imagined himself led through purgatory and hell by an angel. 2) *25 capita*, being instruc-

¹ See concerning it: *Hengstenberg* (Kirchen-Zeitg., 1838, No. 98, etc.). *Tholuck*, (to John 13:1). *Wieseler* (chronol. Synopse, p. 333). *Lichtenstein* (Lebens-Gesch. Jesu, p. 342). *Movers* (Zeitschr. f. Phil. u. Kath. Theol., 1833, No. 8). *Krafft*, (Chronol. u. Harm. der Ev., p. 17). *Bleek* (Beiträge z. Ev. Kritik, p. 107). *Weitzel* (die christl. Passahfeier d. 3. erst. Jahrh., p. 305). *Ebrard* (Krit. d. ev. Gesch. 2 ed. p. 505).

ons for the clergy of his diocese. They show the low condition of the clergy of that period, but also the efforts of Charlemagne and his friends to elevate it. In the *capita* the German church appears to be still rather independent of Rome.—(The *Visio Wettini* is in MABILLON, *Acta S. Bened.* IV., 1, p. 273. The *Capita* in ACHERY, *spicil.* I., 583. See HOTTINGER, *Belvet.* K.-G., I. NEUGART, *Ep. Const.*, 145. PERTZ, *Monum. G.*, III., 439. DU CHESNE, *cript.* II., 719. *Walafrid Strabo*, *Herm. d. contr.* EGINO, *de vir. illustr. Augiæ* in PEZ, *ies. Anecd.*, I. GFRÖRER, K.-G., III. RETTBERG, K.-G. *Deutschl.*, I., 455; II., 93, &c.).

Hatto I. and II., Archbishops of Mayence. —I. born c. 850, probably in Suabia, a pupil and then abbot of Ellwangen (?), 888, abbot of Leichenau, was also elevated to the Archb. of Mayence, by King Arnulf, and in this character played a prominent part in the history of the later Carolingians. He was more of a statesman than a theologian. Arnulf, already, discovered his talents for politics, but he acquired much greater influence when Arnulf's son, Louis IV., in his seventh year, succeeded his father on the throne. He, with Bishop Adalbero and Duke Hatto of Saxony, now actually ruled, until the death of the sickly child, 911. Hatto's influence continued under Conrad I., and, indeed, to his death in Jan. 913. He was a man of great intellect and energy, but worldly and ambitious, even to unscrupulousness.—He was no less active in Church matters. At a synod in Tribur, 895, attended by 22 German bishops, Hatto, with his colleagues, Hermann of Cologne and Ratbod of Trier, secured the adoption of 52 canons, restoring discipline and order, asserting the superiority of spiritual over temporal authority, restricting appeals of the lower clergy to Rome, and defining the jurisdiction of Bishops in disputes between clergymen and the laity.—Various legends spread as to the cause of his death. Some said he was struck by lightning; others, that Satan carried him off and threw his body into Etna.—(Sources: PERTZ, *Monum.*, I., 603; II., *Cent. Magdeb.*, X., 85. BARON., X., 891, 895. GFRÖRER, III., 1, 1. *Ersch u. Gruber*, *Encycl.*, II., 3, p. 117. *Kälin*, *Würtemb. Gesch.*, I., 264, 366. NEANDER, *Ch. Hist.*). —II., a pupil of Fulda, and abbot there, c. 942. In 961 he accompanied Otto I. to Rome, and in 968 was placed by Otto on the Archiep. chair of Mayence, after having declared himself willing to found the Archb. of Magdeburg, and so far reduce the limits of his own See.—(*Cent. Magdeb.*, X., 590. *Baron.*, 961-2. *Gfrörer*, III. *Ersch u. Gruber*, I, 1). WAGENMANN.*

Hazael (Sept. 'Aζαζ; cf. 2 Kings 8: 8, 13) a court officer of Benhadad II. (see *Hadrach*), who probably succeeded Naaman (2 Kings 5: 1, 18). He was an energetic, cunning, hypocritical minister, and scarcely learned from Elisha that he should succeed the King, and deal sorely with Israel (8: 12, 13; 19: 15, 17), before he executed a plot (probably previously conceived, 1: 10, 11) for Benhadad's destruction. Immediately he ascended the throne (8: 15). Possibly Elisha anointed him during his visit to the sick king in Damascus (8: 7, &c.). Hazael vigor-

ously carried out Benhadad's projects for humbling Israel. Soon after he took the throne, the possession of Ramoth Gilead occasioned animosities (cf. 1 Kings 20: 34). Ahab had perished in the first attempt to gain the city (1 Kings 22: 3, 34), and his son Jehoram had returned from an assault on it covered with wounds (2 Kings 8: 28; 9: 15). Jehu, also, was routed by Hazael, who pressed on and seized the whole country beyond Jordan (2 Kings 10: 32, 33). In a subsequent campaign, passing through the midst of Israel and Judah, and laying the whole country waste, he took Gath, and Joash had to pay a heavy sum to keep him from besieging Jerusalem (2 Kings 12: 17, 18; cf. Amos 1: 3). Jehoahaz, Jehu's son, was also oppressed by Hazael (2 Kings 13: 3, 7). Hazael reigned more than 45 years (2 Kings 10: 36; 13: 1). VAHINGER.*

Heart, in a Scriptural sense (καρδία; לֵב, לֵב; or קֶרֶב = the chest with the lungs, &c., cf. Ps. 39: 3; 109: 22; 1 Sam. 25: 37, and *Delitzsch*, *System d. bibl. Psychol.*, 203, 220.

Hupfeld on Ps. 17: 10, makes לֵב = heart; but this is improbable). According to the mode of representation in the Bible, man's life centres in the heart. And as the heart is the central organ of the circulation of the blood (see *Delitzsch* on Eccles. 12: 6, &c.), and thus the strengthening of the body by food is a support of the heart (Gen. 18: 5; Ps. 104: 15), and the reverse (Ps. 102: 4; 22: 14), so the heart is regarded as the centre of all spiritual functions. For all spiritual acts, whether pertaining to the intellectual, moral, or pathological spheres, are originated and propelled by the heart. In a word, all the activities of the soul proceed from and react upon the heart (Prov. 4: 23). In order to determine the Biblical idea of the heart more accurately, we must ascertain the relation between it and the soul, שֵׁנָה, however difficult this may be. And first let it be remembered that the heart is the centre and office of the functions of the soul's life, so that both terms are interchangeably used (Deut. 6: 5; cf. Matt. 22: 37, &c.; 1 Chron. 28: 9; James 1: 8; 4: 8; 1 Pet. 1: 22). The soul is the bearer of the life of the *Ego*, the proper self of man (though at the same time *personality* is to be distinguished from the soul itself), by virtue of the immanence of the spirit (see Art.); the heart is the place where the process of self-consciousness is completed, where the soul communes with itself (*in corde actiones animae humanæ ad ipsam redeunt*; Roos, *fundam. psychol. ex s. scr.*, 1796, p. 99). Hence, in passages speaking of the entire person of man, and of his physical or psychical life or destruction, not the heart but the soul is meant (Job 33: 18, 22; Ps. 94: 17, &c.; Mark 8: 35, &c.; Heb. 10: 39; 1 Pet. 2: 11). In these passages

לֵב or καρδία could not be used, any more than ἐπίσκοπος τῶν ψυχῶν, 1 Pet. 2: 25, could be expressed by καρδιογνώστης, Acts 1: 24, or an oath by the life of the soul, by an oath by the life of the heart (cf. 2 Cor. 1: 23; Ps. 22: 26, ~

69 : 33 ; Jer. 38 : 17, 20). When Nabal was struck with apoplexy, his soul was still in him (Acts 20 : 10), but his heart died (1 Sam. 25 : 37. Cf. Is. 21 : 4 ; Gen. 42 : 28 ; also Cant. 5 : 6). When man is represented as meditating or resolving upon something, *heart* is almost always used (*dum ipsa [anima] sibi aliquid ostendit ac proponit, ad cor suum loqui dicitur ; dum suarum actionum sibi conscia est et illarum innocentiam vel turpitudinem ipsa sentit, id ad cor refertur. Anima humana ut $\psi\chi\eta$ suavia appetit, ut spiritus scrutatur, &c., sed quatenus cor habet, ipsa novit, se hoc agere et ideus reflexas habet*, Roos, *l. c.* Cf. Deut. 8 : 5 ; Is. 44 : 19 [with Gen. 8 : 21] ; Ps. 73 : 7 ; Prov. 16 : 1 ; Luke 1 : 66 ; Matt. 9 : 4 ; Luke 3 : 15, &c. ; 1 Cor. 4 : 5, &c.). But the *heart* is also regarded as the organ of knowledge in general, hence it is used of understanding, insight, &c. (Job 34 : 10 ; 36 : 5 ; Jer. 2 : 21 ; Prov. 17 : 16 ; 1 Kings 5 : 9 ; Ps. 119 : 32 ; 2 Kings 5 : 26). Hence the LXX. often has $\nu\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$ for *heart* (Ex. 7 : 23 ; Is. 10 : 7, &c.). There are indeed exceptions to this ; for the soul, also, is mentioned as the subject of knowledge, reflection, purposes, &c. (Prov. 19 : 2 ; Ps. 139 : 14 ; Lam. 3 : 20, 24 ; 1 Sam. 20 : 4 ; Esth. 4 : 13 ; Ps. 13 : 2, &c.). But dispositions and affections are as often predicated of the soul as of the heart (Matt. 26 : 38 ; John 12 : 27 ; 16 : 6, and Rom. 9 : 2 ; 2 Cor. 2 : 4 ; Deut. 28 : 65 ; Prov. 12 : 25 ; Eccl. 11 : 10 ; Jer. 15 : 16 ; 1 Sam. 2 : 1 ; Ps. 28 : 7 ; Ex. 23 : 9 ; Ps. 6 : 3 ; 42 : 5, 6, &c., &c.). Usually $\מֵרֶץ$ and its derivations are joined with $\שֹׁפֵךְ$, and $\חַמָּה$ and its derivations with $\לֵב$ (Prov. 14 : 10). If functions are designated which imply an action of the subject upon an object, $\שֹׁפֵךְ$ is used (Jer. 4 : 19) ; probably because heavy breathing is connected with vehement desire (Amos 2 : 7). Of course the impulses to which man yields (Ex. 35 : 5, 22, 29), his motives, desires, &c., are matters of the heart (Ezek. 11 : 21 ; 20 : 16 ; 33 : 31, &c.) ; but as soon as they express themselves, they become acts of the soul (Ps. 84 : 2 ; 119 : 20, 81 ; Eccl. 6 : 7, 9, &c.).—From all this we may gather the *ethico-religious* import of the term *heart*. As it is the inner chamber of man's personal life, the workshop for the personal appropriation of spiritual things, man's moral and religious personality is lodged in the heart. Only what has entered the heart acquires a moral character, and only what proceeds from it is a moral product. The state of the heart, therefore, gives tone and character to man's life in general, and to all its particular acts (Matt. 12 : 33, &c.). Hence *ex cordis* designates what has a real moral value, in distinction from mere show (Rom. 6 : 17 ; cf. Matt. 15 : 8 ; 1 Tim. 1 : 5). This distinction occurs even where God is the subject (Lam. 3 : 33, &c.), and when he is said to look upon, know and try the heart (1 Sam. 16 : 7 ; Jer. 20 : 12 ; 1 Kings 8 : 39 ; Luke 16 : 15, &c.). Hence all man's habits and moral characteristics are associated with his heart ; he is *wise* (1 Kings 5 : 12 ; Prov. 10 : 8, &c.), *pure* (Ps. 51 : 10, &c.), *upright* (Gen. 20 : 5, 6, &c.), *simple* (Eph. 6 : 5, &c.), and *good*

(Luke 8 : 15, &c.) in *heart*, and the reverse (Luke 24 : 25 ; Acts 8 : 21, &c., &c.). In such connections we rarely find $\psi\chi\eta$, excepting that the LXX. is not so uniform.—As the law was originally inscribed on the heart, it is the seat of the *conscience*, which bears witness to that law (Rom. 2 : 15 ; 1 Cor. 2 : 44 ; Job 27 : 6, &c. ; Delitzsch, p. 100, &c.). Hence all other divine revelations are addressed to the heart (Deut. 6 : 6 ; 11 : 18 ; Ps. 119 : 10, &c.) ; Wisdom desires admission to the heart, that it may send healing virtue into the whole moral organism (Prov. 4 : 21) ; and the heart is the soil on which the seed is cast (Matt. 13 : 9, &c.). That which the heart appropriates becomes the $\sigma\tau\epsilon\gamma\alpha\sigma\tau\epsilon\varsigma\ \tau\omicron\varsigma\ \kappa\alpha\rho\delta\iota\alpha\varsigma$ (Matt. 12 : 35), which may be good or bad. By nature the heart is wicked (Jer. 17 : 9), so that only a divine act of grace can renew it. This is the work of the Spirit, whose operations were known even under the Old Test. (1 Sam. 10 : 6, 9 ; Ps. 51 : 10–14 ; Ezek. 36 : 26, &c. ; 11 : 19).—On the part of man the process begins with the awakening of *faith*, which, as through it man's personal life receives a new direction in its deepest ground, belongs wholly to the sphere of the heart, and is described, therefore, as a strengthening, support of the heart (Ps. 27 : 13, 31 : 24 ; 73 : 26 ; 112 : 6, &c. ; see Rom. 10 : 9, 10 ; Mark 11 : 23). God purifies the heart through faith in Christ (Acts 15 : 9 ; Heb. 10 : 22 ; 1 John 3 : 19–21), and in it the love of God is shed abroad, and assurance of adoption awakened (Rom. 5 : 5 ; 2 Cor. 1 : 22). Then it becomes the abode of Christ, is kept by and established in him (Eph. 3 : 17 ; Col. 3 : 15 ; Philip. 4 : 7 ; 1 Thess. 3 : 13, &c.).—But if man rejects the testimony of Revelation, the heart becomes hardened, shut, &c. (Ps. 95 : 8 ; Prov. 28 : 14 ; 2 Chron. 36 : 13 ; Is. 44 : 18. Cf. also : Is. 6 : 10 ; Ps. 119 : 70 ; Mark 3 : 5 ; Eph. 4 : 18 ; Matt. 19 : 8, &c.). The result of this unsusceptibility of the heart, is inability to see God's works, to *hear* his Word, and incapacity for salvation.—Finally, the question of the relation of the heart as the fountain of the soul's life, to it as the centre of man's physical life, could be fully answered only in an investigation of the general relation of the soul to the body. We may briefly observe that, according to the Bible, there is not simply a parallel between the body and soul so far as to allow the former to be used as a symbol of the latter, but that, as the soul, which is the bearer of our personality, is the same which animates our blood and breathing, so are our bodily organs also participant in its higher functions. As daily experience proves the influence of affections and passions upon pulsation and the bowels, no one will regard as mere tropes such expressions as : "my heart was hot," Ps. 39 : 3 (see Jer. 20 : 9). But there are two remarkable points in Biblical anthropology, 1) the specific relation represented as existing between some affections and certain internal organs (the liver, reins) ; 2) the prominence of the heart, to the exclusion of the head and brain, in the operations of the reason and the will. In this respect all ancient authors agree with the Bible. In regard to Homer's *usus loq.* see Nägelsbach, *homer. Theol.*, 332, &c. In Latin authors we may refer to the words

ordatus, recordari, recors, excors, &c. (see Cic., *Tusc.*, I., 9, 18. Cf. also PLATO's *Phædr.*, c. 45). The fact that the heart is the central organ for the circulation of the blood, does not explain this. The phenomena of somnambulism have been employed in illustration of the subject. But physiology has yet to solve the problems arising from this mode of representing the heart's functions.—(For the literature upon this subject see *Spirit of man.*) OEHLEK.*

Heaven.—The Bible represents the world as composed of *earth* and *heaven*, this latter term designating everything beyond the earth. But the heavenly region includes such vast diversity of form and being, that it, again, is commonly designated by the plural (not dual) number (Deut. 10 : 14); in the New Test. we frequently find *οὐρανοί*. No fixed number of heavens is named; 2 Cor. 12 : 2, is not definite (cf. *de Wette*, l.c.; *G. L. Hahn*, *Theol. d. N. T.*, I., 247-9). The Scriptures furnish but one distinction, that between the visible, material, and invisible, immaterial heavens; they are not only mentioned together (Col. 1 : 16, 20), but each one is named separately (2 Pet. 3 : 10; Matt. 6 : 9).—Heaven is the name of everything above the earth, the atmosphere, the clouds, the starry heavens, the hosts of heaven (Gen. 1 : 20; Deut. 4 : 19; Ps. 8 : 3; Matt. 24 : 29). These are the visible heavens, collectively called firmament, in the Old Testament, from their aspect. They stand opposite to the earth, but are of like substance with it, and are often placed in a parallel with it. They were both made of the same material (Gen. 1 : 6-8, 14-19), and now they testify to earth of the power, wisdom, and goodness of God (Ps. 19 : 1-6, &c.). Once they shall also vanish like the earth, to reappear in a more glorious form (Ps. 102 : 25-7; Is. 51 : 6, &c.). The recently advanced opinion (especially by Kurtz of Dorpat, "Bible and Astronomy," transl.: Philad., 1857), that angels inhabit the fixed stars, is untenable, however plausible. An abode must correspond with the nature of its inhabitants. But angels (see Art.) are immaterial beings. Hence no mention is made of the creation of angels in Gen. 1.—The invisible, immaterial heavens are the abode of all immaterial spirits, of God, of angels, of Christ, and of the redeemed. It is a fact on which entire Revelation rests, that besides the heavens we see, there is another, a kingdom of God, prepared before the creation (Matt. 25 : 34), a perfect world of life, light, and love. That is the ideal, or rather the only real world (Luke 16 : 11; Heb. 8 : 2; 9 : 24). in which reign purity, holiness, and harmony, in contrast with which our fleshly existence is but darkness and death; hence a fulness, power, glory, and happiness, compared with which earth is poverty and weakness. Such a life is in its nature eternal; such a kingdom, an immovable, and enduring kingdom of unfading bloom and beauty (1 Pet. 1 : 4; James 1 : 17; Col. 1 : 12; 2 Tim. 4 : 18; Heb. 12 : 27).—In Hebrews and Revelation, especially, this contrast between earth and heaven is clearly exhibited. The natural man, separated by the veil of the flesh from the upper sanctuary (Heb. 10 : 20) cannot apprehend this contrast; he minds only

earthly things (Philip. 3 : 19; Rev. 6 : 10, &c.). It is the aim of divine revelation to revive in man a consciousness of heaven, and bring him within the sphere of power and joy. Under the Old Test. the way to heaven was only indicated under dim types and shadows (Heb. 8 : 5; 9 : 23, &c.). Christ, who came from heaven, was the first to bring the pneumatic life of the upper world to earth, and to found the kingdom of heaven amongst men (John 1 : 14-18, 52; 3 : 11, &c.; 31, &c.; Matt. 4 : 17; 12 : 28, &c.); he bestows on his followers heavenly blessings, and translates them, by fellowship with his death and resurrection, into a heavenly state (Eph. 1 : 3; 2 : 6; Philip. 3 : 20, &c.). This transition from death to life, by which the invisible becomes a part of man's life, is *faith* (Heb. 11 : 1, &c.; John 5 : 24), by which possession is gained of the highest sphere of life. Hence the tenor of the first three petitions in the Lord's prayer. Through Christ heaven is opened to believers after they have laid off the flesh (John 14 : 2; Philip 1 : 21-3, &c.); and finally the opposition between heaven and earth will cease when the glory of heaven shall descend upon the new earth (Rev. 21).—Thus we see that the Bible leads us to apprehend the heavenly and pneumatic state, not in a spiritualistic, but realistic sense; a view insisted upon especially by the theosophists (Böhme, Oetinger, Rothe). It also furnishes hints of the riches and fulness of the celestial life. The most exalted object there is the throne of God, the concentrated manifestation of the glory of the Trinity, where the majesty of the universal Potentate, and the grace of the Lamb commingle, so that the entire fulness of the life of God in the Spirit, with its rays, may illumine the world. Around this throne, borne by the four cherubim, are the 24 elders, the representatives of the redeemed, and further out the countless hosts of angels, in their manifold orders and grades, principalities, thrones, powers, all filled with adoring fear and adoring love to God and the Lamb, whom they magnify in holy songs (Rev. 4 and 5).—There are, furthermore, many mansions in heaven for the spirits of the just made perfect (John 14 : 2), and among these a chief city, the heavenly Jerusalem, the city of the living God (Heb. 11 : 10, 16; 12 : 22; 13 : 14; Gal. 4 : 26; Rev. 21 : 2), with a celestial Zion and tabernacle or temple (Heb. 8 : 25; 12 : 22; Rev. 11 : 19; 14 : 17; 15 : 5). Treasures are also said to be there, crowns of life for conquerors, an imperishable inheritance, a fountain of living water (Matt. 6 : 20; 1 Pet. 1 : 4; Rev. 2 : 7, 10; 7 : 17). This is indeed speaking of heavenly things in earthly language, and it may be difficult to determine how much is symbolical or typical. The heavenly temple seems to be exhibited under different aspects. In the passages just quoted, there appears to be a local sanctuary; but in others the whole heavens are represented as forming this temple. In John 14 : 2; Heb. 10 : 21, "house of God" occurs. Heb. 9 : 11, 23; 8 : 1; cf. 4 : 14; 7 : 26; Eph. 4 : 10; Rev. 4 : 1; 5 : 8; 6 : 9; 7 : 15; 8 : 3. According to these the throne of God on which Christ sits is in the holy of holies, which appears as a place above heaven; the holy place through which, as High-

priest, he passed, are the heavens, the abodes of the angels, and, since his ascension, of those saints who serve God as priests. This holy place, therefore, is not the place of absolute holiness, not the full presence of God himself (this explains Job 4 : 18; 15 : 15), though still a sacred, pure abode, in contrast with the outer court, the material visible world. Whilst, therefore, these various expressions are not to be taken too literally, they yet prove that there are heavenly realities and localities, suited to the nature of the spiritual existences inhabiting heaven. The Bible selects such terms and figures from things celestial, as specifically correspond, in their fundamental aspects, to the realities of heaven, which, indeed, are the original types of all things, both in the sphere of nature and revelation (Matt. 6 : 19, &c.; 13 : 31; Luke 16 : 11, John 4 : 13; 6 : 26; Ex. 25 : 9, 40; Heb. 8 : 5; 9 : 23, &c.; 12 : 22; Rev. 11 : 19, &c. &c.). Holding fast to this Scripture idea of the pattern and realness of heavenly things being primeval, we shall escape two errors: 1) a *philosophical* one, which even evangelical theology has not yet quite overcome, of reversing the proper relation between heaven and earth, so as to regard the latter only as real and the other as an unsubstantial ideal, or mere conceit; 2) a *mystical* one, which, in a laudable effort fully to realize heavenly things, forgets the distinction between the original form and the copy of it, paints heaven with earthly colors, and even drafts a chart of heaven (Swedenborg, Oberlin, &c. The latest: Uranographie: Ludwigsburg, 1856). — Thus far we have considered heaven only as the abode of blessed spirits, for this is the predominant idea of it in the Bible. But there are some passages in which bad spirits also appear there (Job 1 : 6; 2 : 1, &c.; 1 Kings 22 : 19–22; Zech. 3 : 1; Rev. 12 : 7, &c.). This may be more easily understood by remembering that heaven is the place of spiritual existence in general, and that fallen spirits, also, have their times of development. Such spirits can, of course, not remain there; but Satan, also, had to be overcome by Christ, before he with his angels could be hurled from heaven (Rev. 12). Thus the atoning work of Christ is not only significant for the restoration of the union of earth with heaven, but also for heaven itself. — (See G. L. Hahn, Theol. d. N. T.: Beck, Chr. Lehrwissensch.; Ph. M. Hahn, Gedanken v. Himmel, in his sermons on Coloss., 1845. Auberlen, d. Proph. Daniel). AUBERLEN.*

Heaven, Christ's ascension to. — In the Gospel account of Christ's ascension into heaven (Mark 16 : 19; Luke 24 : 50; Acts 1 : 3, 9, 10; cf. 1 Pet. 3 : 22; Heb. 9 : 24) we note the fact as it appeared to the disciples, and the fact as declared to them by the angels. So far as the disciples saw, Christ merely disappeared in the heavenly region above them, the visible heavens. But the angels told them that he had ascended far beyond those heavens into the invisible heaven, the place of the full manifestation of the glory of God, and the abode of the holy angels (see *Heaven*). The Scriptures, therefore, teach us that the glorified body of the arisen Saviour ascended until a cloud concealed him from the

gaze of his disciples, and that he went into heaven, as he had foretold (John 14 : 2). Hence Paul (Col. 3 : 1–3) could say that Christ was "above, at the right hand of God," placing "earth" in antithesis to the *τόπος* where Christ is. In his ascension to heaven, Christ left the earth, where sin and death reign, and went to that realm of creation in which there is neither sin nor death. — And this, first of all, was necessary as to his own person. When the eternally begotten Son of the Father united his divine with a human nature, he assumed something which he would eternally retain, and something which he would again lay off. The former was the *essentia humana*, that which makes man, a man (the possession of a perceiving, apprehending, self-developing soul, dwelling in a body, by which man distinguishes himself from God, and relatively also from angels; and the personal organization of that soul, by which he distinguishes himself from beasts, and lower orders of nature). The other was the *accidens mortalitatis*, the bondage to death, the *ἀσθένεια*, the effect of sin, and which is so unessential to humanity, that man not only remains man without it, but first attains to true manhood, when it has been overcome. Now Christ at his incarnation assumed this state too, but only that in it he might free man from it. This he did by his death, and so became the first-fruits of humanity redeemed from that mournful *accidens*, and restored to the pure *essentia humana*, when he arose a glorified man from the grave. And he did this not to lay aside the *essentia humana*, but to remain in this glorified human state, that as first-fruits, head, and king of his members and brethren (Heb. 2 : 11) he might exalt them also to this state (Philip. 3 : 21; 1 John 3 : 2) and draw them to himself (John 12 : 32). — But for Christ thus glorified, our earth still under death was no suitable abode; hence his glorified person demanded that he should quit the earth, and enter that region where a) death had not entered; b) his eternal home had been (Eph. 4 : 9, &c.; John 3 : 13); and where c) he would find a fulness of joy in the presence of the Father (Luke 2 : 49).

Christ's ascension to heaven was also necessary for his work of Redemption and for his Church. For, 1) His ascension is a pledge that as he has gone to heaven to prepare a place for us, he will draw us thither, and keep us in happiness, until his second coming (Rev. 20 : 1, &c.; 21). 2) He had to ascend into heaven, the most holy place, made without hands (Heb. 9 : 24), to represent us there as our High-priest before the Father (Heb. 6 : 20; 7 : 26; 8 : 4; 9 : 24; Rom. 8 : 34). 3) That from thence (John 14 : 16; 16 : 7), as from the fulness of the heavenly glory and majesty, he might pour out the Holy Spirit, now as the *Spirit of Christ*, upon his Church, and thus prove his promise true, that although "above and not on earth," "no more with his disciples," "no more in the world," and "gone from the world" (Col. 3 : 1, &c.; Matt. 26 : 11; John 17 : 11; 16 : 28), he was still with them (Matt. 28 : 20), had not left them orphans (John 14 : 18), but was remaining with them always (John 6 : 56; 15 : 4). For whilst his visible glorified body is withdrawn

from the earth as such, that with that same body he may visibly come again, he is ascended; but by his Spirit (John 14: 16) he might be spiritually and absolutely near *his Church* (by the space-transcending power of his glory) and fill it with the power and substance of his glorified humanity.¹ 4) That he might *participate in the reign and government of his Father*, for the protection and spread of his kingdom; to lead in the war of love against the hostile world described in Revelation; as the Lamb who

¹ Thus *Polanus a Polensdorf* says (syntagm. lib. IV. ap. 25. pag. 762): Ideo corpus Christi non est jam in terra, nedum ubique. Etsi autem Christus corpore suo non sit jam in terra, tamen est etiam conjunctus et praesens corpori nostro secundum carnem, sed non loco; sicut caput uniuscujusque hominis non est eo loco quo pedes, et tamen est illis suo modo unitum. Proinde adest Christus ecclesiae suae non tantum secundum divinam sed etiam secundum humanam naturam, verum spiritualiter, sicut caput membrum, quibus unitum est et quae vivificat.

² The expression is figurative, as Calvin already explained it (Instit. II. 16, 15): Quare mox subjicitur, consedis ad Patris dexteram; similitudine scilicet a principibus sumpta, qui suos habent assessores, quibus regendi imperandique vices demandant. Ita Christus, in quo exaltari, et per ejus manum regnare vult Pater, in ejus dexteram receptus dicitur, ac si diceretur veli ac terrae dominio inauguratus, commissae sibi administrationis possessionem solemniter adisse, nec semel adisse tantum, sed in ea perstare, donec ad judicium descendat. — Vides quorsum pertineat illa sessio, nempe ut ejus majestatem tum coelestes tum terrenae creaturae suspiciant, manu ejus regantur, autum intueantur, virtuti subjectae sint.

³ Thus August. (tract. in Jo. 109): Iturus per mortem erat Christus ad dexteram Patris, unde venturus est ad vivos et mortuos judicandos; praesentia itidem corporalis, secundum sanam doctrinam fideique regulam. Nam praesentia spirituali cum eis erat venturus post ascensionem suam. So ad Matt. 28: 20: Secundum carnem vero, quam Verbum assumpsit, secundum id quod de Virgine natus est, secundum id quod a Judaeis comprehensus est, quod ligno confixus, quod de cruce depositus, quod linteis involutus, quod in sepulchro conditus, quod in resurrectione manifestatus: Non semper habebitis me vobiscum. Quare? quoniam conversatus est secundum corporis praesentium quadraginta diebus cum discipulis suis, et eis deducentibus videndo, non sequendo, ascendit in coelum, et *non est hic*, ibi enim sedet ad dexteram Patris; et *hic est*, non enim recessit praesentia majestatis. Ergo secundum praesentiam majestatis semper habemus Christum, secundum praesentiam carnis recte dictum est discipulis: Me autem non semper habebitis. Aguin tom. X. serm. 140: Ideo Dominus noster absentavit se corpore ab omni ecclesia, et ascendit in coelum, ut fides aedificetur. Especially tom. II. epist. 57. ad Dardanum: Noli itaque dubitare, ibi nunc esse hominem Christum Jesum, unde venturus est . . . et sic venturus est illa angelica voce testante, quemadmodum ire visus est in coelum, i. e. in eadem carnis forma atque substantia, cui profecto immortalitatem dedit, naturam non abstulit. Secundum hanc formam non est putandus ubique diffusus. Cavendum est enim, ne ita divinitatem astruamus hominis, ut veritatem corporis auferamus. Non est autem consequens, ut, quod in Deo est, ita sit ubique, ut Deus . . . Nam spatia locorum tolle corporibus; nusquam erunt, et quia nusquam erunt, nec erunt. Tolle ipsa corpora qualitatibus corporum; non erit, ubi sint, et ideo necesse est, ut non sint. Christum autem Dominum nostrum, unigenitum Dei filium aequalem Patri, eundemque hominis filium, quo major est Pater, et ubique totum praesentem esse non dubites *tanquam Deum*, et in eodem templo Dei esse *tanquam inhabitantem Deum*, et in loco aliquo coeli propter veri corporis modum. And ep. 146. ad Consentium: Sic

alone is worthy to open the seal of the future. This participation in authority is designated a "sitting at the right hand of God" (Matt. 26: 64; Acts 7: 55, &c., &c.). But in order to do this Christ had to leave the earth, and enter the holiest place (Rev. 15: 5), where God's presence is intensively revealed, and whence he governs heaven and earth. — It was thus the ancient Church understood the doctrine of Christ's ascension to heaven.³ — In this *Biblical* sense of the fact the Oriental, Romish, and

eorum, quum esset in terra, contrectatus est manibus (Luc. 24, 39); sic eorum est, quum iret in coelum, deductus aspectibus. Finally tom. IX. tract. 30 in Jo. Corpus enim Domini, in quo resurrexit, uno loco esse oportet: veritas ejusque ubique diffusa est, and tract. 50 Corpus enim suum intulit coelo, majestatem non abstulit mundo.

Likewise *Vigilius* contra Eutych. lib. 4: Si Verbi et carnis und natura est, quomodo, quum Verbum ubique sit, non ubique inveniatur et caro? Namque quando in terra fuit, non erat utique in coelo; et nunc quia in coelo est, non est utique in terra. . . . Diversum est autem et longe dissimile: circumscribi loco, et: ubique esse. Et quia Verbum ubique est, Caro autem ejus ubique non est, appareat, unum eundemque Christum utriusque esse naturae, et esse quidem ubique secundum naturam divinitatis suae, et loco contineri secundum naturam humanitatis suae.

Greg. Naz. orat. 2, de filio: δεῖ γὰρ αὐτὸν βασιλεῖν ἄχρι τοῦδε, καὶ ἐπ' οὐρανὸν δεχθῆναι ἄχρι χρόνων ἀποκαταστάσεως.

Origines hom. 33, in Matt.: Qui dicit discipulis suis: ecce ego vobiscum sum, unigenitus Dei est, Deus Verbum, qui non est corporeo ambitu circumolusus. Secundum hanc divinitatis suae naturam non peregrinatur a nobis, sed peregrinatur secundum dispensationem corporis, quod suscepit. Haec autem dicentes non solvimus suscepti corporis hominem, sed unicuique substantiae suam proprietatem servamus. Quasi homo peregrinatur, qui est ubique secundum divinitatis naturam. Non enim est homo, qui, ubicunque duo vel tres in nomine ejus congregati fuerint, sed virtus divina, quae erat in Jesu. Neque homo (hoc est, secundum humanitatem) nobiscum est omnibus diebus usque ad consummationem saeculi. — *Irenaeus* 3, 16, 8, ἐνα καὶ τὸν αὐτὸν εἰδὼς Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν ὡς ἠνολέχθησαν αἱ πόλεις τοῦ οὐρανοῦ διὰ τὴν ἔνσρκον ἀνάληψιν αὐτοῦ, θεὸς καὶ ἐν τῇ αὐτῇ σαρκί, ἐν ᾗ καὶ ἔπαθεν, ἡλίσσεται, τὴν δόξαν ἀποκαλύπτων τοῦ πατρὸς. And III., 19, 3: Propter hoc et ipse Dominus dedit nobis signum in profundum, in altitudinem sursum, quod non postulavit homo, quia nec speravit, virginem praegnantem fieri posse, quae erat virgo, et parere filium, et hunc partum Deum esse nobiscum, et descendere in ea quae sunt deorsum terrae, quaerentem ovem quae perierat, quod quidem erat proprium ipsius plasma, et ascendere in altitudinem, offerentem et commendantem Patri enim hominem, qui fuerat inventus, primitivae resurrectionis hominis in ipso faciens, ut, quemadmodum caput resurrexit a mortuis, . . . sic et reliquum corpus omnis hominis, qui invenitur in vita, impleto tempore . . . resurgat . . . unoquoque membrorum habente propriam et aptam in corpore positionem. Multae enim mansiones apud patrem, quoniam et multa membra in corpore. — *Theodoretus*, dial. 2, Corpus dominicum surrexit quidem, a corruptione et interitu alienum, et impatibile et immortale, et divina gloria glorificatum, et a coelestibus adoratur potestatibus; corpus tamen est et habet, quam prius habuit, circumscriptionem. — *Athanasius* de incarnat. verbi Dei (ed. Colon. I., p. 592): καὶ πάλιν ἐὰν θεωρῇτε τὸν εἶδεν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἀναβαίνοντα, θεοῦ ᾧ τὸ πρότερον, καὶ ἐγὼ εἶμι ὁ ἄνθρωπος ὁ ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καταβὰς, ὁ ζῶν καὶ ζῶν διδοὺς τῷ κόσμῳ σαφῶς διὰ τούτων ἐκδηλώσεων ἡμᾶς τὴν θεότητα τὴν αὐτοῦ, οὐκ ἀναιρῶν τὸ κατὰ σάρκα προσεληφέναι, ἀλλ' ἐντὸν αὐτὸν πρὸς τὴν σάρκα, ἐπειδὴ κατὰ Παῦλον ἐν ὁμοιώματι ἀνθρώπων γέγονε καὶ σχήματι ἐρεθείς ὡς ἄνθρωπος.

Reformed Churches have agreed to the present day; whilst in the Lutheran Church, so far as adhering to the Form of Concord, the doctrine of the Ubiquity requires a modification of the fact of a real ascension. The theologians of this school proceeded from a mediæval scholastic view of the subject, essentially Nestorian; as though the two natures of Christ consisted of two distinct parts, one the eternal "*filius Dei*," and a "*filius Mariæ*," created by the "*filius Dei*," and with which the latter connected himself (see *Ebrard's Dogm.*, II., § 376, &c.). By his human nature, therefore, was not understood that nature in the abstract, as one assumed by the Logos as *his own*; but that nature in a concrete form, a man, a son of Mary, which he allowed to be made, that he might join himself to it at the first moment of its existence. To avoid the Nestorian consequences of this view, it was assumed that both these parts immediately mingled, yet so that the Son of Mary did not impart to the Son of God the human attributes, but the latter divine attributes to the former: omnipotence, omnipresence, and omniscience.—Whilst the Son of God in reality governed the world by those attributes, the Son of Mary refrained from their exercise, so that their possession was concealed. Not until 40 days after his resurrection did Christ, as Mary's son, begin to use divine prerogative. The ascension, therefore, was the entering of his human nature into the attributes of the divine. The Son of Mary assumed the condition of *ubiquity*, always maintained by the Son of God. He *might* indeed even now again assume a concrete form, and manifest him visibly (as to Paul, and at his second coming), but usually he is *ubique* (see *Form. Conc. sol. decl.*, 7). Thus this system denies a *circumscribed* body to Christ; that he occupies any particular place in heaven; or that he went to heaven as *de loco in locum*. In support of this theory it is affirmed, in the face of all correct exegesis, that the word "heaven" in the Bible designates ubiquity, and that the phrase "at the right hand of God" is not figurative but literal. But recently zealous Lutheran theologians have dissented from these views, and there is no doubt that the Bible doctrine of a heaven distinct from the earth will gradually win more general acceptance. If it is first established that Christ did not unite himself with a son of Mary, but *became man*, i. e. assumed in full the constitution of man (as the son of a king, to ransom his brother, becoming a servant in the enemy's country, assumes the character of a servant), we shall see that the *true communicatio idiomatum* does not consist in an exchange of properties, but simply in this, that *both kinds* of predicates and actions may be affirmed of the *subject*, such as pertain to him as the Son of God, and such as pertain to him as the Son of Man (just as in the preceding comparison it might be said: "The king's son suffered from cold and hunger," and "this servant is a prince"). Thus we may see that Christ's ascension to heaven does not designate a change in the reciprocal relation of both natures, but consists in this, that the *natura hominum* previously under bondage to death, but delivered from death and glorified,

by Christ, has now entered, through Christ, as *the first fruits*, into those mansions which are adapted only to the glorified man, and that from thence he does not pervade the cosmos physically, but is organically, livingly, spiritually, omnipotently near and present with his Church.

DR. EBRARD.*

Hebrew Language.—1) The Hebrew language is the language of the Hebrews, the name given, according to Old Test. usage, to the Israelitish people, who of all the descendants of Abraham were destined to occupy the most prominent position (Gen. 14 : 13). The term expresses nothing more than that the Hebrews spoke this language, without intending that it was spoken by them exclusively. In the Old Test. this particular designation does not occur. As distinguished from the Egyptian it is called the "language of Canaan" (Is. 19 : 18), which implies that other inhabitants of the land, besides the Israelites, made use of it. It is also the "Jews' language" (Is. 36 : 13), to distinguish it from the Syrian. It is only in the writings of the later Jews, for instance the prologue to the book of Sirach, and then in the New Test., that it is called the Hebrew language.

2) As the Hebrew people was a small part of a great national family, so the Hebrew language was a small branch of a large linguistic stock, which has appropriately been designated the Semitic. Other names have been recently proposed, but as none of them have been generally received, and as this rests upon the grouping of nations in Gen. 10, we give it the preference.

To define the boundaries of the region occupied by the Semitic stock of nations, from the earliest periods of history, cannot be done, owing to the changes that were continually taking place, especially in the eastern and northern portions of the newly-inhabited countries. For our purpose, it will be sufficient to say that it was bounded on the north by the highlands of Armenia, on the east by the Arabian Gulf, on the south by the ocean, and on the west by the Red Sea, the Mediterranean, and Asia Minor. Within these limits, the Semitic nations developed themselves. As the starting point and theatre of their intellectual achievements, and of the part they took in the history of the race, the space they occupied was small; and yet, by its central position, its rivers reaching far into the interior, and furnishing easy communication with distant lands, and again by its adjacent deserts and oceans, protecting it against foreign invasion, it possessed great advantages, both for the exertion of its influence abroad, and the undisturbed development of its resources at home. They soon extended their conquests and colonies beyond these boundaries, carrying with them and retaining their language and customs for a long time. Still their condition in those foreign lands was not favorable to an independent civilization in the establishment of their faith, and a more perfect system of morals, and they failed accordingly in this direction. We have proof of this in the three great dispersals of the Semitic stock. (1) In the parts of Africa adja-

cent to Arabia we meet with Semitic languages, of which the Ethiopic has long been known to learned Europeans. That they were carried thither by emigrants from Arabia is testified by the resemblance of the inscriptions found in Axum to the Himjaritic; by historical records, and the physical features of the people of East Africa, who speak their language. As to the time and circumstances of their emigration, we have no knowledge. There was a Semitic population in Africa from the earliest periods. (2) Semitic merchants from Palestine and the neighboring countries spread themselves over the islands and coasts of the Mediterranean, and in great numbers over the northern parts of Africa, where their language was spoken for centuries. Arnobius, Augustine and others tell us, that in their day the peasantry in the vicinity of Carthage spoke a language similar to the Hebrew. The Semitic emigrants carried with them the culture of their native lands, which, as a fruitful germ, met with a genial soil here and there in Africa and Europe, but they failed to maintain an independent vigorous development of their intellectual resources, and when their political power was broken, they lost all influence, and were swallowed up by the surrounding nations. (3) The Arabs, after the time of Mohammed, subdued a large part of Asia, Africa and Europe. Under the banners of Abubekr, Omar and Othman, they extended their conquests and their religion from Spain and the western shores of Africa to the walls of China; and at the head of powerful states for centuries, it seemed as if they were destined to rule the world. This, however, was not the purpose of God. They failed to establish institutions of vital power in the countries they conquered, which were possessed of a superior culture, and they themselves, aside from their religion, to which they rigidly adhered, soon became the pupils of the people they had subdued, and frequently the faithful guardians of ancient science, but which, in their new relations, they knew not how to turn to account, in the way of improvement and more effective organization.

3) It is not then just the origin and germ of the peculiar culture and accomplishments of the Semitic nations, that we are to seek within these limits, but also their growth and advancement to that intellectual power, by which they were divinely called to achieve a world historical importance. Contracted as these limits were, as compared with the space occupied by other national races, it is still an interesting fact, that owing to the combined influence of their geographical position and climate, and of their various historical associations, the particular nationalities within those Semitic boundaries separated from one another, developed themselves according to their own laws, pursued different ends, and obtained greater or less significance. We know nothing of the Semitic stock historically in its simple unity. What we know is of the Semitic nations as distinguished from one another by their customs, their opinions and views, the measure of their civilization and language. Still, if we would speak of them as a whole, we would be justified in the admis-

sion, that in the background of the differences, which in the course of time sprung up amongst them, there was an original unity. This original unity, which a certain similarity of features compels us to admit, notwithstanding the diversity of their culture, rests upon the intellectual foundation of the Semitic stock, the particular endowments, which God in his goodness had bestowed upon them, for the purpose of enabling them to attain to a position of independence and significance in the history of the race. It is therefore necessary to be careful in conducting our inquiries in reference to the Semitic stock, as the recent discoveries in Arabia and the countries of the Euphrates and Tigris abundantly show. We accordingly limit ourselves to the narrower sphere, with which we are better acquainted, that of the people who were to surpass all other Semitic nations, and to impart to them the fruitful germ of their superior culture and requirements.

4) The most prominent among the people of the Caucasian race, are the Semitic and Indo-Germanic nation, or as we now prefer to call them the Arcanic. They develop themselves in various ways, aided by the influence of external conditions, but still more by their particular constitution and appointments, continually increasing in value, in their intellectual efforts. As satisfactory testimony to the peculiarities of the race, we need only call to mind a few controlling facts. Amongst the Arcans, we meet with the attempt, in the phenomena of life, to bring out the necessary and general, to elevate themselves to a calm and comprehensive consideration of things, to discover their correspondencies, and to separate the accidental and essential. The Arcanic nations, especially the Indian, Greek, and German are the bearers and promoters of philosophy. We meet with incipient movements in this direction, as in the book of Job and Ecclesiastes, but of philosophy properly so-called, they were ignorant. — The Arcans were possessed of thoroughly constructed mythological systems, the product of philosophical inquiry. Particular Semitic nations also had their deities, but precisely where the Semitic life was free from foreign influence, do we seek in vain for any trace of the activity and study which lead to the construction of any such systems. — The pure Semitic poetry is the Syrian. It is susceptible of emotions of admiration, or contempt, joy or sorrow, tenderness or terror, love or hate, quick and warm. With the Israelites, it disdains, as it were, the shackles of rhythm, and the rhyme of words, and expresses itself unfettered and free, in flowing euphony of thought, a faithful image of the feelings it inspires. The Arcanic nations, as may be supposed, have their lyric poetry, but they have other poetry also, to which the Semitic nations scarcely aspired: the Epic for instance, with its majestic repose, and objective manner of representation, in which the personality of the poet appears only in the back ground, and the drama, which requires the writer to enter into the feelings, the spirit, and conceptions of others, and to exhibit them as his own. — Music, the most immediate expression of excited feeling, belongs alike to the Semitic and Arcanic nations.

that it is distinguished as to form, by the far-reaching differences, which make their character respectively. That in other spheres of art, the drama, painting, and sculpture, the Semitic are not to be compared to the Arcanic nations, is evident from recent discoveries in the East, and we believe that a more thorough investigation would make this still more apparent. It would appear, if the comparison were carried further, that the same difference would present itself in the organization of the state, the construction of their morals, and the enactment of their laws.

It may, therefore, be safely asserted, that if their scientific and artistic achievements are to be the test of comparison, the precedence must be given to the Arcanic over the Semitic nations. History shows that the significance of the latter is not in that direction. It was their calling to maintain a sense of immediate dependence upon a higher power, cordially to acknowledge their responsibility in all their counsels and conduct, and to have faith in a kingdom of God, as a renovating power in the world, in which all men were to participate, and to which all human effects were to be subservient, whilst they pursued their own way, unable in science and art to satisfy their deepest wants. It was not given to the Semitic nations to comprehend phenomena in the mass, to organize and arrange them before the mind, as an independent all-pervading power, competent to distinguish the general from the particular, the essential from the contingent, and to ascertain the particular laws which govern them. They have as their dowry great susceptibility of feeling, and quickness of purpose. Impressions from without they readily receive, and yield to them influence without a thought. Conscious of dependence and restraint, they freely confess that in all they do, they are but instruments of a higher power working within them. With firm and strong will, they pursue the path, with the marking out of which, they very well know they had nothing to do, and with keen courage they strive for the end set before them, persuaded of their own inefficiency, and yielding themselves wholly to the power which controls them. To penetrate understandingly to the particular they were well able, calmly to consider and settle the particular in a larger connexion they were not competent. Thus endowed, the Semitics never distinguished themselves in the sphere for which the Arcans were specially fitted by their powers. They were, however, admirably qualified by their peculiarities to be the bearers and guardians of religious truth and endowments.

5) If now language, as little as thought itself, is no invention of man, it is still true that particular languages in their peculiar construction, faithfully represent the intellectual efforts of nations, conditioned by circumstances. If the original simplicity and mutual connection of the Semitic nations could be proved in no other way, the affinity and similarity of their languages would compel us to admit it. They are distinguished in the aggregate in their fundamental features from the Arcanic, just as they are by their intellectual activity. The

Arcanic languages are adapted to express, in an easy and convenient way, sober thought and reflection, and to comprehend cause and effect, by means of the comprehensive functions of their periods, and the free use of particles, in the use of which, they readily combine propositions, and bring prominently to view the more delicate relations of particular ideas. In the Semitic languages, on the contrary, ideas are arranged side by side without connection in particular statements, particular impressions are consecutively described, and particular assertions are made; synthesis and combination, they never attempt. In simple propositions, the subject and predicate are loosely placed aside of each other, and thus they have few particles and seldom use them. By the combination of independent words, the Arcanic languages are able to form new constructions, in order to express the correlative of several ideas, or the connection of one idea with another. The peculiarity of the Semitic languages does not consist in thus combining ideas, or corresponding independent words. If an approach to any thing of the kind occurs, it is in an exceptional way. The rule is to use each word for its own idea, and never to connect it with another in a new formation. The Arcanic languages designate in a number of similar conceptions, that which they have in common as derived from the same root, and define it strictly by means of prefixes, as impress, express, depress, suppress, &c. In the Semitic languages, the idea is expressed in the form in which it immediately presents itself to the mind, and thus there are a great many roots and radical forms, whilst the Arcanic languages have but few, and these are profusely employed in rich and regular combinations. In the Semitic languages, a particular law obtains in the construction of the roots themselves, to which all are subject, with the exception of such as lie at the ground of demonstrative words, pronouns, and smaller particles. Every root to which the verbal and nominal formations may be referred, is constructed upon the basis of three distinct sounds, or at least seeks to be conformed to them. An expansion to four or five sounds seldom occurs. And as the free combination of the three sounds in one root is but little limited by the nature of sounds or the law of euphony, it is then possible for the Semitic languages to have the large number of roots for which they are remarkable. In these languages respect has been had, as far as we know, to uniformity and symmetry from the first. The particular ground tone which contributes to the expansion of the root to precisely three fixed sounds, we cannot further explain. —The fixed sounds of the root receive a different vocal expression in the particular words, for whose formation, the root furnishes the basis. The formation of words by a mere vocal change in the fixed sounds is regular and complete, and if the formation by new suffixes to the root is met with from the beginning, it is only in the later constructions, that it spreads itself out. But that this does not lead to the combination of independent words, as in the Arcanic languages, we have already remarked. We have thus sought for the sake of brevity and conveni-

ance to ascertain the peculiarities of the Semitic languages in the way of contrast with the Arcanic. A more extended investigation would lead to the attempt to define the relation of the Semitic linguistic stock to other linguistic families within the reach of scientific inquiry, in which the question would come up, whether there was not a closer connection between the Semitic and Coptic on the one side and the Arcanic on the other.

6) Within the limits we assigned to the Semitic race, as its proper home, conditioned by the influences of climate and country, as well as by historical associations connected with the culture of the people, various languages were formed. Different as they may be, they all rest upon a common ante-historical basis, and have the same general impression. Although some of them, such, for instance, as that of Southern Arabia, and Northern Mesopotamia have only begun to be known to us, we may still venture to hope, that the whole region of the Semitic languages will soon be explored, and that we will be able more accurately to define its peculiar formations, than we can do now. In our attempt to ascertain the position of the Hebrew in the sphere of the cognate languages, we have respect only to such, whose formation, method, and history are presented to view in a more extended literature.

In the northern sections of the Semitic region, in Syria and Mesopotamia, and Babylonia, there were nations, whose history, owing to the various changes of their political state, and the oppression of their conquerors of another stock and foreign culture, was frequently disturbed. They were not allowed to develop according to their original laws. The sudden changes in their civil and social state, as their history shows, in connection with the influence of a foreign language and culture produced a rapid decline and impoverishment in their language. In the earliest times, the Aramaic language lost already many of its finer elements and articulations, that fulness of expression by a change of vowels, and copiousness of words; in fine, much of that which other Semitic languages retained. We have large collections in the Aramaic language, for about five hundred years before Christ, and in these it appears already as the poorest and least cultivated of the Semitic stock. From that time onward, we can trace its history, showing throughout a state of gradual deterioration and decline, justifying the opinion that the Aramaic branch has all along proceeded upon the same downward course it has done for more than 200 years, the period we have known it.

The languages of Central Arabia have a different fate. Among the inhabitants of the deserts, especially the nomadic tribes of the interior, who never were under a foreign yoke, and retained their old customs and institutions with wonderful tenacity, there was very little possibility of any change of language, by the surrender of their traditions. It is precisely in those regions, where the uniformity of the natural relation, and the corresponding pursuits are preserved and handed down from one generation to another, that any activity leading to

a change of languages is least likely to be introduced, whilst the reverse is the case, whenever nature lavishly presents in great profusion whatever man wants, and when permanent employment, and the more substantial forms of life are not required. Thus the deserts of Arabia in this respect are the very opposite of the tropical countries of America, where incredibly rapid changes are made in the languages of the people, and the child and the grandfather often speak a different tongue. We are acquainted with the language of Central Arabia from the 6th century, before Christ; and it comes before us with such a profusion of imagery, such a wealth of words and perfection of grammatic material, as may be looked for in vain in no other Semitic language. We can show that the language of Arabic writings, and if we are to believe reports, the vernacular of the people in their families, from the 6th cent. down, has undergone but little change; and from this we may infer, that from the very first, in ante-historical times, it retained its own with remarkable tenacity. For we cannot regard its peculiar wealth and present perfection as a modern acquisition, incidentally made in the way of subsequent progress; but as an ancient inheritance from the common home of the Semitic languages. This view of the relation of the Arabic language to the other branches of the Semitic family, agrees too with the results of modern investigations, which show that in other spheres the same analogies and arguments hold good. From this, it by no means follows, that in particular cases, independent formations may not be produced from existing germs, still this must be the less frequently expected, the more a language is withdrawn from the range of transforming influences.

As the Hebrew, as to territory, occupies an intermediate position between the Aramaic and the Central Arabic languages, so is it also the case in reference to its construction. On the one hand, it does not possess the wealth of expression, the more refined ornaments of diversified formations, the more perfect vocal utterances, and the exuberance of terminations, which belong to the Central Arabic, and it approaches, especially by its less pliant vocal expressions, and by the consequent limitation of its internal formations, more to the Aramaic; and on the other hand it is possessed of a fulness which the Aramaic, in its rapid polishing-off-process, has lost. — The Nabatic language occupies an intermediate grade between the Hebrew and the Central Arabic languages (comp. *Tuch*, *Sinaitische Inschriften*, Bd. III., S. 129, &c.). The Phœnician is a mediation of the Hebrew and Aramaic, if we may rely upon some few pretty sure indications, although it must be admitted that all that we know of it is from memorials of a very recent date. At the same time the inscription from Sidon, as early perhaps as 700 years before Christ, which has fortunately been discovered in our day, gives to the language pretty distinctly an Aramaic coloring.

The Hebrew language, if we have respect to the period of our first acquaintance with it, is the oldest of the Semitic family. We have it

in writings, some of which, according to the recorded chronology, date as far back as 1500 years before Christ. This does not justify *Renan* (*histoire générale, &c.*, i, s. 97) in his division of the history of the Semitic languages into three periods, in the sense of three ages, or consecutive periods of the evolution of one and the same language, the Hebrew, the Aramaic, and the Semitic. With all his limitations, depriving the division of significance, it is altogether arbitrary. It is simply a fact, that the Hebrew, Aramaic, and Central Arabic did not become different languages consecutively, they became so incidentally by a simultaneous development in the countries in which they have their home. The antiquity of literature is not the antiquity at the same time of its language.

Nor does it follow from the high antiquity of the Hebrew literature, that the language must originally have been of the Semitic form. We would only be warranted in such an inference by the development of kindred languages under the same conditions, and everywhere in the same regular way. But this is not the case. As certainly as the Aramaic deteriorated more rapidly than the Hebrew, as certainly as the Hebrew, in many respects, resembles the Aramaic, and in the course of its history, as we have it in the books of the Old Testament, becomes more like it, so certain is it, that the Arabic retains its inherited wealth and original copiousness; and if the Arabic literature, as compared with the Hebrew, is recent, we must still acknowledge that in the Arabic, we have the most perfect type of the Semitic, which in the end lies equally at the basis of all the Semitic languages.

Thus, upon the broad ground of general considerations, connected with the history of language, we have come to the conclusion, that the Hebrew, in those earlier times to which its literature extends, fell off from a previously existing grade of improvement. This is proven by grammatical phenomena in the language itself. It may be shown that formations which were frequent and familiar in the oldest writings, only occur in later times as antiquated, and have almost disappeared from the sphere of modern improvements (see *Ewald, Lehrbuch*).

The representations of earlier scholars as to the antiquity of the Hebrew language rest upon hypotheses, for which the genesis in the names of the patriarchs from Adam down, for instance, in God's discourse to Adam, presents apparent ground. For a long time it was not doubted that the Hebrew was the original language, coeval with the beginning of the race, and it was supposed the traces and remains of it were discoverable in all languages subsequently. — (*Comp. Steph. Morini, Bode, &c.*).

The process of the evolution of the Hebrew language in the time of Moses is unknown to us. As the Israelites first came with Abram to Palestine from the northern country of the Euphrates and Tigris, it was thought that the Hebrew was brought with them by the emigrant posterity of Terah. At variance with this, we have the separation of the Aramaic and Hebrew, which took place, as is supposed, before the time of the patriarchs (*Gen. 31 : 47*). And if the

Hebrew, as a perfect language, had been introduced into the southern countries, at the first settlement of the Terahites, we might expect certainly to meet with a language closely resembling it among the Terahite Arabians, who, according to all tradition, were the posterity of Abraham. — The Terahites, as they settled in Palestine and the adjacent countries, and subdued the aboriginals, could either have adopted their language, or modified their own. In such case, the more definite principles of the Hebrew would be found in the primitive languages of Palestine, which, in like manner, would have served as the immediate basis of the language of the Israelites and of the Canaanites and the Phœnicians from other lands. Such and similar conjectures present themselves to view, and if we pursue them further, we meet with one difficulty after another. We can only say, that as the Israelites from the first, long before the time of Moses, separated themselves from the mass of the affiliated tribes, so must we also seek the more definite beginning of the Hebrew language before his day.

7) As the proper names of the Moabites, Ammonites and Edomites, according to their construction, belong, without exception, to the sphere of the Hebrew language, it must be admitted that it was spoken beyond the limits of Palestine. The independence of the people, and of the races in those regions, their different customs and modes of living, render it probable that their language was not everywhere the same. Traces of a different dialect are actually met with (*Jud. 12 : 6, &c.*). By frequent intercourse with the people of Syrian countries, the Aramaic influence was felt earlier in the northern parts of the land than in the southern. Whether further investigations would show that the Phœnician language in essential points was a different dialect in the northern parts of Palestine, remains to be seen. It may be that the fortunate discovery of some ancient monuments may throw light upon this question. In *Neh. 13 : 23, 24*, the language of Ashdod, the Philistian, is distinguished from that of the Jews in a way that points to a more thorough separation than any trifling difference of dialect would effect. We are reminded too of the difference of dialect in Galilee and Jerusalem, at the time of Christ (*Matt. 26 : 73*).

8) The formative process of the Hebrew language, until it became the language of Scripture, we are unable, as may be seen from the foregoing, to point out. From this time forward, we have it in the writings of the Old Testament, covering a space from first to last of about 1200 years. During this long period the language was not unchanged, and as we have writings, if not of all, yet of many of these centuries, we may venture to hope, that the process of change may be clearly traced. Still the attempt to do it is attended with so many difficulties, that we can never be certain of the results. We mention the following: of the rich and extensive Hebrew literature, we have, as appears from statements in the Bible, and other reliable indications, nothing more than fragments, in which there is no such completeness of linguistic material for any period of time, as would show

was really the state of the language. It is accordingly dangerous, that in estimating the process of development, we adduce peculiarities which belonged rather to the personality of the writer, or to the method or content of his writings. 2) We are obliged first to the antiquity of many of the books and portions of the Old Test. by investigations which do not always lead to satisfactory results, so that we are not able always to arrange the linguistic material of the Old Test. according to a strict chronological order. Independently of this, the limited groundwork of linguistic material is still more reduced. 3) It is certain that older sections have passed through the hands of modern writers, and as little as they, for instance, in their historical works, in avail themselves of more ancient sources, have reiterated their peculiar features, so have they as little avoided every change which the language of their day suggested. Proof of this we have in the comparison of parallel passages in the books of the Kings and Chronicles. The history of the Israelites during the long period, from the time of Moses until the 7th century, does not warrant us in expecting rapid decided changes in their language. During this period, they were not often for any length of time under a foreign yoke, and in their permanent relations, they were connected with a people, who either spoke the Hebrew, or a kindred language. The changes which take place in a peaceful process of development, are in themselves often hard to be pointed out, and can be readily obliterated, not just by revising them, but also by keeping and copying them. In gradual developments, the most frequent changes take place in the softest sounds, the vowels; but it is precisely in the vocal pronunciations of different centuries, that with few exceptions, we have the most difficulty. We are thus admonished on all sides to be careful in attempting to point out the peculiar linguistic features of a particular age. Since about the end of the 7th cent. the Aramaic language had a clear, decided, and transforming influence upon the Hebrew, and we accordingly distinguish two periods in its history—the first including about 600 years. We think that we can see a difference between the language of the time of Moses, or to speak more accurately, the language of the Pentateuch, and that of the other books, and that the antiquated character of the first is very evident. In a grammatical respect, we constantly refer to the use of the pronoun **אני** for the feminine **אני**, but which also recurs 11 times in the Pentateuch, also **אני** (for **אני**) which is only found in the Pentateuch, and imitated in Chronicles; and yet we cannot avoid the admission that these indications, peculiar to the Pentateuch, do not warrant us in assigning to the language an antiquated character, inasmuch as it cannot everywhere be shown that they are archaisms. We refer also to several antiquated forms as we call them, enumerated in *Keil's* Introd. to the Old Test., p. 40. It would not, however, be difficult in any given number of books of the Old

Test. of equal space with the Pentateuch, to point out as many strange forms, which with equal right might be regarded as antiquated. We are reminded, too, of words, in verbal forms, which either occur only in the Pentateuch, or otherwise quite alone, and do not consider that the Pentateuch constitutes the fourth part of the Bible, and that in each of the other three parts, many words are met with that seldom or never occur elsewhere, and that the Pentateuch, in particular sections, speaks of relations and things, that are never mentioned in the other books. In those words then that are peculiar to the Pentateuch, there are not a great number of grammatical formations which clearly indicate the antiquity of the language. It is certain that there are sections in the Pentateuch which, in respect to language, differ from other parts of it, and from other books, and that these differences, according to our view, belong far more to the sphere of representation and the old method of literary performances, than to a pure grammatical or lexical linguistic development. Differences of the same kind appear more distinctly in the literary performances in the time of the kings. The language of simple narration and history limits itself to the forms necessary for common purposes. The poets avail themselves of more extended constructions, and of necessity employ richer material. The Hebrew poets particularly availed themselves of a parallelism of members, seldom of ideas and words, of which many are met with nowhere else in the writings of the Bible. This apparently strange material we meet with in kindred languages, and most frequently in the Aramaic, not necessarily as the result of the influence of the Aramaic in the Hebrew; but it is explained by the fact that the poets also availed themselves of such a command of their language, as is only to be realized in the voluminous literature of a people of a kindred language, and not in the narrow range of the books of the Bible. The rhetorical language of the prophets moves in a more free rhythm of thought, and in longer sentences than the poets, but in other respects, especially in its palmy state, falls in very much with it. Thus for each particular branch of literature, there is a particular range of language; within which the personality of the writer has room for exhibition. Notwithstanding these differences, the laws of language for the most part, as to form and conditions, remained unchanged until the 7th century.—The second period is from 611 forward. From the time of the Assyrians, the Aramaic made greater inroads upon the Hebrew. In the days of Hezekiah, his minister understood it as a foreign language, whilst the people of Jerusalem were ignorant of it, Is. 36. In the northern parts of Palestine subject to the Assyrians from the year 720, after the power of the Israelites had been broken by long wars and captivity, the Aramaic, owing to the influence of foreign authority, and foreign colonists, spread rapidly. In the south it forced its way in particular expressions after the termination of the 7th century, as may be seen in the writings of Jeremiah. We meet with the Hebrew in its ancient purity and strength, notwithstanding

ing the inroads of the Aramaic in the language of the people, in the writings of authors at the end of the captivity. After their return from captivity, the congregation at Jerusalem had a poor existence, and was in danger of losing its distinctive character, and then it was that the Aramaic forced itself in, and became the language of the Persian court and of the neighboring people. In restoring the ancient customs and peculiarities, Ezra and Nehemiah took care that the Hebrew, in its ancient form, should be made more familiar to the people (Neh. 8 : 8); they both wrote in Hebrew, and Nehemiah was desirous that it should be pure (13 : 23, &c.). Among the more strict Jews, the Hebrew was still retained, although within narrow limits, as appears from Daniel and the legends of the Maccabean princes. Still the introduction of the Aramaic was not to be repressed; and if the ancient language was occasionally imitated, there was always a considerable admixture of the foreign idiom, as is apparent in Ecclesiastes and some of the Psalms. From the second century on, the Hebrew was only known to the learned, whilst the Aramaic became the vernacular.

9. After the Hebrew ceased to be the language of the people, it did not just at once lose its vitality. As it was read in the Bible in the synagogues, so it was known by the people at large, as well as by the learned. Thus it is evident, also, that the learned in those days, when there was occasion for anything to be done by writing, were glad to avail themselves of the Hebrew, intelligible to those of their own faith, as they had become familiar with it in the synagogues; and the more living their traditional knowledge, the less were they limited to a mere imitation of the ancient Hebrew. In the Mishna, which was written about 200 years after Christ, and in the Jewish writings of a later period, we meet with Hebrew, to which an independent development is not to be denied, and that certainly has proceeded on a path marked out by Hebrews of far earlier times. Quite of another character is the language of those learned Jews who, since the 2d century, have availed themselves of the Hebrew in their writings. It is without an independent development according to its proper laws, the pure product of learned exertion. In many respects it is a true image of the old Hebrew, but at the same time, it has a great many new words, artistic expressions, and many particles borrowed partly from the Aramaic, and partly from the dialects of the countries in which they were written. Thus the language we are accustomed to call Hebrew is made up of different elements not transformed and purified so as to form an entirely new whole. BERTHEAU.—*Dr. Wolff.*

Hebrew Poetry.—That we may the more conveniently survey this rich and attractive, and in a critical and æsthetic point of view, by no means elaborated material, we propose to present the notices, which our limited space permits us to take of it, in three aspects, the national, biblical, and technical. The first two have to do with the contents, character, and history of the poetry of the Hebrews, the last with its form. We thus separate them, for the

reason that we are concerned with a science yet incomplete, the imperfections of which may be ascertained before they can be corrected.

1. With the Hebrews, as with all other people, poetry was cultivated before prose. Men give utterance to their feelings before they collect their ideas; and they frequently sing without having learned to write. Poetry seems to have been practised by the Hebrews from the earliest periods of their history. It was, however, precisely of such a character as was to be expected of a people whose primitive social condition was not far removed from nature, and yet in perpetual conflict with it—a people but little inclined to labor, who delighted in the dangers of war, and depended for their security and enjoyments, upon personal prowess more than upon law and order; whilst, on the other hand, they were in a state of gradual preparation for a higher civilization by religious instruction and patriotism, and by a national consciousness based upon both, and handed down by sacred traditions. The shepherd celebrated his love and the warrior his triumphs with music and song. Brief verses, rehearsed at the yearly festivals, commemorated great events, such as the slaying of Goliath by David, and of the Philistine host by Sampson. Battles and victories were described in longer poems, such as the song of Deborah, the crown of the patriotic poetry of Israel, and the most ancient ode that has come down to us entire. The people clothed their homely sense in rhythmical sayings and familiar maxims, expressive of a shrewd and sound judgment. Everything calculated to excite the multitude was expressed in song. It enlivened their festivals and was heard in mournful melody upon personal occasions. Young men and maidens emulated each other in beautiful odes at the village gathering and in the family circle. The daughters of Sion came out yearly to dance and sing at the vintage, and the virgins of Gilead, with sad symphonies, commemorated the tragic history of Jephtha's daughter. The discovery of a fountain was celebrated with joy and gladness, and by its still waters the herdsmen and hunters composed themselves to rest at the close of the day, with singing and the sound of the flute. The spirit of poetry was found even in the lowest walks of life, and was perverted to the basest purposes (Is. 23 : 15). The whole history, indeed, of Israel, as it lies before us in the obscure traditions of the heroic age, and as exhibited in the pastoral pictures of the patriarchal state, reveals a wonderful wealth of poetic sentiment and expression, of which, owing to unfavorable circumstances and the want of judgment on the part of well-meaning, but unpoetic persons, much has been lost, and still more defaced by the dust and daubing of modern scholiasts and scholastics. We must also mention that their religious exercises and worship was always conducted with singing and instrumental performances (2 Sam. 6 : 12; Ps. 68 : 25). The art of poetry was taught in their schools; and the sage philosopher, the sacred orator, and the prophet, not only used a more elevated language, but, as was universal in ancient times, were poets in word and spirit, raised by inspira-

ion above the world and its vanities. Thus enough has been said to show, that a history of Hebrew literature is as yet a desideratum, and that if attempted would have many and beautiful things to say of popular and national poetry.

The attempt has often been made to characterize Hebrew poetry according to its peculiarities. This already must even be so far uncertain, from the reason, that we have but a single species as a satisfactory standard, and the judgment can never be general. Still less would there be a probability of success in the use of categories of modern or classic poetry, or in resorting to doubtful indications, or remarkable expressions. This was the mistake of Bishop Lowth, in his otherwise profound and accurate work, "*de sacra poesi Ebraeorum*."

On the other hand, Herder (*Spirit of Hebrew Poetry*, 1782) prudently avoided theorizing, and sought to unlock the sanctuary to the feelings of the reader; in which, of course, he also failed, when there was no feeling, as has been the case with prominent divines of the present day. If we would have the elements of a general æsthetic criticism, without regard to contents, as is now proposed, we would say at once that Hebrew poetry partakes of the leading features of the West-Asiatic type, conditioned by Semitic culture. 1) It is essentially subjective, inasmuch as the individuality of the poet always appears, giving expression to his own peculiar feelings, views, and wishes, and to nothing external, in the sphere of nature or humanity, as valuable of itself. The Hebrews, accordingly, had neither epic nor dramatic poetry. In these the personality of the poet disappears, and he presents himself as a different individual without, however, divesting himself of his peculiarities. 2) Hebrew poetry (Semitic) is sententious. By this we mean, that the several thoughts are so connected that they would admit of a different arrangement, of increase or diminution, without impairing the symmetry of the whole. Each stanza, each couplet, is complete of itself, and no transposition would affect either the sense or the impression. When the poem opens with even a rhetorical fulness of introductory ideas, it often happens that there are no concluding thoughts to compare and satisfy the mind and ear. Thus the co-operation of the judgment is neutralized by the dominion of the feelings. 3) Hebrew poetry is also more sensuous than that of the Occident; even more than of the romantic. First of all, we are reminded of its proverbial wealth of imagery, not just in the way of illustrations, but also of metaphors, which substitutes the image for the object to be described, and unwittingly lengthens it into allegory. Owing to their secluded life and want of literary culture, the people had few opportunities of rising superior to their natural habits. Their images were accordingly taken more freely and frequently from a sphere, for which the classically educated, those of a higher social position, had no taste, to which they gave attention only for conventional reasons. Just think of images from the animal world playing a part in the name of humanity, and in the idyllic poetry of family life. With this was also connected a great de-

sire for the symbolic, which gives to the abstract idea a concrete form, and a predilection for prosopopoeia, which personifies ideas, and invests even inanimate objects with thoughts and feelings, and speech. Thus the poetry of the Hebrews was so much the ground form of their higher thinking, that it gave coloring to their historical writings, and affected their philosophical speculations; and for this reason too the systematizing logical work of the divine, Jewish and Christian, the most unpoetical that can be thought of, was often so sadly at fault, and corrected itself with so much difficulty. From the same elements arise also those anthropomorphisms, for us frequently so offensive, but which connect themselves so inwardly with the religious views of the Hebrews.

To adduce instances of this would be superfluous, as it is presumed that our readers have more than a superficial acquaintance with the Old Test. and Hermeneutica, and authors able to appreciate poetry in general. For the same reason, it is not necessary to enumerate the various ancient Hebrew poetical writings, of which traces are still extant. It is not our purpose to write a full history of literature, but simply to direct attention to a particular point, with a view to more substantial and extended studies. Modern writers, as well as Lowth and Herder, have given their attention to Hebrew poetry, less as connected with the state of general culture than with its biblical aspect, to which we now pass over.

II. The Bible of late has been termed improperly a code of Hebrew national literature. This is certainly true as to its contents. As to its object and plan, however, it is a manual of doctrine for the religious education of the nation, and for this purpose, in an eclectic way, it takes up a part of the existing national literature, elaborates it, and keeps it from being lost. In this particular collection, there is much that is properly poetical; but it will at once be admitted, that to serve its end, it must be religious poetry—a species of which we are able to speak more intelligently; but whose peculiarities and advantages, as belonging to the poetic national literature of the Israelites, we should cautiously consider. In the meanwhile, we ought to know what is meant by "religious poetry." It is not all the poetry of the Old Test. which may thus be defined. We will here say nothing of the "Song of Solomon," which can only, by a forced allegorical interpretation, have any religious character, and that only in this way was admitted into the collection. At the same time we must not forget, that a good deal of poetry has been woven into the historical narratives, which, so far as its immediate object is concerned, cannot be regarded as religiously instructive, although in sense and spirit it must be supposed to flow from a religious source, and to give evidence of, and encouragement to, a religious faith. The term, accordingly, must be understood in a larger sense. The Jewish doctors counted but three poetic books: Job, the Psalms, and Proverbs. But with equal right must Solomon's Song and Lamentations be classed amongst them. Besides, we must not omit those beauti-

ful poems (Gen. 49; Exodus 15; Deut. 32: 33; Judges 5; 2 Sam. 1; Is. 38: 10, &c.), and the scattered Psalms, and smaller pieces of which we have already spoken. What is still more important, many parts of the prophetic writings, as to form and sentiments, belong to poetic literature, the limits of which, in both respects, it is hard to define. With equal propriety, perhaps with more, upon the ground of a literary-æsthetic judgment, the prophets of the Old Test. may just as well be numbered amongst the poets, as the writers of all the books of the Old Test. were reckoned amongst the prophets by the older divines; some, it is true, with more reason than others, but more altogether without right. Still, we will adhere to the old custom, and keep the spheres apart, so that we may apply to neither a false or insufficient standard.

If now the Hebrew poetry still extant, on account of its great antiquity, must be regarded as quite considerable, it will be found, owing to our present state of knowledge, not so easy a matter to introduce order into it, either as to its epochs or its authors. Every one knows that, upon these points, there is great diversity of opinion. Whether any discussion would bring it to a close is very doubtful. The apparently simple literary historical questions are undeniably connected with others of theological interest—for many exclusively so—and thus it is evident that a perfect agreement upon essential points is scarcely attainable.

For this reason we prefer to consider our subject from a theoretical point of view, and to attempt a classification of the existing poetic literature of the Hebrews, for the purpose of a more careful examination of it. Passing by all that has been taught us by modern æsthetics, we maintain that in the consciousness of the Israelites, and aside from their proper prophetic discourses, all their poetry may be arranged under two classes or categories, the lyric and didactic. Etymologically taken, these two names are not opposed to each other, although in popular speech they are so regarded. The first signifies a Psalm, an air, the singing itself. Poetry and music originally were everywhere closely connected. Lyric poetry was the more ancient, the more prevalent, and frequently the only kind cultivated. Concerning the manner of their connection there is with the Hebrews but little, or more correctly, nothing to be said; and the intimations given in the heading of the Psalms, are for us to this day unintelligible. Additional subdivisions of lyric poetry, according to their sources, can only be admitted as far as the Lexicon, in connection with the corresponding contents, furnishes us with information. This, however, is only in an exceptional way the case, and the inscriptions themselves do not appear to have been made according to an established plan. All that we can do then is to arrange what we have according to its contents, and the prevailing definitions. In addition to the proper religious Psalms, we then also could have national, patriotic, and warlike songs, dirges, individual and general, love songs, and hymns of praise and thanksgiving, of numberless grades, hopeful and encouraging. Even in our Psalm books we find

examples of almost all these rubrics; and it would be difficult, without becoming vague and obscure, to extend the characteristics. On the one side, especially in the Psalms, the lyric itself often passes over into a didactic method, simple and dull; and in the other, as in Job, the didactic narrative is raised to the highest pitch of lyrical effusion. In historical Psalms sometimes, the song of Deborah for instance, we are almost led to think it was a prelude to an epic. We therefore can scarcely blame those critics, who discountenance the distinction between the didactic and the lyric, whilst others have lost themselves in hair-splitting rubrications. In the 19th Psalm both elements, as to language, spirit and versification, are found in such immediate contact, that some have thought of dividing them into two distinct and different parts. We may safely affirm that in the lyric the individual feeling predominates, overpowering its objects, seeking the beautiful and the good in its contents, lending to it its vesture, imparting to it life and motion, or enjoying itself in the natural, realizing and graphic expression. Thus understood, the Hebrew lyric, few as may be the points of affinity between it and others, may far surpass the most of the species which antiquity has left to us, in inwardness, depth, and power, only that what we call grace is less immaterial in Semitic literature.

To characterize the second principal division upon the ground of technical distinction, is more difficult. The root **שׁוּב** expresses the idea of a comparison: **שׁוּב** is then a parable; and if, in addition to this, we now add that, by comparing two apparently different things, for instance, things from the natural and the moral world, we may derive from it an instructive thought, and remember too that the Orient ever had an aptitude for such sort of instruction, it will lead us to conclude that originally it was known by that name, but that later it obtained a more general application, derived from the end in view. However this may have been, it represents the following classes: a) the fable of which we have two examples (Judges 9: 7; 2 Kings 14: 9, &c.), although they are not brought out in poetic form. b) The parable (2 Sam. 12: 1), which also includes the allegory, and is expressly called **שׁוּב** (Ezek. 17: 2). c) The apothegm, moral saying and proverb, three classes combined, for the reason, that according to the genius of the Hebrew people, they are not really different, and in the various collections of proverbs which have come down to us, as in Solomon's, they are intermingled. In most cases actual comparisons are made in such way as to present in parallel propositions, a maxim of morality or wisdom, a fact of expressions, with or without a judgment in frequent brevity, and often in witty combinations affecting the spirit, in such way, indeed, that the subsidiary thought precedes, and the idea principally intended, comes after. How strictly this definition applies to the proverb (see 1 Sam. 10: 12; Ezek. 18: 2). d) The

iddle which rests essentially upon comparisons, and together with the allegory, so far as it presents a difficulty to be solved, is called **חֵדָּה** (Judges 14: 12). e) The satire (Is. 14: 4; Job. 2: 6), which, in the expression of strong national feeling, derives its pungency chiefly from comparison. Hence the phrase to become **חֵדָּה**, sometimes translated proverb, and also witty saying. f) The proper didactic poem, which, in musical strains, treats of religious and moral duties, the dealings of Providence, the relations of human actions to divine judgments, &c. Here may be mentioned many of the Psalms (comp. 78: 2; 49: 5), the first part of the book of Proverbs, and by extending the idea, the book of Job 27: 1; which, according to its name, may be called an epic, in reference to its form or dialogue, and, so far as specific merit is concerned, it rivals the most beautiful productions of Hebrew poetry. Finally, so far as prophecy serves the purpose of instruction it is also called **חֵדָּה** (Numb. 23: 24), and so far as instruction attains its end, by speculative reflection, it is called **חֵדָּה**, a word of counsel, or dark saying (Prov. 1: 6; Ps. 78: 2, &c. comp. generally: C. Aurivillius, *de poesi bibl. Diss.*, p. 74, &c. Ravius, *de poeseos hebr. præstantia*, 1800. Meyer, *Hermen. des A.*, T. II., 13, &c. P. Sarchi, *Essay on Hebrew Poetry*, London, 1824. B. F. Gultenstein, *Poet. Literatur der Israeliten*, 1835.

III. That the language of all poetry is peculiar, and different from the ordinary forms of speech, lies in the idea of it. This peculiarity is frequently found in the choice of expressions, which popular language avoids, but with which poetry adorns itself, and seeks to preserve and increase in all their profusion. Thus we find with the Hebrew poets a list of words which the Old Test. prose writers never employ. That they are proper is shown by their use in other Semitic dialects, and their adoption is also indicated by their etymology. Still more is the language of poetry distinguished by its artistic structure, as governed by particular rules. This *technic* of poetry, if it is not to be merely mechanical, must take its rules from the nature of its object on the one side, and from the ear and music on the other. That Hebrew poetry is subject to this natural condition is a matter of course; but as the means by which this is effected are various, the question arises, which are those made use of by the Old Test. poets.

For the most part, the form of poetry which we call rhyme, and which in modern literature is most prevalent, affects the eye and the ear. As to the means of producing rhyme, the Hebrew language is by no means deficient, as modern Jewish poetry sufficiently shows. It is not met with in the Old Test., and the attempt to discover it (*Clericus*, on Exodus 2: 15) was a failure. The supposed instances (Ps. 8: 5; Is. 3: 22), we unhesitatingly say, are nothing more than natural modes of expression, still more frequent in Latin. Hebrew poetry is familiar with the assonance, and loves the inci-

dental. The assonance is also a rhyme, but it need not appear at the end of the line; nor is it accidental that Ps. 124 is divided according to accent, affecting the ear pleasantly, and that in Lament. 5, the same sound recurs 40 times in 22 verses. This, however, happens but seldom. It is no law of poetry; still less so alliteration—that is, the beginning of words with letters of the same sound. This is more appropriate to popular poetry in proverbs and pithy sayings, than to artistic poetry. Numerous examples occur in Isaiah, in solitary texts (5: 7; 21, 2, &c.). As a rule, never, as in the ancient German.

In the second plan, the division of the text into equal members, shorter or longer, is often seen. The first we call verses, the second strophes. Verses, not in the modern, but in the Old Testament sense, are, properly speaking, separate and independent parts of speech. This is more the case, as it is a prominent characteristic of Hebrew poetry to arrange itself in such short disconnected verses. That the masoretic division often interferes with this, is saying nothing. They generally consist of two lines, sometimes of three; and the parts, as well as the verses, may be of equal length, although the sentiment and the music may both require and justify diversity. A strophe may be made up of several verses. In the construction of a strophe, homogeneousness is required, both as to form and the number of verses. When this does not exist, it is doubtful whether there is any proper division into strophes. It is customary, however, in our day, to find strophes everywhere, and to seek, not only a psychological but a theological motive, for every purely arbitrary exhibition of singularity. Externally the strophe is simply marked by the refrain, or the repetition of the concluding verse (Ps. 42; 43; 57; Is. 9: 7, &c.; Amos 1; 2), or by the alphabetical beginning (which, however, is frequently mere play), or the alphabetical order is repeated either within the verse, or the strophe (Ps. 111; 112). Inwardly the strophe rounds itself off with the thought, and by means of the mutual reference of the particular parts of the poem (for instance, Ps. 2; 68; 104; 114; Exod. 15, &c.).—(Comp. *Köster*, in *den Studien*, 1831, 1. *Wocher*, in *der Tübing. Quartalschr.* 1834, p. 613, &c.).

Closely allied to the verse, in the third place, is *parallelism*, that is, the regular placing aside of each other of symmetrically constructed propositions, or rather the parallelism consists in the peculiar nature of Hebrew poetry. The symmetry, however, is not so much external as ideal. It lies essentially in the *relation* of the expression to the thought, so that the last, variously applied, furnishes additional material for versification. Either the same thought is repeated several times in other words, or it is apprehended antithetically from opposite sides. Either each line constitutes a perfect whole, corresponding in all respects with the subject of the parallel lines, or the reduplication relates only to one or two elements of the subject, whilst the others are divided upon the two lines without parallel. Again, the parallelism is extended to two or three lines of the verse. In

the last case, either three times synonymously, as in Ps. 1 : 1, or only twice, and these completing the thought with an introductory, or concluding line. It can, however, include four members, if the repetition be simple and four-fold, although this is seldom the case, and by carrying it too far, it becomes tedious; or it may be, as is more frequent, by connecting the lines two and two, *a b* and *c d*, or more elegantly *a c—b d* (Ps. 33 : 13). Antithetic parallelism is seldom met with, and for the most part consists of two members, sometimes of four and intricate (Sol. Song 1 : 5). All these, otherwise infinitely diversified forms, are interchanged in most poems, and this interchange itself contributes to the gradation of poetic language even to a rhetorical elevation, or at least not very far from it. Still there are pieces in which there is the strictest adherence to rule, and in which, for this reason, the strophic plan is decidedly prominent. To these belong some of the elegies of Jeremiah, and many of the later Psalms.—(Comp. generally, *Kaiser, de parall. in poesi heb. natura*, 1839).

From all that has been said, we are still far from the principal thing, in classic, modern, and other Semitic literature in a technical respect, from a proper measuring of the long and short, and the connection of the same according to definite rules. A poem, without respect to this, is a contradiction in terms. The attempt accordingly has been made to discover a metre in the Old Test. poetry, and the more so, for the reason that Josephus, and after him Jerome, has assured us, that the Hebrews actually practised, and wrote their poems in hexameter, pentameter, &c. Every such attempt, however, has thus far failed. Nevertheless we are persuaded that something more than mere parallelism belongs to Hebrew poetry, and something of the strophic order. The latter has no significance, the first no grace, without a certain sort of music, without which poetry is inconceivable. But this music we call rhyme, the pleasing application of the natural laws of sound, which, when properly managed, has a much finer effect than the most formally correct and mechanically conducted syllabic enumeration, as the comparison of each unmetrical, rhymeless, but beautifully cadenced dithrambic, with the next best French Alexandrines will show. That such a rhyme was attempted in Hebrew poetry, and is yet to be found, is evident from this, that poetic language occasionally prefers certain peculiar forms (particular endings) which require a removal of the accent, and a change of the tone in suffixes, and breathing points. Here and there grammatical singularities, which we ascribe to the punctuators, or a peculiar accentuation, may be simply explained upon rythmical principles, and may rest, we need not say upon pedantic tradition, but upon a proper understanding of the thing (comp. the first line of the first speech of Job, &c.). To go beyond the general here, is, however, very uncertain. Rhyme is, so to say, the breath, or pulsation of language, and can only be perceived, as long as it lives and proceeds from the mouth of a good reader. We cannot believe that our pronunciation of Latin

and Greek, with both of which languages we are very familiar, will ever represent the true music of the odes of Horace and Pindar, and yet we have the benefit of the undisputed quantities of the syllables. How much more careful then should we be, in setting up rules of rhyme for the Hebrew, when we cannot know what the ancient pronunciation was, and if we did know it, would in all probability, with our organs be unable to reproduce it! The latest system (*L. Meier, Form d. Heb. Poesie*, 1853) betrays a conviction of the necessity of referring everything to its proper standard, the ground idea of which, however (the only one applicable in our practice), that it is the accent, not the quantity, which determines the rhyme, will, by the farther representation that each line must have two accented principal syllables, whilst there may be as many unaccented articulations at the beginning (or before), in the middle, and at the end, as may be pronounced within the given time, lead either to the actual giving up of a versification, or to the breaking of the discourse into very short lines, consisting often of a single word, and that in fact might just as well be made up of a number of prosaic texts.

Literature:—*Bellarmin, Instit. hebr. Buxtorf thes. gram.*—*F. Gomarus, Davidis lyra*, lib. 1. *A. Pfeifer, de poesi hebr. vet.* CALMET, Bib. Unters. CRAMER, Psalmen. J. D. MICHAELIS on Lowth's work, cited above. C. G. ASTOR, *de metro hebr. antiquo*, 1770. C. L. BAUR *progr. de metro hebr.*, 1771. C. L. LEUTWITZ, richtige Theorie der bibl. Verskunst, 1774. HOFFMAN, in der Hallischen Encycl. 2. Sect. Sommer, bibl. Abh. 1. Ed. REUSS.—*Dr. Wolf.*

Hebrews, Epistle to the.—As Christ designated (Matt. 5 : 17) his *kingdom* the *kingdom* of the law and of the prophets, it was so regarded by all the Apostles, and especially by Paul. The author of this epistle shows a Jewish Christian Church, which was inclined to transfer the types and shadows of the Old Test. to the realities of the New Test., and many of whose members were on the point of relapsing to Judaism (10 : 25), that the founder of the new covenant was exalted above Moses, and the angels even, and that, as another Melchisedec being the true high-priest, prophet, and king in one person, and more excellent than the Aaronic priests, he was the mediator of a higher covenant, of a higher and an eternal atonement of which the temporary Old Test. atonement furnished only symbolical figures (8 : 1–10, 13). Of course on the basis of the mystical and cabalistic style of exposition then in vogue, and in which the Rabbinical hermeneutics afford better proofs than Philo, the author of the Epistle took a profound view of the symbols and types of the Old Test., and exhibited the eternal Christian ideas which lay concealed in them.

In regard to its *authorship*, the reader at once perceives that the style differs from that of Paul, in being more rhetorical, quiet, and regular. The Epistle has more of the form of a treatise than a letter (*Valckenaer, Berger, Baur*); it has not the introductory salutation or name of the writer always found in Paul's Epistles; and, 13 : 19, 23, excepted, we miss those personal allusions so frequent in Paul's

Epistles. But it seems especially strange, that although in addressing *Jewish Christians* he generally dwelt with emphasis upon his equality as an Apostle with the other Apostles, he mentions himself, 2 : 3, as but a disciple of those who had themselves attended from the first upon the Lord's ministry (LUTHER, Walch, XIV., 46). And yet those churches nearest to Palestine (where those addressed must have lived), the Alexandrian, Syrian, Mesopotamian, with few exceptions, regarded the Ep. as Pauline, and *Clem. Alex.* explains the difference in style by assuming that Luke translated, *Origen* by assuming that an unknown writer edited it. It was only after the 4th cent. that Paul came to be generally considered the author, in the Orient. In the West, however, as far as we can trace the matter, in Rome, Gaul, Africa, there were but 13 Ep. ascribed to Paul, *Hebrews* being excluded. The cause of this diversity has not yet been satisfactorily explained. *Hug* argues with some acuteness (*Thiersch* and *Delitzsch* following him) that the Western Church was committed against the Ep. on account of the appeal of the Montanists, and of the Novatians in the 3d cent., to 6 : 4, as opposed to the restoration of the *lapsi*. But the Montanists did not acknowledge Paul as its author; and *Tertullian* in *de pudicitia*, c. 20, quotes from it only as furnishing *testim. ex redundantia*. No Christian ever refers to it, but only his party. If, therefore, Oriental tradition did not report the author, we must assume that it became known in the West, without a tradition of its authorship. For had an author been named, the Western Church could not have remained undecided, as it was, whether Barnabas or Clemens wrote it.

But if such external arguments exist to show that Paul was the author of this Epistle, the following internal evidence might be urged in favor of the same view. What is said in chapt. 3 of his intimate relation to Timothy, &c. In 10 : 30 we find a quotation from Deut. 32 : 35, in a form which more nearly agrees with Rom. 2 : 19, than with the Hebrew or LXX. text. The Ep. contains many Hebraisms, both in words and phrases. Though the style differs from Paul's, it has been well remarked, that a man of such mind is not to be thought bound to one set of phrases and constructions. This may be seen in his addresses in Acts. Let Acts 26 : 4, 5, be compared critically with some parallel periods in Hebrews. The typology of the Ep. is Pauline, and also the manner of stating a number of doctrines: 1) God as the foundation and end of all creation, 2 : 10; Rom. 11 : 36; Cor. 8 : 6. 2) Christ as the *σπέν* of God and mediator of the world, 1 : 1-3; 2 Cor. 4 : 4; Col. 1 : 15, 16. 3) Christ's humiliation and exaltation, 1 : 4; 2 : 9; Philip. 2 : 8, 9. 4) That Christ deprived death of its power, 2 : 14; Cor. 15 : 54, &c.; 2 Tim. 1 : 10. 5) That Christ died once for all for sin, but is now lifted above all suffering, 9 : 26, 28; 10 : 12; Rom. 6 : 9, 10. 6) Christ as mediator, *μεσίτης*, between God and man, 12 : 23, and *ἄγνωτος*, 7 : 22. 7) Christ as our high-priest before the Father, 3 : 25; Rom. 8 : 34; and other parallelisms, especially in Colossians. To these we must add

the use of certain words peculiar to Paul: *ἐντυγχάνειν*, 7 : 25; *ὁ θεὸς τῆς εἰρήνης*; *παρησία* and *καύχημα*; *ὁ λόγος τῆς ἀποκάλυψης*; *σκιὰ τῶν ἐπουρανίων*, &c. And yet such resemblances might be expected from a disciple of Paul, as well as from Paul himself. That in his addresses in Acts, we must assume that the reporter of them imparted some shade of his own thoughts, seems probable from two expressions altogether peculiar to Luke: *ἀποφθέγγομαι*, 26 : 25 (cf. Acts 2 : 4, 14); *προχειρίζεσθαι* 26 : 16; (cf. 3 : 20; 22 : 14).

But the internal evidence of the Ep. is greatly predominant in favor of a *different* authorship. Some explain the absence of all controversy about *ἔργα νόμου*, of Paul's favorite themes of justification by faith, the importance of Christ's resurrection, and the equal privileges of the heathen, by saying that they were not specially called for in this case; but it is not true that he treats of those themes only in controversial epistles (see *Philippians*). And it is still more difficult to account for peculiar modifications of Pauline doctrines, as that of the atonement and justification. As to the language, it differs from Paul's not only in style and purity, but we meet with idioms peculiar to this author: *ὁ Ἰησοῦς*, *ὁμολογία*, *μακροθυμία*, *οἶον*. Very remarkable is the difference in citations. Whilst Paul, even when quoting the LXX., shows that he had the Hebrew text in view, which he often follows exclusively, the author of Hebrews always quotes from the LXX., even its mistakes (11 : 21; 13 : 15; 10 : 5; 2 : 7). In an ep. to Jewish Christians one would least expect this. Whilst Paul's citations agree with the *Cod. Vatic.*, those in Hebrews agree mainly with the *Cod. Alex.* Paul cites with *ὡς γέγραπται*, *κατὰ τὸ γεγραμμένον*, or *Μωϋσῆς λέγει*, *Δαβὶδ λέγει*; but Hebrews direct declarations of God (2 : 6 excepted). But, above all, Paul would never, especially in addressing Jewish Christians, have designated himself as one who had received the gospel secondarily from an immediate apostle (although *Ebrard* on 2 : 3, assumes just the opposite).

These points of agreement, and of diversity between Paul's other ep. and Hebrews, have caused a corresponding difference of opinion between critics, as to the authorship of the latter. *Storr*, *E. W. Meyer*, *Scheibel*, *de Groot*, *Stuart*, *Gelpke*, *Paulus*, *Stein*, *Klee*, &c., maintain that Paul wrote it; *Stier*, *Hug*, *Delitzsch*, *Guerike*, *Ebrard* (*Olshausen* continued), that Paul was the *mediate* author, an assistant, chiefly Luke composing it. On the contrary *Camerarius*, *Tweslen*, *Ullmann* (*Stud. u. Krit.*, I., II. 2), *Wieseler* (*Chronol. d. ap. Z. A.*, 504), *Thiersch* (*Comm. histor. de ep. ad Hebr.*, 1848), following *Tertullian*, regard Barnabas as the author. Most suppose an Alexandrian: thus *Eichhorn*, *Seyffarth*, *Schott*, *B.-Crusius*; especially Apollos: thus *Luther*, *Clericus*, *Semler*, *Bleek*, *de Wette*, *Reuss*, *Credner*. Two reasons have been urged in favor of Apollos: 1) what is said of him in Acts 18 : 24; 2) the author's acquaintance with Philo's doctrine and hermeneutics (see *Tholuck's Comm. on Hebr.*, 3d ed., p. 80, &c.). But *Neander* (*Planting*, &c.) has shown that the realistic practical character of this ep. is at

variance with Philonism. And yet among the disciples of Paul, Apollos was most likely to be the author; or next to him Clem. Rom., or Barnabas. But Clement himself quotes the ep., and if Barnabas wrote the ep. ascribed to him, he is excluded. So that only Apollos remains, whose qualities, Acts 18:24, well suit those evidently possessed by the author of Hebrews. That the rhetorical and hermeneutical culture exhibited in the ep. might have been acquired outside of Alexandria, we would not deny, but they certainly point strongly to that city. And from 1 Cor. 1:12; 16:12, and Tit. 3:13, we know that Apollos (see Art.) made independent missionary tours; and according to Acts 18:25, 28, he was especially active among Jews, so that he may have sustained intimate relations to Christians in Palestine.

Those *addressed* were, according to the inscription, Ἑβραῖος. If these were of Palestine, it might again be questioned whether Apollos, or any disciple of Paul's school, could be the author. But this name neither designates the place of their birth, residence, nor their language. In Philip. 3:5; 2 Cor. 11:22, Paul of Tarsus calls himself a Hebrew of the Hebrews. Eusebius (*H. E.*, 2, 4) calls Philo, an Egyptian Hellenist, a Hebrew, &c. The fact is, simply, that the term designates *descent from that ancient people* (see Tholuck, *l. c.*, 97), and especially the old language (*Jos. Ant.*, 10, 1, 2). There are other proofs that these Ἑβραῖοι used the language of the country of the Jews. And at the time when this ep. was written the Aramaic idiom was not only prevalent among Parthian, Babylonian, and Mesopotamian Jews, but was used by authors even in Egypt (*Tholuck, l. c.*). The fact, however, that the ep. is directed against an overestimate of the priesthood and cultus of the temple, whilst Jews in the countries named rarely made pilgrimages, then, to Jerusalem (Philo but once in his life), compels us to suppose that a Church of Palestine is meant. For although Paul had many enemies among the Jews, we must not conclude that he had no friends among converts of that nation. And as to the objection from the use of the Greek language, it has been shown by *Paulus* and *Hug* that learned Rabbins were acquainted with Homer, and that even country-people in Palestine had a knowledge of Greek.

The time when the ep. was written can be pretty accurately determined. It must have been before the destruction of Jerusalem, for the Mosiac cultus was still in operation (8:4, 13; 9:6, 7, 9; 13:10); and yet James could no longer have been at the head of the Church at Jerusalem, or the author would not have addressed the readers so authoritatively. We therefore assume the period a. 62-67. — The place seems to be intimated in 13:24. Some (*Semler, Bleek, de Wette*) suppose "fugitives from Italy" were meant. But there is no etymological objection to supposing the expression equivalent to οἱ Ἰταλῶται (so *Ebrard, Köstlin*), in which case not Rome, but lower Italy is meant (see Acts 28:13, &c.). — The condition of the Church addressed, so far as the tenor of the ep. indicates it, also points to Palestine. They do not seem to have overrated the ritual

law (excepting 13:9), circumcision, or an Abrahamic descent, but not to have perceived the superior worth of Christ and his atonement in comparison with Moses, the Aaronic priesthood, and the typical sacrifices. If anywhere, Ebionitic tendencies must have prevailed in Palestine, and, as a result, the value of the ideal Christian atonement be disparaged; and in proportion as the spiritual view of the subject was lost sight of, would the sensuous Jewish cultus become more attractive. To this must be added that the Ep. to the Romans, in the 2d cent. the *test. XII. patriarch*, shows what offence was given to the Jewish portion of the Church by the growing addition of heathen members, which threatened to crowd out the Jewish Christian element. And in the 2d cent. the *test. XII. patriarch*. presents the same points of controversy.

Those books of the Bible have suffered most from erroneous *expositions*, which possess a symbolical typical character, which contrasts most strongly with the modern spirit of rational reflexion; thus with the Apocalypse and Hebrews. Whilst the aim of the latter is to bring forth eternal ideal truth out of the typical veil which concealed it in the Old Test., it was made use of by the Romish Church in defence of their sacerdotal and sacrificial theory. Whilst in the earlier Protestant Church, the book was interpreted spiritually, the realistic gnosis of *Bengel* introduced a realism in the exegesis of Hebrews which operates to this day. On 12:24, *Bengel* says expressly, that Christ took his blood to heaven, not with his glorified body, but *apart* from it. *Rieger*, one of *Bengel's* pupils, adds in proof, that in Rev. 1:14, Christ has white hair, and was, therefore, bloodless. Accordingly, a *purifying*, sanctifying virtue is ascribed to his blood, independent of the atoning efficacy of his death,—a view which forms an essential point in *Kahn's* exposition (p. 64, &c.) of the Lutheran doctrine of the Lord's Supper. Whilst the old Luth. Church—*Calov, Hunnius, Baldwin*—supposes the Holy of Holies, the heavenly Jerusalem, Mount Zion, mean the Church; *Oetinger, Menken, Stier* (on Hebrews, I., 137, 138; II., 319) insist that all might be taken in a *realistic-local* sense.—In *Semler's* day the book must have seemed incomprehensible, and hence it was considered a mere accommodation to crass Jewish notions (*Semler, Versuch einer freien theol. Lehrart*, p. 447. So likewise *Ernesti, Döderlein, Griesbach*, and even *Ammon*, bibl. theol., III., §7). *Rationalism* has regarded the Ep. as the product of the personal prejudices of the author, and as deficient in good taste. *Böhme* on 8:2, says the heavenly tabernacle is a *figmentum Judaicum, quo hæc gens divina omnia sibi soli tribuens loco suo sanctissimo summam dignitatem conciliare studuit*. The return to a deeper understanding of this Ep. was begun by *de Wette* (*Theol. Ztschr. v. Schleiermacher, &c.*, I. and II.).—The most learned and thorough Exposition of Hebrews is that of *BLEEK*, 1828, 2 Thle. This was followed by *THOLUCK's* Comm. 3d ed., 1850. That of *DE WETTE* is spirited, 2 ed. 1847. The latest is that of *Ebrard* in the Olshausen series, 1850.

A. THOLUCK.*

a gown. When the Elector Gebhard of Cologne contemplated introducing the Reformation, Hedio and Bucer were called to Bonn, his residence, but the Emperor soon stopped the work. Hedio spent the rest of his days in Strasburg, mostly in literary labors. He died Oct 17, 1552. His works are partly historico-philological, partly exegetical: *Chronicon german.* until a. 1545; *Chron. Abbatis Urspergensis correctum; paralipomena ei addita rerum memorab. ab a. 1230-1537*; *Prælectiones*, in VIII., cap. in Joh., et in Epist. ad Rom.; *Serm. de decimis*, &c. He also translated various classical and ecclesiastical writers into German.—(See ADAMI, *Vita*, p. 116 (240, sq.). SECKENDORF, *hist. Lutheran.*, I., 247-71; II., 140. ISRLIN, *hist. Lex. Bouginé, literargesch.*, II. RÖHRICH, *Gesch. d. Ref. im Elsass.*, I., 163, 167, 204, 262; II., 40, 104, 152, &c. &c. HERZOG, *Oekolampad*, I., 87). HAGENBACH.*

Heerbrand, Jacob, a Lutheran theologian (born Aug. 12, 1521, † May 22, 1600) distinguished for his zeal in literary studies, and his learning. After filling various other posts with honor, he was sent, 1551, by Duke Christopher as theol. delegate to the Council of Trent. Subsequently he filled the post of theol. professor at Tübingen for 40 years, and was eight times appointed rector of the University. After J. Andrea's death in 1590, he became Chancellor, provost, and ducal counsellor. In 1598 he resigned his offices on account of old age.—His chief work is his *Compend. theologicæ* (Tüb., 1573), afterwards enlarged and more fully conformed to the *Form. Concord.* (1578, and after). Next to Melanchthon's *Loci* this was the first scientific system of theology (including Ethics).—(See CELLIUS, *oratio fun.* ADAMI, *Vita theol.*; WALCH, I., 38. Böck, Eisenbach, Klüpfel, *Gesch. d. Univers. Tüb.* GASS, *Gesch. d. prot. Dogm.*, I., 77). WAGENMANN.*

Heermann, John, a preacher, hymnologist, and devotional writer, born at Rauten, Oct. 11, 1585; † Feb. 17, 1647. He is chiefly distinguished as a composer of hymns. A constant sufferer from sickness, and especially distressed by the Thirty Years' War, his hymns breathe the spirit of his sorrows, yet are chastened by firm faith in and love for Christ. He is pre-eminently the "singer" of the militant and suffering Church. Wackernagel has published 200 of his hymns; but he composed at least 400. Many of these are universal favorites: "O Gott du frommer Gott," &c.; "Herzliebster Jesu was hast du," &c.; "Wo soll ich fliehen hin," &c.; "Jesu deine tiefen Wunden," &c. Among all religious poets from the Reformation to Paul Gerhard, he is chief; in character and talent far surpassing Opitz.—(See funeral sermon of *Holfeld*; *Ev. Kirchenztg.*, 1832, Nr. 27-29. *Wackernagel, Ph.*, J. Heermann's geistl. Lieder: Stuttg., 1856). WAGENMANN.*

Hegelian Philosophy of Religion.—George William Frederick Hegel figures so prominently in the modern history of German philosophy and theology, that a theological Encyclopedia cannot be complete without a brief exposition of his idea of God and of religion. He was born Aug. 27, 1770, at Stuttgart, the capital of the kingdom of Würtemberg, studied theology at

Tübingen, 1788, became private lecturer (*Privatdocent*) of philosophy at Jena in 1801, then professor extraordinary in the same University in 1805, rector of the gymnasium (college) at Nürnberg in 1808, professor ordinary of philosophy at the University of Heidelberg in 1816. From Heidelberg he was called to Berlin in the same capacity, and died there of the cholera, Nov. 14, 1831 (comp. *Rosenkranz*, G. W. F. Hegel's Leben: Berlin, 1844). As a philosopher he was associated with Schelling in his system of identity as it is called, but subsequently he founded the system of absolute idealism as a further development of the system of his younger and more precocious friend, and thus completed the idealistic speculation of the German philosophy since Kant. His significance, therefore, lies in the fact that he represents the culminating point of an important period in the history of philosophy, and not of philosophy only, but also of theology and religion. For the spirit of the age, since the middle of the last century, the growing worldliness, the spread of English and French sensualism and materialism, and the decay of German theology into that insipid rationalism which degraded Christianity to a level with the so-called natural religion, all this combined to give philosophy, since the rise of Kant, such a preponderance over religion and theology that it became and remained to the death of Hegel the ruling power of the age in the scientific and literary circles of Germany. No wonder that not only the founder of this preponderance, Kant, but also its finisher, Hegel, should have exerted a powerful influence on theology, especially on dogmatics and doctrine-history. The names and writings of Daub, Marheineke, Göschel, Rosenkranz, F. Chr. Baur, David Strauss, Zeller, Schweigler, Vatke, Bruno Bauer, and others, and the entire Tübingen school as headed by the famous church historian, Dr. Baur of Tübingen, sufficiently prove the powerful effect of Hegelian philosophy upon the more recent theology of Germany. Nor can it be said by any means that this influence was only a disadvantage. The leaders of the so-called "right wing" of the Hegelian school, Daub, Marheineke, and Göschel (with whom Dr. Rauch of America may be ranked as far as his *Psychology* is concerned) took a prominent part in the revival of evangelical orthodoxy in Germany, and many others owe to Hegel their first deliverance from infidelity. The depth and acumen of thought with which he opposed the so-called *rationalismus communis* or *vulgaris* which then ruled supreme, and defended the fundamental Christian doctrines of the Trinity and the incarnation—although he perverted their orthodox meaning, and adapted them to his pantheistic idealism—contributed very largely towards the reconciliation of the spirit of the age with Christianity. And this was a far more difficult task than the refutation of the pantheistic error which, through Hegel, acquired considerable strength and vitality in German theology as far as it was affected by his philosophy.

The idea of God (the absolute) forms the beginning, middle, and end of Hegel's system, so that it may be called a progressive dialectical

volution of this idea. According to his view the entire world, both nature and man, are but the self-manifestation of God and the unfolding process of his being as the absolute Spirit. "The idea of the absolute Spirit," he says (Philos. of Relig., I., 201), "comprehends the entire wealth of the natural and spiritual world, it is the only substance and truth of this wealth, and nothing is true and real except as far as it forms an element of his being." The absolute, i. e., the unconditional and the unlimited or infinite, allows no rival and no existence out of itself; else it would stand related to it and be limited by it, consequently it would not be independent and absolute, but relative like every conditioned and finite being. "If the finite is bounded by the infinite and stands on its side, then the infinite is likewise limited, and has the finite for its limit" (Philos. of Rel., I., 180). The absolute, therefore, is superior to all contradictions and distinctions of finite existence and finite thought, it is the unity of the infinite and finite, the eternal and temporal, the ideal and real, the subjective and objective of nature and spirit. But it is not so superior to these contradictions and distinctions as to be *only* their unity and harmony, and to exclude their difference; on the contrary it carries in itself also the differences and opposition as an element of its being and part of its substance; otherwise the distinctions would stand outside and over against the absolute as something foreign, as a boundary; that is, the absolute would cease to be absolute.

God, therefore, according to Hegel, is not absolutely done—no motionless, eternally self-identical and unchangeable being, but a living eternal "process" of absolute self-existence. This process consists in the eternal self-distinction or antithesis, and equally eternal self-reconciliation or synthesis of those opposites which enter as necessary elements into the very constitution of the divine being. This self-evolution, whereby the absolute enters into the antithesis and returns to itself again, is the eternal self-actualization of its being, from which it (the absolute) eternally results, and in which it constitutes at once the beginning, the middle, and the end, as in a circle where the beginning is at the same time the end, and *vice versa*. It is in this conception of God as the absolute Spirit, in living process of self-manifestation and self-actualization, that Hegel places his difference from the conception of God in the systems of Spinoza, Fichte, Schelling, as well as those of Kant and all the Deists.

The whole philosophy of Hegel consists in the development of this idea of God by means of the so-called dialectical method which reflects the objective life-process of the absolute. It is divided into three parts, *logic* (which with Hegel is identical with metaphysics), *philosophy of nature*, and *philosophy of mind*. Each part has again three subdivisions, the whole system being controlled throughout by the trichotomic or Trinitarian principle. Passing by the logic and the philosophy of nature as being foreign to our purpose, we confine ourselves to the philosophy of mind.

The philosophy of mind, according to Hegel,

is subdivided into three parts. We have first the subjective or individual mind (psychology), then the objective or general mind as represented in the state and in history (political philosophy, ethics, and philosophy of history), and finally the union of the subjective and objective mind, or the absolute mind. This last manifests itself again under three forms, representing the three degrees of the self-consciousness of the Spirit as the eternal truth. These are, first, *art*, or the representation of beauty (æsthetics); secondly, *religion* in the popular sense of the term (philosophy of religion); and, thirdly, *philosophy* itself as the purest and most perfect form of the scientific knowledge of truth. Religion and philosophy are essentially the same as to their contents, and differ only in the form of their conception of the absolute. All historical religions, the Oriental, the Jewish, the Greek, the Roman, and the Christian, are the successive stages in the development or self-actualization of God. The Christian religion is the true revealed religion, the consciousness of the absolute truth.

This whole conception of religion, however, is false, and conflicts with the actual nature of Christianity. Hegel's philosophy, and historical Christianity, in spite of his repeated assertions of the essential agreement, are as violently opposed to each other as pantheism and theism. And this is the case not only as regards the idea of God, but also as regards the critical conception of man. He regards the Trinity as the central truth of Christianity, but perverts it from the scriptural and orthodox sense into a mere metaphysical abstraction, and with his view of the necessity of sin he overthrows the Christian doctrine of an actual historical salvation from sin by the life, death, and resurrection of Jesus Christ. In his system Christ is not the incarnate Son of God, but only the first man who rose to the knowledge that religion is the absolute truth, and that man is essentially divine, and who exhibited this unity in his holy life.

Such a violent misinterpretation of the doctrines of the Church, far from being a philosophical exposition of the Christian faith, overthrows Christianity, and substitutes for it the abstractions of pantheistic idealism, which starts with a false idea of the absolute, and the denial of personality and freedom as essential attributes of God. Here lies the firm basis from which both the pantheistic and the materialistic tendencies of the age can be refuted.

H. ULRICH. — *P. Schaff*.

Hegesippus. — Among the names enumerated by Eusebius (*E. H.*, IV., 21), of orthodox church-writers in the reign of Marcus Antonius, and during the episcopate of Anicetus, and (168) of Soter, that of Hegesippus stands first. In c. 22, Eusebius cites H. as relating: that on his way to Rome he had spent some time at Corinth in edifying intercourse with the Christians there, and that at Rome he had drawn up a record of the apostolical succession (according to Pearson's interpretation, which is justified by the connection of the words: *τὰς δὲ ἐκκλησίας ἐκείνης*) to the time of Anicetus, who had now — the period at which H. wrote—

been succeeded by Soter and Eleutherus. From this it appears that H. remained at Rome only until the episcopate of Anicetus. But in B. IV., 11, Eusebius says that H. staid there until that of Eleutherus—a discrepancy which may easily have arisen from a want of care in comparing the relevant passage in H. Jerome (*de vir. ill.*, XXII., p. 89) omits this statement of Eusebius.—The passage in Eusebius, Bk. IV., 8, seems, at first sight, to aid us in fixing the time in which H. lived, provided the reading, *γενόμενος*, be correct. According to this reading H. relates, that the games in honor of Antinous, Adrian's slave, were instituted in his day—and so places himself in the reign of Adrian. But the expression, *ἐφ' ἧμιν*, is too indefinite to warrant a safe conclusion in respect to time; and that H. lived under Adrian, at all events admits of no doubt. To call him, for this reason, as Jerome does, *vicinus apostolicorum temporum*, is saying too much. The record of his stay at Corinth and Rome, constitutes the only sure one we have of his life. Eusebius, indeed (IV., 22), says that H. was a converted Jew, but on what authority he leaves us in doubt. Yet the information is probably correct; in any case, his native country must have been in the East. According to the Chron. Alexandr., he died under Commodus; hence after 180. As to his character, the only indubitable statement which can preliminarily be made, is that Eusebius considered him to have been one of the pillars of orthodoxy (in Eusebius's sense) in the age in which he lived. An examination of his own work must unfold more in this respect. Eusebius not only used it, but has given us several important literal extracts (comp. II., 23; III., 11, 16, 20, 32; IV., 8, 11, 22). Jerome appears not to have been acquainted with it; Stephen Gobarus, a Monophysitic writer, on the contrary, availed himself of it as late as the end of the ninth century, and has preserved a passage from it, in *Photius' Bibl. cc.*, XXXII., 893. This passage, together with the extracts in Eusebius, have been collected and annotated by Routh, *reliq. sacr.*, I., 189-255, and before him by Grabe, *spicileg. ss. Pat. secl.*, II. (T. II.), 203-214. According to Eusebius the work of H. consisted of five books, and bore the title, *ὑπομνήματα* (IV., 22; comp. also Steph. Gobarus in Phot. Bibl.). Jerome demonstrates it to be unequivocally a church history, from the death of the Lord to the times of H.; but as he was acquainted with the work only from Eusebius, his opinion is not worth much, although it has given to H. the reputation of being the oldest historian of the Christian Church. The liberal extracts in Eusebius undoubtedly are historical in their character; and many other passages in his work appear to be based on the records of H., without a direct reference to this source as found in IV., 22; IV., 8, &c. Nor would pieces from the gospel of the Hebrews, and other matters taken from written and unwritten Hebrew sources—remarks on the Proverbs of Solomon, and the Apocrypha—of all which Eusebius speaks (IV., 22), be altogether inadmissible on suitable occasions, in a Church history such as H.'s work is supposed to have been. But when Eusebius (IV., 22) says that he has introduced in their appropriate places the nar-

ratives which he took from H., it becomes doubtful, to say the least, whether, in the work of the latter, they stood in historical order. And a well-grounded doubt of this, and consequently of the historical character of the entire work, must arise, when we find not merely that the only positive reference given by Euseb., in the case of a historical extract (that respecting the death of James) is to the fifth book of H., but likewise that in this reference (II., 23) he expressly remarks that H. had introduced the narrative when treating of the immediate succession of the apostles—a subject which in a work like Jerome presumed that of H. to be ought certainly to have been brought forward in the first, and not in the fifth book. In B. IV., 8, Eusebius declares that the great purpose H. had in view, was to set forth, in a most simple style of composition, the plain tradition of the apostolic doctrine. Hence his remarks respecting the churches with which he became acquainted on his journey (*Euseb.*, IV., 22). Eusebius further says that, in his *ὑπομνήματα*, H. has left us a most complete record of his own views, inasmuch as he states that he had formed connections with many bishops when travelling to Rome, and found the same doctrine held by all. We might, therefore, suppose his work to have been a journal of travels, just as well as a history. And yet this supposition again is scarcely tenable, since in the very passage of Eusebius (IV., 22), which contains the opinion of the writer on the *ὑπομνήματα*, we are told that H. annexed his statement respecting the condition of the Corinthian Church to observations on the first epistle of Clement to the Corinthians. Only one way of explaining the difficulty remains. The *ὑπομνήματα* (in spite of this title which after all means not much more than our general term notes) constituted a kind of apologetic or polemic work, enriched with historical demonstrations. This view of the case is rendered more probable by a closer examination of the passage in Eusebius (IV., 8) where H. is introduced, for the first time, as a character belonging to the history of his age. For, after having described the magnitude and evil of the gnosis, in the reign of Adrian, and referred to the fact (IV., 7) that the true faith was victorious in the contest with it.—Eusebius remarks, at the end of chapt. 7, that in those times the truth had called forth “many champions who undertook its defence, not only by unwritten argumentation, but also by their written demonstrations against the prevailing heretical impieties.” “Among these,” he continues in chapt. 8, “Hegesippus holds a distinguished rank.” From all this the words of Eusebius, adduced above, respecting the purpose which H. had in view, become plain, and lead us to believe that the work was a polemic production, written from the standpoint of genuine tradition, and in accordance with its mode of argumentation. The simplicity of style, spoken of by Euseb., probably consisted in this, that H. argued only by means of historical narratives and traditions. And it is just on this account that he assumes a very remarkable position in the process by which the old Catholic Church as such was formed—in so far as this process is considered by opposition to the heretical gnosis.

Although the fragments from the work of H., literally cited by Euseb., are comparatively few in number, yet their subject matter is of very considerable interest. They constitute, moreover, the only records of the kind, which enhance their importance. The most ample of them, however, describing the death of James, must be used with great caution as a historical source, for it bears the evidence of traditionary adornments, and is written without a clear apprehension of the circumstances of the case. The deepest interest which these fragments have awakened, has always been in relation to the opinion given by H. on the state of all important churches of his day. This opinion was the result of his journey; and has originated two lively controversies, bearing with great force on the mode of conceiving the history of the Church in the second century. Socinian deism, already, regarded the favorable impression which the churches made on H., pre-eminently as a means of proving the universal spread, in them, of a Judaizing way of thinking; in so far as H. himself was said to have been, by birth and disposition, a decided Jewish Christian. Against his entire position Bull entered the lists 150 years ago. But now Dr. Baur of Tübingen, and his school, reoccupy precisely the same ground, and the view and argumentation of the subject from the standpoint of this school, have been finally and clearly set forth by A. Schweiger (Das nachapost. Zeitalter, I., p. 342-359). Numerous energetic representations of the opposite side have appeared, among whom we mention especially Ritschl in his Entsteh. der alt-kathol. Kirche, I., 3, 3, and Dorner, whose remarks on Hegesippus, in his Entwickelungs-gesch. der Lehre von d. Person Christi (I., 1., p. 219-230) constitute the most comprehensive and thorough reply to the school of Tübingen. In order to decide the controversy, everything depends on establishing either that the tendency of Hegesippus itself was a Judaizing one, or that it was not. The most convincing proofs that it was not, can be brought forward. But for this reason H.'s Jewish extraction should not be called in question. The fact that a Palestinian Christian, by birth a Jew, and educated exclusively under the gospel influence of his native country, meets with his own principles in the whole gentile Christian world: this is the very thing that makes the case of H. so instructive, and shows that not even in the contracted Christian circle of Palestine, Ebionitism which is said to have ruled the whole Church, had a home. Baur has based another controversial point on what H. remarks in Euseb. (III., 32) respecting the origin of the gnostic heresy, namely that it first saw the light of day with the death of Simeon, in the time of Trajan; and that until then the Church had kept itself unspotted from false doctrines. From this statement it follows, so he says, that the apostolical age knew of no gnostic heresy; and this becomes a conclusion decisive for New Test. criticism. However, in the passage in question, H. states that the heresy had existed before, but was not publicly and generally manifested. Such remarks of H. are to be understood altogether relatively, as is quite evident from the circumstance, that on another occasion (Euseb., IV., 22) he dates the

origin of the gnosis from the death of James.— (Compare, in this respect, Dorner, p. 223, &c.; and Thiersch, Versuch zur Herstellung &c., chapt. V.). C. WEIZSÄCKER.—*de Schweinitz.*
Hegira (*the flight*), the epoch from which Mohammedans (see Art.) compute time, by order of Caliph Omar. The era began on Thursday, July 15, 622, A.D. Most chronologists, especially the earlier European, reckon from Friday, July 16, the actual new moon, instead of the real time of conjunction. It is a prevailing error to suppose that Mohammed's flight occurred on that day; it is only the 1st day of the year, on the 8th day of the 3d month of which it took place. The Arabs reckon their civil day from sunset. Their month is the period from the first crescent after the new moon until the next. In this the popular must be distinguished from the astronomical calendar, as in the former the month may have 29 or 30 days. Twelve such months make a year, which may, therefore, begin successively in any month or season. This irregularity disappears in the cyclical method of reckoning, in which, as two synodic months include 59 days, the months singly, have alternately 29 and 30 days.¹ Their lunar year, therefore, has 354 days. But the astronomical lunar year is 8h. 48', 36" longer, which, in the solar year, must be added as an intercalary day. These 8h. 48' (the 36" are left out because they amount to but one year in 2400) make 11 days in 30 years, and are so disposed of, that when the excess added from year to year, after abstracting the whole days, is more than 12 hours, an entire intercalary day is added to the last month.² Now in order to

¹ The following list will illustrate:—

	Dura- tion.	No. of days.
1) Muharram.....	30	30
2) Szafer.....	29	59
3) Rabi' ul awwal.....	30	89
4) Rabi' ul achir.....	29	118
5) Dschumâdâ-l awwal.....	30	148
6) Dschumâdâ-l achir.....	29	177
7) Radschab.....	30	207
8) Scha'bân.....	29	236
9) Ramadhân.....	30	266
10) Schawâl.....	29	295
11) Dsul-ka'dah.....	30	325
12) Dsul-biddscha.....	29	354

² In the following table an * will show what years, in a tricennial cycle, are intercalary.

Years.	No. of days.	Years.	No. of days.
1	354	*16	5670
* 2	709	17	6024
3	1063	*18	6379
4	1417	19	6733
* 5	1772	20	7087
6	2126	*21	7442
* 7	2481	22	7796
8	2835	23	8150
* 9	3189	*24	8505
10	3544	25	8859
11	3898	*26	9214
12	4252	27	9568
*13	4607	28	9922
14	4961	*29	10277
15	5315	30	10631

reduce the Mohammedan date to our chronology, the present sum of their years must be divided by 30; the quotient will be the intercalary cycle, the remainder the surplus years. Multiply the quotient by 10631 (see note 2), and seek for the remainder, the corresponding number of days in table 2. To this add the current year (table 1) and 227015, the whole number of days from the commencement of the Christian era to that of the Mohammedan epoch. This gives the absolute number. The sum of all these items will give the whole number of days from the commencement of the Christian era, to the Mohammedan date in question. Divide this by 1461, the number of the Christian intercalary cycle, and multiply the quotient by 4; the remainder will be the number of days over the intercalary cycle, 365 for one year, 730 for two years; the remainder still left will indicate the days of the current year.¹ In a leap-year the number of days in each month is one more, from February on. If, therefore, we wish to ascertain the date of the death of Haroun el Raschid: 3d of Dschumâdâ-l âchir, 193 Hag., we get 6 as the quotient of $192 \div 30$, and 12 as remainder. Then $6 \times 10631 = 63786$. The number of days in 12 years is 4252 (table 2). But the 3d of Dschumâdâ is, in that year, the 151st day, (table 2). We must, therefore, reckon $63786 + 4252 + 151 + 227015 = 295204 \div 1461 = 202 \times 4 = 808$, and the remainder, 82 will be (table 3) the 23d day after February. Hence, Dschumâdâ 3d, Hag. 193 = March 23, A. D. 809. The old Julian calendar is, naturally, the basis of these calculations; we must therefore notice that it differs from the Gregorian 10 days from 1582 — 1700; 11 days from 1701–1800; 12 days from 1801–1900. — To change a Christian to a Mohammedan date, the reverse of the preceding process must be adopted. — To ascertain the day of the week, of a Mohammedan date, it must be remembered that July 15, 622, the first day of the Hegira epoch, was a Thursday; hence every 8th, 15th, &c., day will also be a Thursday. We need, therefore, only divide the number of days from the commencement of the epoch to the desired date, by 7, and when the remainder is 1, it will always indicate Thursday, when 2, Friday, &c.—(See *Ideler*, Handb. d. mathem. u. techn. Chronol. II., 471–512. *Lehrb. d. Chron.*, 106, &c. *Wahl*, Neue arab. Anthologie: Lpz., 1791, 63–84. *Wüstenfeld*, Vergleichungs-Tabellen d. Muham. u. Chr. Zeitrechn.: Lpz., 1854). ARNOLD.*

Heidelberg, or Palatinate Catechism.—It is historically certain that this Catechism was the joint production of Dr. Caspar Olevianus, formerly Prof. of Theology, and court-preacher at Heidelberg, and Dr. Zacharias Ursinus, Prof. of Theology in the University. The one composed it in German, the other in Latin. The decree of Elector Frederick III., ordering its publication and use, was dated Jan. 19th, 1563.

¹ The following table shows how these days may be put into the desired Christian date.

Jan., 31 days,	May, 151 days,	Sept., 273 days,
Feb., 59 "	June, 181 "	Oct., 304 "
March, 90 "	July, 212 "	Nov., 334 "
April, 120 "	Aug., 243 "	Dec., 365 "

The first edition, unlike succeeding ones, had not the numbering of the questions, nor the eightieth question, nor the division into Sundays, nor the lessons, while the chapters only, containing the proof passages, were given. In the second, the eightieth closed with the words: "And the mass is nothing but an idolatrous denial of the single offering and sufferings of Jesus Christ;" and, when the Council of Trent published its decrees, the Elector took pains to suppress this edition, and issued a third in which the close of the answer to this question was made to read as now. Before the end of 1563, the Catechism was cast in the mould in which we now have it. In the following editions it was adapted, more or less perfectly, to practical purposes, by the addition of prayers, formularies for baptism, communion, marriage. The best of them appeared 1592, in Neustadt, under the superintendence of Matthäus Harnisch.—The Elector, feeling it to be his duty to provide for the religious wants of the people, made it a point to introduce the Catechism into both Church and schools. The ecclesiastical bickerings that had disturbed the first year of his reign, convinced him, that the only way to make head against the decided Lutheranism of his day, was the adoption of the Reformed faith. We cannot, by any means, agree with Dr. Heppe (*Dutch. Prot.*, I., p. 443–447) who affirms, that the Heidelberg Catechism, "is thoroughly Melancthonian and, in no sense, Calvinistic." If we bear in mind that Calvin allowed the communion of the sick — e. g., in his letter to the Montbeliardians: "*De cœnæ administratione ita sentio, libenter admittendum esse hunc morem, ut apud aegrotos celebretur communio, cum res et opportunitas feret — hac tamen lege, ut sit vera communio: hoc est ut panis in cœtu aliquo frangatur* (Epist. ed.: Gen., 1576, p. 43; see also, l. c., 329); that, touching the monthly celebration of the Lord's Supper, he says: *Jam vero singulis mensibus cœnam celebrari maxime nobis placeret malimus tamen singulis mensibus invitari Ecclesiam, quam quater duntaxat in singulos annos: ut apud nos fieri solet. Quam huc primum veni distribuebatur nisi ter quotannis Mihi placebant singuli menses; sed quum minime persuaderem, satius visum est populi infirmitati ignoscere, quam pertinacius contendere. Curavi tamen referri in actu publico vitiosum esse morem nostrum, ut posteris facilius esset ac liberior correctio*; that the Calvinistic liturgy of the Church at Frankford provided for monthly communion, and the Herborn Church Discip. by Olevianus who was a thorough-going Calvinist, arranged: *Cœna singulis mensibus ad minimum celebretur et quisque suo loco laboret, ut si non singulis dominicis diebus totus ecclesiæ cœtus communicet—Saltem fiat sæpissime*: it will not be easy to conclude with Dr. Heppe, that the Church order instituted by the Elector was not Calvinistic in its character, but Melancthonian, or, as he says, "German Evangelical." Nor will any one be able to understand why the general proclamation of the forgiveness of sins should not be of the Reformed practice, who knows anything about the liturgies of the Reformed Church.

The doctrine of the Heidelb. Catechism—which

as the same as of the churches called Calvinistic — can be understood only from the point of view of that theology which owes its existence chiefly to the influence of Calvin. Dr. Heppe is wrong when he attempts to derive it from the Frankford Recess, which is so ambiguously worded that the Lutheran need not take offence. Whilst the Catechism presents in clear, precise terms the Reformed views of the Lord's Supper, this does not even approximate to a correct expression of its points. With Calvin and Martyr it teaches that *bread and wine* are simply *signs and seals* of the presentation, in the *holy transaction*, of the heavenly gifts which are all comprehended in the *sacrifice of the Cross* (Quest. 67). On the one hand, it affirms the Holy Supper to be a memorial and assurance of the fact that the believer has part in the one sacrifice of Christ, a representation of His death and a pledge to the Christian that the body of Christ was broken for him, and His blood shed, and that Christ nourished him to eternal life with His crucified body and shed blood (Quest. 5); and on the other, that, "*besides this*, the believer is more and more closely united to his glorified body, *through the Holy Ghost*," and that this body "*is in heaven and we on earth*." In his defence of the Catechism, p. 317, 318, Ursinus places this point in a very clear light. "The one party," says he, "affirm the body and blood of Christ to be substantially in or with the bread and wine, and so partaken that He enters into their bodies with the bread and wine, from the hand of the administrator, through the mouth of the communicant. The other party, that the body of Christ, *no longer on earth, is and ever remains in heaven* till he shall come again to judgment. We, although on earth, are not only cleansed from sin by his blood and sufferings, but through His Spirit that dwells in Him and us, are so united and incorporated into His true, real, human body, that from His flesh and bones we are more closely joined to Him than the members of our body to its head, and that we have eternal life in Him and from Him.—From Quest 65, 66, 73, 74, 77, as well as from the fact that the Catechism is intended for believers only, it is clear that it teaches these, and not unbelievers, receive the sacrament. Ursinus thus expresses the difference between the Heidelbergers and the Lutherans. The one party affirm that all who approach the Lord's table, whether believers or unbelievers, eat and drink bodily, and with the mouth, the flesh and blood of Christ; the one to salvation, the other to condemnation. The other, that unbelievers eat the signs only to their condemnation, but only believers eat and drink the body and blood of Christ to eternal life, by means of faith and the operation of His Spirit.

As in this, so in every other doctrine, the Catechism agrees with the theology of the Reformed Church generally, and with that of the Calvinistic type in particular. Take, for instance, its definition of the Church and the distinctively Calvinistic view of the descent into hell. Most unquestionably, nothing Melanchthonian here. Still less is this the case with its doctrine of sin and grace. No one can deny that Melanchthon, who invested the natural

man with the *facultas applicandi se ad gratiam*, was a synergist: whereas the Catechism teaches that "we are wholly incapable of doing any good, and inclined to all wickedness." Questions 1, 31, 51, 53, 54, affirm beyond a doubt the *perseverantia sanctorum*, the inamissibleness of grace and regeneration. Ursinus thus commentates on Quest. 1: *Inst. Quidsi gratia Christi excidat? Potes enim peccare et deficere: et longum atque arduum est iter in cœlum. Resp. Christus sua beneficia non tantum meritis et semel contulit, sed etiam perpetuo conservabit et donabit me perseverantia, ne deficiam aut excidam a gratia. Explicit., p. 24; on Quest. 53: Locus hic de æterna Dei prædestinatione, seu de electione et reprobatione, oritur ex loco de ecclesia (Epl., p. 392): on Quest. 53; Confirmat (Sp. S.) nos vacillantes in fide et facit certos de salute, hoc est, continuat et conservat beneficia Christi usque ad finem.—Object. Saul et Judas non obtinuerunt hæreditatem et tamen habuerunt Spiritum sanctum. Ergo . . . Resp., Saul et Judas habuerunt Spiritum S. quoad aliqua ejus dona: sed non habuerunt spiritum adoptionis. Inst., Atqui est idem spiritus. Resp., Idem quidem spiritus est, sed non eadem efficit in omnibus. Adoptionem et conversionem in solis electis efficit (Epl., p. 372–374). Fieri non potest ut electi nullas retineant fidei reliquias (p. 380). This anti-Melanchthonian *perseverantia sanctorum* necessarily leads to the doctrine of *Predestination*, and, though this is not treated of particularly in the Catechism, it would be as well just to infer that the Palatines and the German Reformed did not hold it, as that those in Geneva discredited it, because their Catechism left it undiscussed. As already stated, the theory of predestination alone corresponds to its view of sin and grace. Besides, the interpreters of it, when handling it theologically, always append this doctrine to Quest. 54, and it is well known that foreign ecclesiastics, so far from distrusting its meaning on this point, adopted it as an orthodox text-book, considered it a shield for Calvinistic doctrine against the Arminians, and the Synod of Dort looked upon it as a sound, correct treatise.*

Notwithstanding this, Dr. Heppe (*l. c.*, p. 446) tells us this doctrine is not in the Catechism because *the circumstances in which it originated forbade its admission, and its authors never dreamed of an apostasy (!!) to Calvinism*. And yet the theologians of Heidelberg were Calvinists, and most decided Calvinists, as Peter Martyr and Zanchius were called to fill its professorships. Besides, from the judgment passed in favor of Zanchius, Aug. 25, 1561, by the Heidelberg theologians, Boquinus, Tremellius, Olevianus, and Diller, we learn that, before the time of the Catechism Calvin's predestination theory found favor there (comp. Schweitzer, *Centrals.*, I., p. 460–462). Nor will any one be so fool-hardy as to deny the Calvinism of Olevianus. As regards Ursinus, in his *Epistola ad D. Jacobum Monan de prædestinatione*, he declares he had no views on this subject different from those of the Calvinists Beza and Martyr. Indeed, it would be hard to speak more Calvinistically than he does in his *Explicatio*, of the Catech. (See Williard's transl., p. 297, &c.)

It is not necessary to enforce the positive Reformed character of its doctrine on *Baptism*, the relation between the *Divine* and *human natures in Christ* (Quest. 47 and 48), and *images*, while the Scriptures afford a sufficient vindication of Quest. 5-7, against the attacks of infidelity. It is worthy of remark, that some seem not to appreciate the preference that ought to be awarded this book on the score of its making the sum of the law (Matt. 22 : 37-40) the best means for the excitement of a true knowledge of sin, instead of the several commandments in detail. Cocceius remarks very appropriately on Quest. 4: *Cum ponenda hic esset quædam sive sanctitatis in lege requisita, optimo consilio Catechesis non posuit Decalogum, quia Deo sic conceptus est, ut potius recessionem a malo, quam bonum, quod in homine debet esse et ad justitiam ejus requiritur, exprimat: sed duo maxima præcepta a Christo indicata* (Opp. tom. VI., p. 5); comp. Sudhoff, Fester Grund, p. 215.

Princes and theologians drew the sword against it. Conspicuous among the latter were Laurentius Albertus, who warned Worms and Spire against its poison, the inconstant Franciscus Balduinus, Brenz, Andreä, Hesshus, and M. Flacius Illyricus. The Melanchthonian theologians of Wittenberg, also, combatted it. The Elector, however, stood firm, and every body knows how brilliantly he conducted himself when assailed by the Lutherans, their princes at their head, who combined with the Romish bishops and Cardinal Commendone to destroy his influence.

The Catholics disliked it, and succeeded, during the Thirty Years' War, in suppressing it. One of their most generally known controversial treatises of this period, is Koppenstein's *Excalvinizata Catechesis Calvino-Heidelbergensis*: Cologne, 1621. The Reformed replies found in *Kücher*, Katechet. Geschichte der Reform. Kirche: Jena, 1756, p. 349. *Walch's* Biblioth., Bd. I., p. 528.—With the year 1685, when a Roman Catholic ruler swayed the Palatinate, the opposition to it waxed warm. The Jesuits directed their artillery particularly against the eightieth Question. *Lenfant* vindicated it in his *L'innocence du Cat. de Heidelberg*, 1688. In the year 1719, appeared the prohibition of the Elector Charles Phillip, which suppressed it. The Reformed party, however, not disheartened, at last succeeded in having the prohibition withdrawn. The war again broke forth in the year 1738, when the Jesuits of Cologne issued two tracts on the subject. The Catechism, however, held on in its course. In 1568, it was adopted by the *Weseler Synod*, by the Emden Synod, 1571, by the Swiss, earlier. It was introduced into *Holland*, 1568, *Hesse*, *Brandenburg*, and *Anhalt*. In Hungary it was used as a text-book, and highly regarded in Poland, France, and England.

For its literature see *Struve's* Pfälzische Kirchenhist.; *Kücher's* Katechet. Geschichte; *van Alpen* Gench. u. Literat. des Heidelb. Cat.; *Augusti*, Einleit. in d. beiden Hauptkat. d. Evang. K. Also, the commentaries by *Ursinus* and *Olevianus*, and "Fester Grund christl. Lehre. Ein Hilfsbuch zum Heidelb. Cat., Zusammengestellt aus deutschen Schriften Dr.

Caspar Olevianus, &c., by Südhoff.: Frankf., 1854." Comp. Art. in Ersch and Gruber.

LIC. R. SUDHOFF.—*Ermentraut*.

Helbon, a place whence Damascenes (Ezek. 27 : 18) brought wine to Tyre. Robinson in his second journey identified it in a village called Helbon, N. W. of Damascus, still noted for its wine. At one time Helbon was thought to be the modern Haleb, which also produces wine; it was then associated with *Χαλβών* (Ptol. 5, 15, 17; Strabo, XV., 735). But Ptol. 5, 15, 13, expressly distinguishes X. from "Bercia," which the Byzantines considered the old name of Haleb, which first flourished in the middle ages. Besides the X. of Ptol. lies too far N. (See Robinson, Palest.; Rochart, hieroz., I., 543, sq.; Winer, RWB.; Ritter, Erdk., XVII., 2 S., 1319, &c.). RÜRTSCHL.*

Helena, St.—The Romish Church has three saints of this name, all of high rank, a Russian, a Swedish Zealander, and the mother of Constant. M. (see Art.), born c. 274. Gloucester, Treves, Upper Mœsia, and Bithynia claim to be the home of the last. Constant. Chlorus shall have married her for her beauty. It is probably an error that she was at first his concubine, for such were then designated by ambiguous names. When Constant. became Cæsar, Helena had to yield place to the daughter of Maximian. She lived retired, perhaps in Treves, until her son's elevation, when he allowed her large participation in the imperial honors, made her an Augusta, and had coins struck in her honor. It is uncertain whether the mother or son first renounced heathenism. She exerted a softening influence upon the tyrannical temper of her son. The large means he gave her were used in acts of mercy, or in decorating churches. She made her celebrated pilgrimage to Palestine, c. 325, where she discovered the grave and cross of Christ. She built pilgrim churches on Calvary, the Mount of Olives, and in Bethlehem. These acts furnished incentives to subsequent crusades. In 327 she returned and died in her son's arms. The Romans say her remains lie in the *Ara-Cæli* Church, on Capitoline Mount. But the monks of Hautvilliers, near Rheims, affirm that one of their number removed the body in the 9th cent. to their monastery. The Venetians, however, declare that she was buried in Constantinople and then brought to Venice. Thus the Romish Church kneels, on Aug. 18, simultaneously at three graves of this imperial saint. It is certain that scarcely any other woman exerted so much influence upon Church customs. REUCHLIN.*

Heliodorus.—1) Treasurer of Seleucus III., Philopater (187-176, B. C.), who sent him to Jerusalem to demand the treasures of the temple. When he reached the temple he was prostrated by a miraculous appearance, and was only restored by the prayers of *Anias* (2 Macc. 3 : 7, &c.). Josephus says nothing of this, and the author of *de Maccab.*, c. 4, mentions an Apollonius, but not the miracle. Subsequently H. aspired to the throne, and poisoned Seleucus, but Antiochus Epiph. soon subdued him. *Appian. Syriac*, XLV., 60-70. — 2) H. of Emesa, son of Theodosius, of an ancient sacerdotal family, c. 390. In youth he wrote

romance, *Aethiopica*; afterwards he became king of Tricca in Thessalia. *Socr. (H. E., V. 22)* says he was the first to depose priests who, after their consecration, would not leave their wives. Ptolemy (H. E., XII., 34) says that a provincial synod condemned H. for his romance, and required him either to destroy the book, or quit his See. H. did the latter. But this account seems improbable, as the book furnishes no ground of accusation. It relates the adventures of two lovers, Chariclea, the daughter of an Ethiopian king, and Theages, a noble Thessalian, who, after continuing faithful to each other amid many trials and dangers were at last rewarded by a happy union. Its moral tone is above that of all other Greek romances. From the book it seems that H. was acquainted with Christianity, but had not yet embraced it.—We have no further accounts of the life of H.—3) H., native of Dalmatia, who accompanied Jerome on his Oriental journey, but returned to his home until Jerome persuaded him to come back by his beautiful letter *de amore solitudinis*. He subsequently became a priest in Aquileia, then Bishop of Altino. Jerome commends him for having as Bishop maintained a strict monastic life.—4) H., a priest in Antioch, c. 440, wrote *de naturis rerum exordium* against the Manicheans, in which he tries to confute their error of two original principles.

TH. PRESSEL.*

Heliogobalus, Roman Emperor, A. D., 218–22, was a son of the Roman Senator, Varius Marcellus and Julia Soëmis; his original name was Varius Avitus Bassianus. In his 13th year he was consecrated high-priest of the sun at Emesa, near the Orontes. Heliogobalus is the Greek name of the Syrian Phœnician god, *ἥλιος*, i. e., *deus montis*, hence originally a mountain deity, but who afterwards was regarded as a sun-god. The orgies with which he was worshipped consisted of dances to the sounds of all sorts of instruments, in which women with cymbals and drums took part. Human sacrifices, especially boys, were offered. The youthful high-priest was revered by the Roman troops stationed in winter-quarters at Emesa, who readily recommended him as Emperor. Macrinus, obnoxious to the effeminate Romans for his strict discipline, was conquered in a battle against the rebels at Immæ, and Rome bowed to the yoke of H., but 14 years old, who became the first Roman Emperor of Asiatic descent. Utterly degraded and enervated by his licentiousness, H. exhibits the picture of a moral monster. The great object of his reign was to introduce into Rome the worship of his deity. Soon after he entered the city he had a splendid temple to the sun built upon Mt. Palatine; in it he placed the conic stone which he brought from Syria. Sacrifices were offered, with all the gorgeousness and voluptuousness of the Syrian worship. Other temples were robbed to adorn this, and all other deities declared subservient to the god of the sun. A public festival was held in honor of the nuptials between the sun-god and Astarte. H. himself submitted to circumcision, and forbade the use of swine-flesh—and is even said to

have meditated his own castration in imitation of the priests of Cybele. But during his reign Christians had rest. As he introduced innovations upon the old Roman cultus, it was politic in him to tolerate other new religions. He and his mother perished in a tumult of the soldiers; his mutilated body was dragged through the city, and thrown into the Tiber. A subsequent decree of the Senate loaded his name with reproach.

TH. PRESSEL.*

Hell, *Christ's descent into, Descensus ad inferos, κατάβασις εἰς ᾗδου*. This designation of the corresponding dogma in the doctrine of the person of Christ, and there regarding his twofold state, is taken from the phraseology of the Apostles' creed. G. Holger Waage, *de aetate articuli, quo in symbolo apost. traditur J. Chi. ad inferos descensus commentatio*, 1886, has refuted the common view, advocated especially by Peter King in his *Historia Symb. Apost.*, c. 4, that the article was introduced in opposition to Apollinarianism. Rufinus, *Expos. Symb. Aquilejensis*, c. 18, says the article was found in the confession of the Church at Aquileia, c. 390, but not in the symbols of Rome or the Eastern churches. But a careful comparison of the various editions of the creed, as far as known (WALCH, *Bibl. Symb. Vet.*) shows that the article was admitted before Rufinus' time. Whilst it is not found in most copies prior to the 6th cent. (although the Church Fathers frequently dwell upon the subject), at the beginning of the 7th it is commonly, and in the 8th cent. constantly met with. Its incorporation with the creed was, therefore, gradual, but only because its importance came to be more deeply felt.—In the nature of the case the dogma must have kept pace, on the one hand, with that of the person and work of Christ, on the other, with eschatological views; so that the gradual development of these doctrines must reflect themselves in that of the *Descensus*. The orthodox doctrine of the various churches does not agree, therefore, in this case, upon any point. The *Greek Church*, resting upon the Bible and tradition, holds that the *Descensus* was the *voluntary* descent into hades of the *human soul* of Christ as united with the Godhead; whilst there, from the time of his death until his resurrection, he *preached the gospel* to those held under Satan's dominion on account of original sin, and offered them *salvation*, and led believers, especially Old Test. saints from hades into Paradise (Conf. Orthod., I., 49). The *Romish Church* holds, resting on tradition alone, that *the whole person of Christ*, in the inseparable union of the human and divine natures, voluntarily descended to the *Limbus patrum*, bosom of Abraham, or ante-hell of the fathers, the *ignis purgatorius*; there he proved himself the Son of God by overpowering the demons, granted to the fathers, who *ibi que sine ullo doloris sensu quiescentia habitatione fruebantur*, the merits of his death, and raised them from *limbus* into heaven (*Cat. Rom.*, § 100–105). In *Lutheran theology* we find a real descent into hell. Christ, the *Godman*, after the *vivificatio* and *redemptio animæ et corporis*, immediately before manifesting himself as arisen, early on the first day of the week, went with his soul and body into

the place of the damned, having spent the interval from his death until then in Paradise. This was *primum resurrectionis momentum*, the lowest step of the *status exaltationis*. Then first he took possession of the *regnum potentiae*, and displayed his triumph over the devil and his angels, whilst his preaching to them was *legalis* and *damnatoria* (*Form. Conc. art.*, 9). Reformed theology holds that Christ spent the interval between his death and resurrection in Paradise, without associating this, however, with the *Descensus*, which is to be taken metaphorically. Regarding a literal descent of Christ into hell as a *contrad. in adjecto*, the Reformed explain this article as referring to the unutterable hellish anguish endured by the Saviour in his human soul, in his death (*Calvin, Inst.*, II., 16, 8–12. *Heid. Cat.*, Q. 44. *Niemeyer*, 132, 402).

On the *Lutheran* side, the dogma being considered an integral part in the doctrine of the person of Christ, the views sanctioned by the Church were tenaciously maintained; and various attempts to modify those views (by Dreyer, Artopoeus, Russ, &c.) were put down. Dietelmayer (*Hist. dogm. de desc. Chi.*, etc., 1741, 1762) cites many leading theologians as advocates of the Church view. On the *Reformed* side it has been otherwise. Alongside of the orthodox view we find *Descendere* explained of the simple burial of Christ (Beza, Drusius, Amama, &c.), or of his state of death, *status ignominiosus* (Piscator, the remonstrants Arminius, Limborch, &c.). Others, unconsciously, came nearer the truth in the case, although by an arbitrary allegorization, the article almost lost its significance in the creed. Zwingli, already, with Megander, Leo Judä, Bullinger, P. Martyr, and Melancthon also, almost discovered the doctrine of Christian antiquity, as derived from the hints of the Bible. Even early in the 17th cent. Rob. Parker wrote an extensive apology of the symbolical, Church interpretation of the article. But from the year 1650, this interpretation was more and more surrendered. Lightfoot and Pearson subjected it to a triumphant criticism. Subsequently, when the orthodox system gave way, the *Descensus* became a withered branch of a tree at whose root the axe was laid. Some thought it a Jewish mythical mode of describing the condition of Christ in hades; others, a symbolical representation of Christ's love in abiding in a sinful world (Marheineke, Ackermann), or the universality of the salvation obtained by Christ (de Wette, Hase, Grimm). Schleiermacher thought the entire account destitute of proof (*G. L.*, II., § 99, 1).

The following points we regard as clearly taught in the New Test. 1) Christ, during the time that his body lay in the grave, manifested himself to the departed in hades. Whilst Eph. 4 : 8–10, may not be cited in support of this view, Paul assumes a *κατάβασις εἰς τὸν ἄβυσσον* in Rom. 10 : 6–8. But in Acts 2 : 31, cf. 37, it is directly said, *ὅτι οὐ παρέλειπεν* (Χριστὸς) *εἰς ἄδου*, and in Luke 23 : 43, Jesus assures the penitent thief: *σήμερον μετ' ἐμοῦ ἔσῃ ἐν τῷ παραδείσῳ* (see *Hades*). 2) Christ went as a *πνεῦμα* to the dead in their kingdom (1 Pet. 3 : 18, &c.; Acts 2 : 27). 3) There he carried on his work of preaching the gospel (1 Pet. 3 : 19). Whether

Peter meant only the contemporaries of Noah, or all who died before Christ, cannot be decided from the passage. 4) But from 4 : 6, *νεκροὶς ἐν ἡγγελισμῷ* (cf. 5) all the dead seem to be meant. The object of this preaching is stated (v. 6) to have been that they might "live in the spirit" according to God's plan and purpose of mercy. There are other passages, which, although they do not explicitly teach a *Descensus*, cannot be explained on any other ground.

If it must be admitted that the soul of man, from his death to the resurrection at the *ἀνάστασις τοῦ κόσμου*, occupies a middle state in hades, it follows from the *humanity* of Christ, that he must have shared this universal lot of mankind. But as he submitted to this only in fulfilment of obedience to all the laws of humanity, hades had no power to retain this sinless second Adam. His *Descensus*, therefore, was only the concluding part of that perfecting process (Heb. 2 : 10) through which the divine-human person of Christ passed in attaining to its proper *οὐρα τῆς δόξης*. Hence the *Descensus* belongs neither to the *status exinanitionis*, nor to the *status exaltationis*, but is the transition from one to the other, and represents the unity of both.—In determining the soteriological significance of the manifestation of Christ among the dead, we must assume that he entered the realm of spirits in his own proper identity, as the God-man, in whom God has fully revealed himself to man, and who, therefore, exerts a redemptive power in all ways. His very entrance into that middle state was a proclamation of the grace of God in him, his presentation of himself as a soul among souls was in itself an announcement of the absolute fulness of truth in him, the manifestation of that light of the world "which lighteth every man." Filled with the spirit and love of God the Father, the redemptive virtue, the principle of salvation, which constitutes his being,—the saving life-power of God which dwells absolutely in him, is there imparted personally to those, who, united to him by faith, stand in living communion with him.—We have no means of ascertaining the result of this activity of Christ among the dead, excepting the analogy afforded by the operations of grace in this life. If before his *Descensus* hades was divided into Abraham's bosom and the place of torments, the gulf of separation must have widened after Christ's preaching there.—(See J. L. KÖNIG, d. Lehre v. Chr. Hölle. : Frankf., 1842. GÜDER, d. Lehre v. d. Ersch. Jesu Chr. unter d. Todten. : Bern., 1853. Even WIRSIUS, *Exercit. s. in symb. ap.*, 1730, thought: *de descensu tantum ferme dissertatum est, quantum est muscarum, quum caletur maxime*). GÜDER.*

Hell punishments.—Immortality is the destiny of all men, but eternal life is secured only to those who become partakers of the divine life of Christ, and thus have been born of God, and delivered from sin. All salvation is unchangeably bound to real life-communion with Christ. So far, therefore, as man attains his true destiny only in the realization of the divine image in himself, his eternal misery must consist in that perversion of his being involved in his alienation from God. This alienation increases, ob-

actively, with man's bondage to his selfish tendency, and with his sinful decrease of liberty to return to God. As a necessary result of the unreconciled contradiction between the true idea of man and his actual character, it is a state of punishment, in the form of the realized relation of evil to man's nature as created by and for God. This punishment becomes absolute damnation at the judgment to be connected with the second coming of Christ (Matt. 25 : 41 ; 1 : 23 ; Rev. 20 : 15). But the condition of the ungodly, before and after that event, is represented as essentially the same.—The New Testament sets forth the misery of the lost in symbolical language (Mark 9 : 44, 46 ; Matt. 25 : 30 ; Heb. 10 : 27 ; 2 Pet. 3 : 7 ; 2 Thess. 1 : 8, 9 ; Rev. 4 : 10, 11 ; 20 : 15 ; 21 : 8). These expressions have from the first been variously explained ; some have taken them figuratively only, others literally. Earlier writers speak of material fire, yet differing from terrestrial fire. *Dante's* representations of hell were considered as something more than poetic fancies. The body as well as the soul were thought subject to those punishments. Though, others again, explained the punishments as chiefly inward, supposing the fire that of burning passions, or an unrestrained sense of guilt (*Origen*, &c.), and the sting of hell to consist in the utter impotence of the damned (*Eckhart*, *Duns Scotus*, &c.). But however true it may be that the punishments of hell spring in part from within the soul, it is certain that his inward wretchedness will find its aggravating counterpart in external circumstances. For the second death will consist—1) in a self-condemning exclusion from all participation in the happiness of eternal life in heaven, the *pœna damnationis*, or *mala privativa* of older theologians ; 2) in the *pœna sensus* or *mala positiva*, which again is *interna* and *externa*, viz., the full consciousness of deserved damnation ; the unsolved contradiction between the ideal of life, and its hopeless perversion into confirmed selfishness, connected with an inherent sense of ruin, and restless destruction of personal existence ; consuming enmity to God ; unavoidable association with the lost ; the agony of ungodly desires which cannot be appeased ; and the extreme misery of their external condition. — As to the locality where all this will be endured, besides knowing that there will be no place for it in "the new heavens and new earth wherein dwelleth righteousness," we can designate it in no better terms than those of our Lord who declares it to be in "outer darkness."—Although the eternity of hell punishments has been frequently disputed, the doctrine is strongly asserted in the Scriptures, not only in single passages (Matt. 25 : 46, cf. 41 ; 26 : 24 ; Mark 9 : 43, &c. ; Matt. 12 : 32, cf. Mark 3 : 29 ; Rev. 14 : 11 ; 20 : 10), but still more forcibly by the general tenor of the New Test., which always assumes that the divine plan of redemption will not, in fact, prove availing for all, and that at the second coming of Christ there will not only be a moral separation of men, but that the true *ἔσχατος*, the *συντελεία του αἰῶνος τούτου* will be attained. And this has from the first been the doctrine of the Church, some individuals excepted, as *Origen* and some of his followers, the

school of Antioch, many Chiliast and pantheistic mystics, and later, but on wholly different grounds, the rationalists. Indeed the doctrine must follow from the *self-determining power* with which God has been pleased, even to the limitation of his own absoluteness, to endow man ; hence he *may* eternally destroy himself. That many *will* do it is plainly declared in the Bible, and receives further corroboration from what we sadly witness in daily life, in their contempt of the only plan of salvation. "He that believeth not the Son, shall not see life ; but the wrath of God abideth on him." — (See J. F. CORTA, *Hist. succincta dogm. de pœn. infern. duratione* : Tüb., 1774. J. A. DIETELMAYR, *commenti fanatici ἀποκαταστάσεως πάντων hist. antiquior* : Altorf, 1769. ERBKAM, in *Stud. u. Krit.*, 1838, 2, 384–464). GÜDER.*

Hellenists was the name given by national Greeks to those foreigners who adopted the customs, manners, language and other peculiarities of the Greeks. The Hellenization of foreign nations occurred, from times immemorial, everywhere on the coasts of the Mediterranean sea, where the two elements came into close contact, on account of the superiority of Greek civilization ; but more extensively, and in connection with political principles, since the time of Alexander and his successors, especially the Seleucidæ and Ptolemies, who carried it on systematically, and even forcibly. The result in Asia and Africa, after a thousand years, was very small ; but for the time the immediate object, the firm establishment of the new government, was completely attained. The immigration of Greek colonists, the influence of the court, of the government, of the army, of trade, literature, the founding and enlargement of numberless towns and cities, all this finally accomplished more than the sword was able to do in this direction.

But now there existed also, in the nations of Semitic origin, an instinct to travel and to trade, and the Jews especially followed it. On this account it happened, that the stream of Greek immigration was met with the stream of Jewish emigration, which also cast itself upon the young Macedonian cities, gained a footing everywhere, animated commerce and industry, and developed that innate spirit of speculation, which has remained to this day the most prominent trait of the Jewish character. These two streams, however, did not mingle. For the same legislation, whose material side was so easily stripped off, stamped upon the nation a culture so peculiar, and, what is not to be forgotten, so pre-eminently religious and moral, together with an aversion to foreigners so personal, that an absorption of it by the Greeks was impossible ; much rather, notwithstanding all other approaches, everything that was connected with their faith made a gulf so wide between the two nations, that it not only protected their faith from every danger and temptation, and preserved their peculiar customs, but also aroused every bad passion which could separate them. In such relations it is a question of the highest interest to inquire in what measure the Jewish element yielded to or resisted foreign influence, in other words, what spheres of public and private life, what sides of

the national character were most affected and changed by the Hellenization. The answering of this question will bring before us the image of Hellenistic Judaism.

The Jews were not so skilled in the arts and learned in the sciences as not to need foreign teachers. They possessed but a small degree of the warlike spirit, and this was connected with sacred traditions and religious ideas, by which it was removed from the common political sphere. Commerce is, in its nature, cosmopolitan; every step forward in it was, in fact, a departure from the spirit of the law and the prophets, and so much the more remarkable, because the Jews did not regard it as such. By means of it the two neighboring and jealous ruling houses sought at the same time to gain a foothold on the soil and in the hearts of the nation which separated them, and each ministering largely to the Jewish greed for gain, they entirely blunted the national conservative sense of honor. If the Jews had not possessed so powerful a restraint in their religion, they would then already have been absorbed by the Greeks. The best proof of this, apart from the affectation of assuming Greek names, is, that wherever the two came into contact, the Jews surrendered that which is most precious and peculiar to a nation—their language, with an ease almost unparalleled in history. But in spite of this wonderful capacity and willingness of the Jews to feel at home in foreign elements and even to forget the language of their fathers, their religious faith, as already remarked, raised a high wall of partition between them and foreign nations. Far removed as they might be from home, and powerful as were the temptations in prosperity and adversity, apostasy was ever the unfrequent exception. Wherever there were Jews, there were also synagogues, the strongholds of the national spirit and the targets of foreign antipathy.

Here we come to that part of our subject, when it becomes important for the history of Christianity, and where the more profound contemplation of it clearly reveals the high providential connection existing between the destinies and relations of nations. The transformation of Hebrew Jews into Hellenists is not only of statistical or philological interest; its consequences reached farther and wider. The Hellenization of Judaism, now already not only means the adoption of the Greek language and of Greek customs by Jews, but at the same time the bringing of Jewish faith and doctrines nearer to the Greek population, at a period when heathenism was approaching an unavoidable catastrophe. Its dominion over the minds of men was already broken; doubt, science, and immorality were undermining it, and where this was not the case, an insipid, unpoetical, foreign superstition took the place of religious conviction. However, there were many individuals, who were not able to find satisfaction, either in the intoxication of the senses, the abstractions of philosophy, or in the delusions of the mysteries and secret sciences. These often found their way to the synagogue, where they learned to know the God of Israel, edified themselves by prayer, praise, and preaching, as

never before at the altars of their gods, and the female sex especially soon and in large numbers took part in exercises, for which heathenism had no equivalent.

If now, on the one hand, Hellenistic Judaism broke the way for a better religion, in the midst of a heathen population, so on the other, the peculiar development to which it was subjected by its foreign surroundings modified the fundamental elements of the Jewish character. We can say, in general, that in the populous commercial cities, amid the tumult and confusion of dialects and business, where what was national and peculiar was banished to the narrow limits of day, place, and hour, while things common and uniting ruled exclusively everywhere else, where, so to speak, a freer atmosphere dissipated the heavy fog of narrow-hearted and local prejudices, the Jews gradually must be disposed to judge less unfavorably what was foreign, to acknowledge the universally human, without any danger to their monotheism. For it must not be forgotten, that outside of Jerusalem, the public Jewish worship consisted only in the above-named exercises, there was no offering of sacrifices, and consequently it must lose its importance for the reflecting. The Hellenist, without wishing or knowing it, became more and more freed from the bonds of Levitico-pharisaic traditions; he had preachers, no priests; and this change did, by no means, proceed from indifference; it was the natural result of the circumstances. We do not say by this, that all Jews speaking Greek were in the same manner raised above the exclusive views of those speaking Hebrew—the acts of the Apostles give proofs of the contrary. However, it is just the way in which the gospel was spread, that shows what powerful assistance the circumstances described above furnished. The gospel, already as preached by Jesus, made a marked separation between the essential and non-essential in religion, contrasted love and sacrifice, the worship on Gerizim or Zion and in spirit and truth, recognized true faith also outside of Israel, and offered salvation to all nations—things, which, to say the least, must be more intelligible to a Hellenistic mind, if not always consistently more acceptable. Those disciples, who were the eloquent bearers of this side of the message, were all Hellenists, and their preaching found the best soil among the Hellenists. In Palestine, where the Jew was at home and wished to be his own master, the heathen was doubly unwelcome, in whatever form he came; he was called the sinner, the ungodly, the unrighteous, simply because he was a foreigner. National prejudice was the source of moral self-overestimation which, at the same time, resisted the influence of the gospel. Many of the Jews at Jerusalem refused to accept a gospel that they must receive in common with the uncircumcised; at Antioch not only the market, but also the synagogue, to a certain extent, was common to both. How deep the gulf was between the two elements of the Jewish nation, when the Church was first established, we learn from this circumstance, that already where the Church is first spoken of (Acts 6), mention is made of an unhappy dissatisfaction,

the occasion of which was plainly a trifling circumstance, the real cause, however, being the national antipathy. We commit to exegesis the application of the ideas here developed, for the better understanding of the text and history of the New Testament. **ED. REUSS.—Beck.**

Hellenistic Idiom is the current designation of that mode of speech, which was employed by the Jews who either lived among the Greeks or had intercourse with them. From the preceding article it must be evident to the reader, that the Jews did not obtain their knowledge of Greek by education, as the Romans did, but through direct intercourse in practical life. For such the chief matter was not, that they should be able to understand the spirit of the foreign language in its peculiarity, but only be able to make themselves understood in common life, have a stock of words large enough to satisfy the wants of material and social relations, and possess the necessary facility in speaking, in which definiteness of meaning is more important than correctness of expression. Moreover, the Jews in the Greek commercial cities not only learned the Greek in this way with rapid ease, but, at the same time, unlearned their native language equally rapidly, or ceased to use it gradually in the family, just in order to learn the Greek more quickly, so that it came to pass, that in the second or third generation it was no longer necessary to learn it from the Greeks.

Before proceeding further we must call attention to a circumstance, which was formerly only very imperfectly known, and on this account led to many mistakes in judging of facts which are here to be considered. At the time when the commingling of nations began to assume large proportions, in consequence of the conquests of Alexander, the Greek language suffered changes lasting and comprehensive enough to arouse the attention of scholars and to give rise to studies, from which proceeded, for the first time in the history of literature, the science of philology. These changes were manifold in their character. It is of least importance to note, that the Greek language was compelled to take up many foreign words, Egyptian, Persian, Semitic, the names of animals, plants, raw materials, fabrics, implements, arrangements of public and private life of various kinds. It is more remarkable, that, together with the new political order of things, which created great kingdoms and pushed the petty States and their narrow-minded policy into the background, proceeded also the fusion of the local dialects into a common Greek universal language. Of course, the common man at Athens continued to speak the Attic, at Sparta the Doric, at Halicarnassus the Ionic dialect, but they mutually approached each other on a middle ground, especially in the new cities, where the population was not of the same origin, finally in the literature of the time. This common language, on account of the superiority of the Athenian spirit, developed itself from the basis of the Attic dialect. But in the same degree in which it became the common language, it also became mixed, in that it took up lingual materials of different local origin, or produced

something altogether new. We know in part from the old grammarians themselves how, and how far, this was the case; they note the separate manifestations rubrically or alphabetically, or critically; and our better lexicons, especially those for the New Test., contain these notices. New forms of inflexion, especially in verbs, were formed; nouns changed their gender; certain characteristic derivative final syllables became prominent, or were changed; lost roots were restored, or those in use were supplanted by derivatives; known words assumed new meanings; figurative modes of speech, formerly belonging to an artificial style, were used in the language of common conversation, or vulgar expressions were honored with literary citizenship; new ideas, and still more the plastic power of the language, created new words continually, which were as picturesque and expressive in their composition as rich and national in their power and naturalness. Much, also, that we meet with for the first time in the monuments of the Macedonian period, may indeed be older, but may have been then first brought out of the obscurity of the vulgar language, or from a more remote province into the focus of the new metropolitan civilization.

This last remark leads us still further. The Greek tribe, which gained dominion through Alexander, and which was the farthest scattered and the most influential, was that one which hitherto had relatively manifested the least intellectual life. It is certainly, therefore, not without reason, that a Macedonian coloring of the later Greek language has been spoken of. From Alexandria proceeded a tendency, which not only gave tone to the customs and character of the Greek nation, but also especially to its language. Here especially were combined all the productive powers of social culture, commerce, art, science, and literature, in order to found an intellectual kingdom. With justice, therefore, an Alexandrian dialect is spoken of, with which we are also acquainted especially through the MSS. of the New Test., which were made here, and of which some modern critics even affirm, that it was the dialect which the Apostles employed in their writings. If this affirmation were true, it would be necessary to admit further, that the present lingual form of the printed Greek text of the New Test. had a later origin, at the time when Alexandrian culture and its influence were destroyed by the Arabs, and Byzantium became the centre of literary, as well as of ecclesiastical life.

Without pursuing these investigations further, we will proceed to inquire as to what became of the Greek language in the hands of the Orientals, and especially within the sphere of a religious application. Here a fact of great importance at once meets us. It is well known, that the Mosiac pentateuch was translated into Greek at Alexandria already in the reign of the second Ptolemy; at a time, therefore, when a generation of Jews flourished, whose immediate ancestors were the first who were compelled to speak Greek. The history of this version, it is true, is now very fabulous; but we will certainly not err, if we refer it to a felt ecclesiastical want, and not to a princely ca-

price, as is commonly done. The first look into this version shows with what a limited knowledge of the Greek language it was undertaken. We do not refer here to such mistakes as originated from a defective hermeneutics on the part of the translators, or from a corrupted text, but to the numberless examples of Greek expressions wrongly applied, which had not the meaning given to them, and to the Hebrew constructions. For many ideas of religious and ecclesiastical (to say nothing of economical or political) life, adequate Greek expressions were altogether wanting; for many more the unlearned translators had none; and, being familiar only with the language of the market and exchange, they selected without hesitation such expressions as were equivalent in common life, without any reference to the *usus loquendi*. We have long been acquainted, through the Bible, with such mannerisms, and we are no longer offended in many cases at the Hebrew phrases; but what must a Greek have thought when he heard such expressions as these: all flesh, seed, snare, heathen, fruit of the loins, upright heart, cup, tongue, lip of the sea, to seek the soul, anointed, to walk, etc.? The particles, always the most difficult in learning a foreign language, gave the Jew no trouble, for they remained Hebrew; the oath clothed itself as yet in the elliptical formula of condition; the universal copula also performed its manifold service in the new vesture; the *status constructus* served the customary relations; indirect address, participial construction, parenthesis, subordination of proposition, fine distinction of prefixes, with their changing cases, the conjunctions and moods, all levelled and smoothed themselves into the clear, simple, artless structure of the sentences of the Old Test. Such a theory and practice of translation was an invaluable blessing for Judaism, but is not yet sufficiently prized by history. We venture the assertion, that the formation of the Jewish-Greek language of the Bible was the first and most indispensable pre-requisite for the further and lasting influence of the revelation contained in the Old Test., and propagated in the schools. The Hebrew spirit so perfectly rules the Greek body in it, that it is often necessary for us foreigners, at the present day, in order to understand the seventy translators, to go back to the original text.

But what was thus far the effect of natural relations in the way described, soon became a co-operative cause. The Alexandrian Bible became, to a certain extent, for the Hellenists, what the Koran was later for the Arabs, or Luther's translation for the Germans, and this the more so, because the so-called Hellenistic literature was essentially religious. Still we meet with important various colorings, and we must examine the causes which produced them. There were several.

The first is that all authors did not possess the talent for language. As a matter of course, some among the Jews were more, others less gifted by nature, had less opportunity, or did not seek it, to obtain a better knowledge of the language. Apart from the fact, therefore, that we find some among the so-called Apocrypha mere translations of the Old Test., it will not

appear strange to us, if the legends in this same collection bear the character of the most vulgar Hellenistic mode of expression, as the one more natural to the sphere from which they proceeded, and for which they were designed, whilst the talented author of the Book of Wisdom approaches nearer to the Greek spirit in form and expression. If we pass to the Apostles and their contemporaries, certainly no one will at this day deny that a striking difference exists between the different books of the New Test. as regards style. As proof of this, we need not compare the two extremes, the Epistle to the Hebrews and the Apocalypse. Matthew differs from Luke, Luke from John; and Paul from all; and, in the absence of all tradition, the first glance, at the first Epistle of John for instance, apart from its contents, would ascribe it to the author of the fourth gospel. If we inquire, now, wherein do these peculiarities of style exist? we are brought to the second cause of the changes in the Hellenic idiom.

The kernel of a language is the words of which it consists. At this time already a gradual change began to take place in the material of Hellenistic idiom. On the one hand, it was modified by the transformation of the later Hebrew, on the other, it enriched itself from the Greek. We need not detain ourselves with the last fact. It was natural that the acquisitions in this direction should increase, and that correct and well-selected expressions should be found in the New Test., of which the old Alexandrian translators made no use, or also such as are found more after genuine Hellenic than Hebrew analogy. Luke, and even the Epistle of James, furnish us with interesting examples of this kind. But the spirit of Palestinian culture also reacted continually upon the language. A dialect modelled after the Aramaic gradually took the place of the old classic Hebrew, which not only continued to use grammatical absurdities, but also particular expressions and tropes, which were foreign to the Old Test., *ex. gr.* to taste of death, to free from death, to loose and bind, flesh and blood, this and the world to come, demoniac, powers or deeds of power for miracles, to remove mountains, a camel going through the eye of a needle, which, however, were familiar to the Hellenists of the later generations from infancy, and were brought over by them. Indeed, apart from the newer Aramaisms, the period of the New Test. is acquainted with Hebrew modes of expression, which, although very old as to their roots, now for the first became more universal in derived meanings, forms, and applications, *ex. gr.*, way for tendency, bowels for sympathy, unclean spirits, and many others. But infinitely more important than the two sources of change just mentioned, is the influence of the Christian spirit and the ideas awakened by it. Hundreds of important and deeply significant expressions, which have been adopted by all modern languages, were created by the first disciples who spoke Greek. Such are faith, grace, works, mystery, flesh and blood, spiritual, redemption, saints, Saviour, messenger, regeneration, gospel, to justify, to save, to edify, to awaken, and numberless others. To sum up, in a word, the

Hellenistic idiom was slavishly bound to translating during the Jewish period; during the Christian it was free and creative.

Finally, as regards the more intellectual elements of the science of language, it will not be difficult to show, that each of the writers of the New Test. used them differently. John, *ex. gr.*, how altogether Hebraic the disposition of his propositions! how simple the connection of his thoughts! In his constantly recurring *καὶ* and *ἐν* there is no Greek spirit. How differently do the thoughts weave themselves into rhetorical periods in the Epistle to the Hebrews, in the introduction of Luke, and in some of the addresses of the second part of the Acts of the Apostles! And in Paul we can clearly distinguish the currents of the soul wrestling with the language, which is not sufficient for the thoughts: Jewish dialectics, with its incomplete syllogisms, its citations crossing the natural flow of speech, its everything that can make the word dark and the sentence unpleasant, and with it that captivating rhetoric of the heart, the genuine outflow of the new life, which reflects the internal wealth of feeling and intuition in the external wealth of synonyms and figures.

A few historical and critical remarks, in conclusion upon the treatises on this subject.

The philological learning of the period of the restoration of learning and of the Reformation was not sufficient to fathom it. Still it is deserving of mention, that classically educated men, such as H. Stephanus and Beza, were on the way correctly to apprehend the peculiarity of the style of the New Test., but their investigations lack completeness and connection. In the first half of the 17th cent., a mistaken theological zeal earnestly took up the investigation, but conducted it, as regards the material, altogether superficially and one-sidedly, and as regards the motive of decision, transferred it from the sphere of history to that of a dogmatic formula. We refer to the endless quarrel about the Hebraisms of the New Test. The course of this unrefreshing, and, on the whole, fruitless controversy, is related in *Morus Acroas hermen.*, 1797, T. I., in *Planck's Einl. in die Theol.*, II., p. 42, sqq., in the Jena Programm by *Eichstädt*, 1845, etc. We will simply remark with regard to it, that already the circumstance, that the treatises almost exclusively referred to the Old Test., to the entire neglect of the New, is sufficient evidence, that they were not on the way to get at the truth. And even now, when a bright light has been thrown upon the subject by the united labors of many theologians, of whom we will only mention J. F. Fischer, J. F. Schleusner, C. G. Bretschneider, H. Planck, G. Bd. Winer, Chas. Abr. Wahl, Chas. G. Wilke, J. A. H. Tittmann, Chas. G. Gersdorf, whose thorough grammatical and lexicographical results also have found their way into all the best commentaries on the New Test., it must still be said, that the province of ante-Christian Hellenism has been relatively but little cultivated. Thankworthy contributions are made by single exegetical works on the Apocryphal books, such as Thiersch's work on the Alexandrian Pentateuch, 1841; but a grammar is altogether

wanting, and the Lexicon, even in its latest form (*Schleusneri, Thesaurus*, 1820), is little else than a concordance, from which, it is true, may be seen the exegetical mistakes of the translators, but which gives but little insight into the richness of the language.

All the sources of information on this subject may be found in *Geschichte des Neuen Testam.*, Ed. Reuss, 2te Aufgabe, § 41, sq.

Ed. Reuss. — Beck.

Helvetic Confessions. — *The first Helvetic Confession.* — The Reformed Confessions of the Swiss, as "*the Christian Introduction*," (1523), the articles of the *Berne Disputation* (1528), *Zwingli's Confession of Faith*, or *fidei ratio ad Carolum rom. imp.* (1530), and his *expositio fidei ad Franciscum Francorum regem*, finally the *Basle Confession* of 1534, were generally unanimous in their views to about 1535. But there was still wanting a common confession for all the Swiss churches. This want was relieved in the following way. — It is known that the Strasburger theologians, who to this time still adhered to the Reformed Confessions, and among them especially Bucer, zealously endeavored, from ecclesiastical as well as political reasons, to reconcile the differences existing between the Swiss and Saxon doctrines. Everything seemed to promise success to these efforts in 1535. Luther was more moderate, the condition of the Reformed Swiss and the circumstances of the times, which urged the Protestants in Switzerland, as well as Germany, to union, all this made the closest combination of the Swiss orders, and also the avoidance of all controversy with Luther and his adherents very desirable. Bucer renewed his efforts to promote this end. He found a most willing associate in Myconius of Basle. The latter, in connection with his colleague *Simon Grynaeus* († 1541) and *Leo Judæ*, *Conrad Pellican*, *Theod. Bibliander* of Zurich, brought to pass a convocation, at which the Reformed doctrines as opposed to the Lutheran were discussed, and a formula was constructed, which, holding fast what was indispensable, sought, in an ironical way, to promote peace within Protestantism. But the ambiguities and concealments of Bucer's attempts at union hitherto had proven so tortuous, and had caused so much mistrust in Switzerland, that many expected nothing from compromise-formulas in matters connected with the doctrine of the Lord's Supper. Berne especially opposed most decidedly Bucer's unionism and the formula proposed by the above-named theologians, as too yielding to the Lutheran doctrines. It proposed a convention of all the Reformed churches of Switzerland, to take into consideration the matter of a confession. This proposal was approved from all sides, and the convention assembled Jan. 30, 1536, at Basle, being composed of spiritual and temporal delegates. Prominent among them were *Bullinger*, *Leo Judæ*, of Zurich, *Megander*, of Berne, *Myconius*, and *Grynaeus*, of Basle. The first and the two last named were appointed a committee by the convention, to construct the confession. *Leo Judæ* and *Megander* were added to them. The labors of the committee were already pretty far advanced, when the Strasburger theologians

Bucer and Capito, also arrived in Basle. It cannot be said, that their arrival was generally very acceptable. Bullinger and Judæ insisted even that they be not admitted to the sessions. They were at last, however, admitted, but not allowed to vote. — The confession produced by this convention was called from the place of its origin the *second Basle*, but from the authority from which it proceeded, the *first Helvetic* confession. It was originally written in Latin, but, at the request of Leo Judæ, was translated into German. This official version was approved and accepted by all the delegates as a common confession, which, as was expressly resolved, dare not in the least be changed by any rank. The Latin edition, on the other hand, appeared, especially to the Zurichers, to approach to the Lutheran *usus loquendi* in some expressions, and was opposed on this account. The Latin text was therefore officially revised and corrected according to the approved German edition by Myconius and Grynäus. Therefore the delegates assembled again in March, and after renewed examination of the whole matter, the confession, also the improved Latin edition, was finally adopted and subscribed as the common confession of the Swiss churches.

The German edition bears the title: "Ein gemeine bekantnus des helgen waren und uralten Christlichen gloubens und unsern Mitburgern und gloubgenossen, Zürich. Bern. Basell. Straszburg. Constenz. Santgalln. Schaffhusn. Millhusen. Biel, &c., Z. B. Basell uffgericht geordnet und gmacht," &c., Im 1536. The Latin title is briefly this: *Ecclesiarum per Helvetiam confessio fidei summaria et generalis in hoc edita, quod de ea existimare piis omnibus liceat.*

The origin and object of this confession, as well as the ecclesiastical circumstances under which it arose, are of such a character that it must be regarded as an important confession of faith of the Reformed Church. It would be very interesting to discuss every one of the twenty-eight articles of which it is composed, but we are compelled to limit ourselves to those on the doctrine of the sacraments. For further information we refer to Niemeyer's collection. With regard to the idea of a sacrament it affirms, that the sacramenta are first *rerum arcanarum symbola*, but then not *nuda signa*, but *symbola quæ signis simul et rebus constant.* The signa are received by the mouth, the *res* by the believing soul. In baptism the water is the *signum*, but the *res ipsa* is *regeneratio adoptioque in populum Dei.* In the Lord's Supper the bread and wine are the *signum*, the *res* is *communicatio corporis domini, parata salus et peccatorum remissio.* Thus then the sacraments are not merely *litteræ quaedam societatis christianæ*, but also *gratiæ divinæ symbola*, of that kind, however, "*ut omnis virtus salvifica uni domino transcribatur*" (Art. 21). The baptism of the children of Christian parents is proper, because they are born among the people of God, and their election must be *pie* presumed—*præsertim quum de eorum electione pie est præsumendum* (Art. 22). Especially remarkable is the statement of the doctrine of the Lord's Supper in Art. 23: *Cœnam vero mysticam, in qua dominus corpus et sanguinem suum, id est, seipsum suis*

vere ad hoc offerat, ut magis magisque in illis ritat et illi in ipso. Non quod pani et vino corpus et sanguis domini vel naturaliter uniantur, vel hic localiter includantur, vel ulla huc carnalis præsentia statuatur. Sed quod panis et vinum ex institutione domini symbola sint, quibus ab ipso domino, per ecclesiæ ministerium, vera corporis et sanguinis ejus communicatio, non in perituum ventris cibum, sed in æternæ vitæ alimentum exhibeatur.

The antitheses against the Lutheran doctrines are very clear and decided. Opposed to the presence of the glorified body and blood in every particle of the bread, is the characteristic qualification *id est seipsum*, and the rejection of the *carnalis præsentia* to the oral manducation, Art. 21, and the words *non in perituum ventris cibum*; to the participation of the unbelieving, the declaration *seipsum suis vere ad hoc offerat.* The confession teaches positively, the Lord himself (*dominus*), the *Son of God*, is present in the holy transaction, and *himself* offers, not in the bread and wine, which are holy and true signs alone from the institution of the Lord, the "true communion of his body and blood." The communion of the body and blood of Christ is further explained in Art 21 (20), by the addition: "the salvation won on the cross and the pardon of sins." The result of this transaction of the Lord with his own is, that they live more and more in him and he in them. The Lord's Supper is called a nourishment of the spiritual life, a high and holy food, and especially as it is added to this: "we use it often, that being thereby admonished we may look by faith unto the death and blood of the crucified Christ, and contemplate our salvation with a foretaste of heavenly things and with a correct knowledge of eternal life. These views of the Lord's Supper, therefore, do not lead us beyond the death of Christ on the cross and the benefits thereby secured. Not a word is said about the communication of the powers of the glorified corporeity of the risen Christ, and much less about a *divinæ human* way, in which He here communicates himself to believers, according to Schenkel (Unionsberuf, p. 233). From this circumstance alone, that to the words "his body and blood" is added, *that is himself*, should be concluded, that here under "flesh and blood" something altogether different is understood, than by Luther or in the Augustana. From the articles 21 and 22, in connexion with their expressed qualifications, the following doctrine concerning the Lord's Supper may be constructed. The *Son of God* (Logos)—not *God-man*—present in the transaction, exhibits himself to believers as the one who gave himself up to death, i. e., his body and blood with all the benefits thereby secured, whereby then the life-communion of believers with their head already existing, is knit more closely, of which the bread and wine, according to the institution of the Lord, are *signa exhibitiva.* If by "personal-real self-communication of Christ" (Schenkel, l. c.) to believers, anything else is understood, this at least is not taught by the Helvetica I. In short, neither Art. 21 nor 22 contain a definition of doctrine to which Zwingli would not have given his full consent.

Art. 28, *de sancto conjugio*, closes the whole. The German edition has only 27 Articles, because the 13th and 14th are united in one.

The doctrine concerning *predestination* is only stated in the most general terms in Art. 10, concerning the "eternal decree," or the "*Concilium Dei æternum de reparatione hominis*." More than this was not necessary for the object in view, because at this time the Swiss and Upper German churches were as predestinarian as the Saxon. The Old Reformed of Germany, as well as the Swiss, are predestinarians, according to their doctrines and confessions. And this fact again remains as irrefutable, as that other historical fact, that as regards the doctrine of predestination, the disciples of Luther did not depart from those of Zwingli and Calvin from the beginning to the end of the 16th cent. Melancthon first began to recede from the Protestant doctrine, after having for a long time held it, but, as is known, the Lutheran Church did not follow him. This fact, often denied, but now again fully acknowledged (comp. *ex. gr.*, Julius Müller, *Lutheri doctr. de prædest. et lib. arb.*; Schweizer, *Centraldog.*, Vol. I.; Baur, *Gegens. d. Kath. und Prot.*, 2 ed., p. 125, sq.; Hundeswagen, *die Conflicte*, etc., p. 268, *et al.*), explains the treatment which the doctrine of predestination as opposed to the Lutherans received in the Helvetica prior, just as perfectly as the Apology of the German Reformed Tetrapolitana shows, how this belongs to a predestination system of doctrine. — Ruchat translated the first Helvetic Confession into French (see his *Hist.* Vol. V.).

11. *The second Helvetic Confession.*—The completion of this confession falls in the year 1564, although the first sketch of it by Bullinger is, according to the testimony of the author and of Hottinger (Vol. III., p. 849), two years older. The pestilence that raged in Zurich, 1564, prompted Bullinger to this work, which was to be given over to the government of Zurich after his death. An external event caused this private labor to become that public confession, which was regarded as the second Helvetic confession of the Reformed Church. Maximilian II. had convoked the Diet at Augsburg on Jan. 14, 1566, when the Lutheran party was determined to effect, if possible, the exclusion of Frederick III., who had gone over to the Reformed, from the peace of the empire. The prince sought in time to cover his position as well as was possible, and as the Lutherans had for a long time represented the Reformed as being divided and split into sects, and especially the Reformed outside of Germany, as dangerous heretics—he requested Dr. Henry Bullinger to prepare for him a confession of faith, in order that he might therewith refute the slanders and perversion of his enemies. Bullinger sent him his work, and the Elector was so much pleased with it, that he requested permission to publish it in German. This determined the Zurichers to propose Bullinger's confession to the Swiss churches as the common confession, after that negotiations to this end had already been carried on. The necessity for a common confession of all the Swiss churches was felt; the question how best to bring it to pass, was being earnestly discussed; the common re-

adoption of the first Basle, or the first Helvetic confession, was already proposed; but now the confession of Bullinger became the standard under which they would assemble themselves with one mind. Geneva and Berne first agreed to the proposal made by Zurich, then followed most willingly Schaffhausen, Biel, St. Gallen, Graubünden, Glarus, Appenzell, Thurgau, the valley of the Rhine—then Neuchâtel (1568). Basle, which at first had ungraciously "dismissed" Gualther, also accepted it later. At the same time with the original and Bullinger's German translation appeared also Beza's French translation with the appended Gallicana. Thus originated the *second Helvetic Confession*. It met with the most general acknowledgment in the Reformed Church of all lands, just as the Heidelberg Catechism. We mention in this regard the following facts. In 1566 and 1584, the *Scottish Church* declared its agreement with the Helvetica; in 1571, at Rochelle, the *French* repeated it with special solemnities; in 1571 and 1578, the *Polish*; in 1567, the *Hungarian* at the Synod of Debreczin. It was but natural, under the circumstances, that there should be many translations. Concerning these, as well as concerning the different editions and titles, we refer to *Niemeyer's Sammlung der symbolischen Bücher der reformirten Kirche*.

Upon the *contents* of this Reformed confession, we make the following remarks. Like the Helvetica I., the Tetrapolitana, the Puritan *confessio fidei*, it begins with the Holy Scriptures, the true Word of God. According to this the known evangelical doctrines are treated of, but so, however, that the specific Reformed character is everywhere prominent. In illustration of this we may refer to the way in which the divine Word works: "We do not hold," it says, "that the external proclamation is, as it were, unnecessary, because instruction in the true religion is conditioned by internal illumination, for although no one can come to Christ except the Father draw and illuminate him, yet we still know, that God by all means wishes, that his Word be also preached externally—nevertheless we acknowledge, that God can (internally) illuminate man also without the external use of the Word, and truly whomsoever and whensoever He will." After the statement of the general Christian doctrines concerning the unity of God and the Trinity in Art. III., in Art. IV., not only the idols of the heathens, but also the images of Christians, especially the images of Christ, of angels and the saints, are emphatically rejected. The Art. V., VI., VII., VIII., are more generally Protestant; in the ninth, on the other hand, the Reformed doctrine with its opposition to the Lutheran again becomes very perceptible, in that it affirms, that fallen man "is not deprived of will and converted into a stock or stone." The 10th Art. of the Confession, which treats of predestination and election, has given rise to much controversy. Arminianism, Phillipism, and Unionism have been found in it.

The teachings of this confession on the doctrine of the Lord's Supper, may be summed up in the following propositions: I. Bread and

wine are and remain visible signs and pledges of the heavenly blessings of the sacrament, without either becoming or containing these. A twofold eating, the oral, by which the bread and wine are received, the spiritual, by which the soul is nourished with the body and blood of Christ, is very plainly distinguished. Bread and wine are simple images, seals, pledges of the spiritual nourishment of the believing soul. II. Body and blood do not mean the same as they do in the Augustana, *but the broken body, the shed blood, the crucified Christ*. III. Nothing is said of a body present in the bread, or of blood in the wine, but only of Christ, and plainly only according to his divinity, who, being present in the Supper, feeds believers with the heavenly blessings, and increases the life in communion with him, which previously existed. IV. Unbelievers do not receive the blessings of the holy Supper. V. It is the Holy Spirit, who consummates the nourishment with heavenly blessings in believing souls. VI. The specific Reformed view, that the heavenly blessings mediated by the Word are essentially the same as those offered in the sacrament, is also peculiar to the Helvetica. VII. The physical mouth is not adapted to receive the blessings, as the Augustana of 1530 affirms, which allows the body and blood of Christ to be communicated to every *vescens in cœna Domini*, whether he believes or not. — We remark, in conclusion, that this universally approved confession represents the doctrines accepted by the Reformed Church of all languages and lands, and is the first Helvetic Confession in its perfect development. The contents, as well as the form, and the succession of the articles, will demonstrate this assertion to every unprejudiced mind that makes the comparison between the two.

LIC. K. SUDHOFF.—Beck.

Helvetic Consensus Formula (*Formula Consensus Ecclesiarum Helveticarum Reformatarum circa doctrinam de Gratia Universali et connexa, aliaque nonnulla capita*) is the title borne by the Swiss Reformed particular symbol, which was formed in 1675 to repudiate certain methods of teaching, and opinions proceeding from the French Academy at Saumur. As the last confession, it is essentially different in its character from the great confessions of the Reformation period: its contents are derived mainly from the dogmatics of the schools, instead of from the faith of the Church. Hence it is, that it is generally not regarded and treated as a new confession, but as an explanation and defence of the old ones; not as a symbol of faith, but of doctrine.

After the Synod of Dort (1618–19) had determined upon and fixed the dogma of absolute and particular election against the somewhat indefinite universalism of the Remonstrants, and its decisions had received almost universal acceptance in the Reformed Church, it was hardly possible to think of a modification of the doctrine as regards the thing itself. The harshness with which the unconditional and infallible election of some, and the equally unconditional rejection of the remainder by the eternal decree of God, are expressed in it, brought constantly upon the Reformed violent

attacks and imputations from the Catholics, as well as the Lutherans, and threatened to make the union with the latter impossible, for which, moreover, there remained but little hope after the Formula of Concord. For this reason, the want and desire arose, especially where the Reformed came into daily contact with the Roman Catholic Church, and felt its pressure, with all tenacity for the substance still, so far to modify the form of the doctrine as was necessary to vindicate it. This was the state of things especially in France, and it was here, where the disciples of the Scotchman, John Cameron, especially Moses Amyraut, since 1632 Prof. at Saumur, and P. Testard, preacher at Blois, opened the way to a modified view of the doctrine. The so-called hypothetical, better ideal universalism of Amyraut is well known, by which he hoped to support the main building of particularism as with an addition. According to him, God has the will and desire (*voluntas, affectus*) to grant salvation in Christ to all men, provided they, according to the measure of the revelation made to them, will receive the divine mercy in faith. However, although the objective possibility for all existed, still no one was able to realize it on account of moral depravity and weakness of will, without the special influence and illumination of the Holy Spirit, which God owed to no one, and which He had resolved, in his eternal decree, to give to a number of elect; these, and only these, therefore, are really, definitely, and infallibly saved (see Art. Amyraut and Schweizer: M. Amyraudus, Versuch einer Synthese des Universal. u. des Particularismus; — in the theological Review of Baur and Zeller, Bd. 11, (1852), p. 41, sq. 155, sq.). This new view of the doctrine found at first many opponents in France, but also many friends; the French national Synod regarded the charges against it as groundless, and consequently only forbid controversy, and admonished against the use of certain expressions, and finally Amyraut succeeded, by concessions and explanations, to reconcile his most decided opponents. It was not, however, so favorably regarded abroad, in Holland, and especially in Switzerland. It was certainly an innovation, and already, as such, it was dangerous in the opinion of the theologians; but even the advantage which it promised seemed to be illusory and doubtful; the modification of the form, in order better to vindicate the doctrine, led to all kinds of hazardous consequences and contradictions in the doctrine itself, *ex. gr.*, between the two wills of God, an active and inactive will; and if really Amyraut himself did not depart from the kernel of orthodox doctrines, still the germ and starting-point for later greater departures lay in it for others. Besides, there were many other views, which made the entire more liberal tendency represented by Saumur suspicious. First of all, certain subordinate departures from the customary mode of teaching followed of themselves from Amyraut's principal doctrine, as *ex. gr.*, in reference to the order of the divine decree of salvation, the sufficiency of the natural knowledge of God for the heathen, objectively taken, a threefold covenant between God and man, etc. Then also the theologians

¶ Saumur shared Cameron's preference for the assertion of Piscator, that only the passive obedience of Christ was imputed to us for righteousness, but not the active, which He as man owed to God. (*Baur, die christliche Lehre von der Versöhnung*). Connected with this was also the view of Jos. Laplace, a friend and colleague of Amyraut, that the sin of Adam was not imputed to his descendants directly and immediately, but only mediately, so far as they themselves have been thereby corrupted and become sinners. Finally, the investigations of L. Capetel, the third colleague, into the history of the Hebrew text of the Bible, seemed to make insecure the foundation upon which the Reformed Church more than any other rested, in that he demonstrated the partial incorrectness of the received text and the later origin of the points (see the Art.).—On this account the otherwise celebrated school of Saumur was regarded with increasing suspicion, as a nest of neology and heterodoxy, the more dangerous for Switzerland, because it was largely patronized by Swiss students.

The first sign of opposition was given by Geneva, which, in 1635, expressed its disapprobation of Amyraut's *Traité de la Prédestination* (1634), through the pen of Fr. Spanheim. From Geneva and Switzerland efforts were made to counteract the innovation in France, but the clergy, who were friends of Amyraut, defended him and his "Method," and even sent an apology, written by him, to Irminger of Zurich, in which he attempted to show that his views were not different from those of these Reformers, and were even tolerated at Dort. At the same time, the efforts to compose the difference were continued, even to the national Synod at Lausanne (1659). The danger seemed to become more threatening, when Amyraldism approached nearer to Switzerland, and even entered into Geneva. Spanheim's successor, Alex. Morus, having fallen under the suspicion of heretodoxy, was compelled, in 1649, to subscribe a series of articles on original sin, election, redemption, calling, and the divine promises, which can be regarded as the first germ of the Consensus Formula. He was followed by Philip Mestreat, and associated with him later was Louis Bronchin, who received a theological professorship in 1661; both adhered to the freer French tendency, the latter even was once a pupil of Amyraut. In spite of the opposition of their rigidly orthodox colleague, Francis Turretin, they succeeded, 1669, in obtaining a decree from the Council, that, concerning election, one must conform to the doctrine of the Church and existing regulations, but must thereby avoid all controversy and debate. Against this decree not only Sam. Desmarets in Gröningen, but also the Swiss ministeria, and even the governments of the four Reformed cantons, earnestly protested. The consequence was that the Council of the two hundred rescinded the offensive decree, and required the candidates to subscribe the article, threatening all those who departed from it. But this did not appear to give any sufficient guarantee for the future, and against a new revulsion of public opinion. This was sought in a clear and exact formula of pure

doctrine, to be made in connection with the Swiss churches which had not been agitated by the innovation, and under the authority of the governments. This was urged already at Geneva, 1659, by Turretin, and was actively discussed at Baden and Zurich, by superintendent Luc. Gernler, of Basle; Deacon Hummel, of Berne; Ott. of Schaffhausen; and J. H. Heidegger, and afterwards by correspondence. To Gernler must be added yet, as most active, John Zwinger and the younger John Buxtorf (II., see the Art.); they insisted that the formula be directed against *all* the innovations of Saumur, and not only against Amyraut. A large portion of the Zurich clergy, with the superintendent, Casper Waser and Prof. John Müller, at their head, were not less zealous than these; they even would have willingly rejected at the same time other innovations, especially Cartesianism and Cocceianism, at the instigation of Desmarets. But on the other side there also existed a moderate party; a decided opposition was formed by the two Schweizers in Zurich, and the two Wettsteins, father and son, in Basle; Heidegger even was milder and accessible to their representations; those from Schaffhausen wished to restrict to the most necessary things—the doctrines of Amyraut—and although those from Basle finally prevailed, still this much was obtained, that no condemnation was expressed, only certain methods of teaching were disapproved, the theologians of Saumur were not named, were even, indeed, expressly to be recognised as brethren and orthodox in all fundamental articles.

The matter having been thus prepared by the theologians, then came before the governments. At the meeting of the evangelical conference of the four cities at Baden (June, 1674), it was resolved, "that the theologians should correspond with each other about this matter, and unite on a certain formula, by which such erroneous views (concerning *gratia universalis*) might be entirely, everywhere, rooted out of the evangelical Church, which was to be laid before the first evangelical conference that would be held, for examination and approval." Heidegger was appointed to prepare this formula. His Latin plan was first communicated to the Zurich ministerium, and then to the three remaining ministeria, to obtain their opinions. Basle was so zealous that the Council, without waiting for the ratification of the other orders, adopted the plan, March 6, 1675, and made it law (*Hagenbach, Kritische Geschichte der ersten Basler Confession*, p. 173, sq.). Zurich soon did the same (March 11 and 13). At the Conference at Aarau (March 16–18), the ratification of Berne and Schaffhausen were yet wanting—"for want of time;"—and it was, meanwhile, resolved, that the sketch should be translated into German by the theologians of the four cities, and then be sent for ratification to the remaining evangelical orders and places. Finally, on the occasion of the new annual reckoning at Basle (June, 1675), "the projected *Formula Consensus* was unanimously granted and approved, and it was further recommended, "that sacristans and school teachers, also all professors, immediately subscribe it, and for the future

no one be received to the holy ministerium who does not accept it without condition and subscribe it; and if any one has scruples and hesitates to subscribe, he shall not be admitted to the ministerium." Immediately hereupon followed the ratification at Berne (June 14) and Schaffhausen, and after the formula had been sent to Protestant Glarus, Appenzel on the Rhine, St. Gallen, Mülhausen, Biel, Neuenburg, Neuenstadt, and Graubünden, it was almost everywhere received as an addition to and explanation of the Helvetic Confession. Neuenburg alone was unwilling, notwithstanding repeated admonitions, especially from Berne, to require the individual subscription of all the clergy, but was satisfied with permitting the deacons and secretaries to subscribe in the name of the clergy. Finally, the turn came also to Geneva. Here there was some hesitation. The French Reformed, as de la Bastide, Claude, Daillé, *et. al.*, attempted to prevent its reception by correspondence; objection was made especially to the Hebrew vowel points; but after Heidegger had written to Turretin, that the decision of grammatical and critical questions was not the matter in question, but only the value of the original text as against the translations, etc., adhesion to the Formula was also given here, although not until the beginning of 1679, and, with some hesitation and opposition.

This Consensus Formula, so universally accepted in Reformed Switzerland, contains, after a preface, 26 canons, in which all the points of controversy raised by the school at Saumur, are defined and decided with great theological exactness, contrary opinions decidedly but mildly rejected, and those holding other confessions, *ex. gr.*, the Lutherans, not polemically touched with a word, which is not the case in the Formula of Concord as regards the Reformed. The *preface* refers to the duty, to preserve pure and unperverted the faith received from the Word of God, and to protect the youth and the Church from erroneous opinions. The first three canons then treat of the *divine inspiration and preservation of the Holy Scriptures*; especially that the transmitted Hebrew Codex of the Old Test., including the consonants as well as the vowels, was inspired by God, both as regards the matter and the words; all translations must be tried and corrected by this Codex and that of the New Test., as the only uncorrupted canon, whilst a reverse procedure (Cappel) with the help of versions, MSS., or even mere conjectures, must shake the foundation of faith. Canons 3-6 treat of the doctrines of *divine election and of the order of the decree*. God wished so to glorify himself, that he resolved, first to create man, then to decree (Latin, permitted) his fall, finally to have mercy on some of the fallen, and consequently to elect them, but to leave the remainder in corruption. Christ was comprehended in this decree, not as meritorious cause or preceding ground—for this is alone the good-pleasure of God—but he himself is elected, the Mediator and first-born of the brethren, ordained before the foundation of the world, whose merit would be so used as to give us salvation without injury to his justice. Therefore the opinion (Amyraut's) of a conditioned will or

wish of God, to save all men if they believe, preceding election, is not approved, nor an appointment of Christ as Mediator for all, etc., all of which contradicts the Scriptures, and attributes human imperfection, affections, and change of will to God.—In canons 7-9 the *covenant of works* with man, created holy, is represented against Amyraut as such a one as would have led man, if he had remained obedient, not only to permanent earthly happiness, but to eternal heavenly life, as Christ the second Adam has again secured it for us by his perfect obedience.—The three following canons, 10-12, reject the view (La Place's) of the merely indirect *imputation of the sin of Adam*. As God concluded the covenant of works with Adam, and in him, at the same time, as head and root with the whole race, so Adam sinned and forfeited the promised blessings of the covenant, not only for himself, but for all mankind.—Canons 13-16 treat of the *particular appointment of Christ*. As he was elected from eternity to be head and Lord of all who would in time be saved by his grace, so he was also made in time to be the Mediator of the new-covenant only for those, who, by eternal election, are given to him as a peculiar people. According to the Father's decree, as also according to his own intention, he died alone for the elect. His will, and that of the Father, and of the Spirit agree, are absolutely of the same extent, and as Christ purchased salvation itself, so also the means of salvation, faith, and the spirit of regeneration, for those for whom he died, and they are only really granted to these. His merit consists in his entire, perfect active and passive obedience; they cannot be separated; his life and work was nothing else than complete subjection and humiliation even unto death, and if salvation is specifically attributed to this latter, it occurs in the sense, that in it as the last and noblest act, his whole former life and sufferings are also comprehended. The *calling to salvation* was, according to canons 17-20, sometimes more, sometimes less comprehensive, but never absolutely universal. In the Old Test. it was limited to Israel, in the New it comprehends Jews and heathens, though there are still many who have not heard of Christ. God has also revealed himself to these in the works of nature and of Providence; but this cannot supply the place of the external calling (by the word) and to make them acquainted with the secret council of God, but only to give them no excuse for not honoring God as God. This external calling by the gospel is always sincerely and earnestly meant on the part of God. This calling is always attended with effect; the elect obtain salvation; the reprobate, who do not heed the calling, are reminded of their duty and of the inexcusableness of their unbelief. This difference in the effect of the general calling, has its ground alone in the grace of God, by which the elect believe, whilst the reprobate persevere in their innate wickedness and hardness of heart.—Canons 21 and 22 declare (against Amyraut) the *inability of man to believe the gospel of himself*—a natural and not merely moral inability, as if he could believe, if he only would.—According to canons 23-25, there are only

two ways of justification before God, that by works, and that by obedience on the part of the surety for sinners. This is expressed also by the *twofold covenant* of God, the one made invalid by the fall of Adam, the other eternally valid for the elect in Christ. The latter divides, it is true, into two economies; but even in the Old Test. the fathers were not saved differently from us, but through faith in the Lamb of God. But faith in the Holy Ghost was also necessarily connected with faith in Christ, and although the knowledge of the Trinity was obtained by greater effort, it was still at hand, and, according to the small measure of revelation, was sufficient, under the grace of God, for the salvation and comfort of the elect.—The *concluding canon* 26, expresses once more the wish and exhortation, to hold fast to the pure and simple doctrines of godliness, and to flee vain babblings. It was especially desired to insist upon the necessity of the sanctification of the Sabbath (against Cocceius), and unanimously and faithfully to hold fast, teach and defend the truth of the present doctrines in the churches and schools on every occasion.

Now, although this Formula was introduced everywhere into the Reformed churches of Switzerland, the divine foundation upon which it was built, was too much mixed with human elements, to make it permanent. At first, the introduction of it was conducted prudently, except in Basle; in Zurich they were a long time satisfied with the first subscription of the clergy, without demanding it from the younger ones; in Geneva only the candidates for ordination subscribed it; in Lausanne the academy was controlled by Berne, requiring the candidates for ordination to sign the Formula as well as the other Symbols; it was not done, however, by all, and some did it, adding the clause: *quatenus Scripturæ consentit*—without it being observed. It was proceeded with more carefully and strictly when, after the revocation of the Edict of Nantes, many French clergymen fled to Switzerland, and received appointments, especially in Vaudois. It was decreed, that these, and generally all who wished to preach, should subscribe it unconditionally (*purement et simplement*), which was now also extended to the natives. An intercession of the great Elector Frederick William of Brandenburg (Feb. 17, 1686), in which he refers to the dangerous condition of Protestantism and the necessity of union among the Reformed, and with the Lutherans, received only an apologizing answer from Berne and Zurich (May 6, 1686), and anxious wishes; in the over zealous Basle, on the other hand, it had this effect, that, at the request of the secret council, the subscription of the formula was no longer required (*Hagenbach*, c. c., p. 177). Twenty years later (1706) it was omitted in Geneva. Berne and Zurich, meanwhile, adhered to it; but the spirit of the times had changed; worldly interests rose into importance; science began to emancipate itself from theology. Partly from necessity, partly from a spirit of opposition, men returned to the Bible, and anew made prominent the practical side, the ethical ideas of Christianity as the most essential. This new spirit entered French

earlier than German Switzerland, especially in Lausanne, where, at the beginning of the 18th cent. distinguished men, as the jurist Barbeyrac, the philosopher and mathematician, de Crousaz, the Church historian, Ruchat, and others, taught; and here arose again a conflict, in which the Consensus Formula, and with it the system of old orthodoxy, received the first fatal blow. Arminian views, which found favor already among the students in 1698, gave occasion to insert in the oath of association for Vaudois, directed against the Pietists of the chief city, a clause against Arminianism and Socinianism. Meanwhile, since 1706, following the example of Geneva, they began again to subscribe the formula conditionally; the academy, therefore, decided it should be done with the formula, "*contrarium non docebo*;" but the *quatenus* occurred more frequently with the connivance of the rectors. In Jan., 1716, rector Barbeyrac undertook to vindicate the *quatenus* as established by custom, as self-understood in the evangelical Church, and as very natural in a symbol, which touches points that are not articles of faith (canons 2 and 3). This vindication was by no means satisfactory to Berne. A controversy as to the duty of subscribing, now arose between Berne and the Academy at Lausanne, which was tedious and unedifying, and which finally terminated in a kind of compromise, according to which the professors simply subscribed from respect for the government. Many of the candidates at first refused, but afterwards subscribed, the government declaring, that "the Consensus Formula was merely a formula of doctrine, against which it was not allowed to teach or preach, either publicly or privately."—From the many controversial treatises, memorials, declarations, etc., which this movement called forth, and which circulated only in manuscript, we mention particularly Ruchat's proposition to make the Helvetic Confession alone obligatory (*Sages réflexions sur la Formula Consensus*); Bergier's, which is pretty latitudinarian and superficial (*Projet concernant les moyens de prevenir les disputes et les contestations scandaleuses, etc.*); two treatises by de Crousaz, in which the uselessness, evil, and senselessness of the Consensus is attempted to be proven (*1^{re} et 2^d Dissertation faite à l'occasion de la signature du Consensus*); finally an anonymous letter to the recusant candidates, encouraging them in their refusal (*Lettre à un proposant de la dernière volée—pour la communiquer à ses confrères*), and many others. The weapons of fiction, of satire, of persiflage, and of pasquil were also employed; the Reformers were raised up to admonish and chastise the leaders of the Bernese Church (*Lettre des bienheureux Réformateurs sur le Consensus*), and a *spurious* address of the Nuncio of Luzerne to the Pope on the hopes of the speedy restoration of the papal authority and Church, by the triumph of the Cons. over the Prot. doctrine concerning the Scriptures was issued (*Lettre du Nonce du Pape à S. S. par rapport aux disputes sur le Consensus*); de Crousaz replied to an imaginary letter from one of the hyper-orthodox (*Lettre à Mr. le Prof. de Crousaz avec sa réponse article par article*), and another pretended champion of ortho-

doxy defended, with the best sustained irony, the proposition, that nothing had been gained by the unconditional subscription of the clergy, so long as the same had not been obtained from the teachers, and from the fathers and mothers (Une lettre du 27 Juillet, 1718).

The proceedings in Vaudois, and also single persons concerned in them, drew attention from abroad to the affair of the Consensus. The Kings of Prussia and England (Feb. 21, and April 10), and the *Corpus Evangelicorum* at Regensburg (May 12, 1722), urgently advised the Reformed cantons, for the sake of conscience and of Protestant union, to let the Formula drop. Zurich and Berne answered evasively, and at the same time declared themselves also in favor of union, to which they considered the formula no hinderance. The second attempt of Prussia and England (Jan. 30, and April 6, 1723) succeeded no better; they replied as before, and added that they were prepared to sacrifice subscription, as soon as the union existed.—Several Lutheran theologians also mixed in the matter, especially the Tübingen chancellor, Chr. Matth. Pfaff, against the particularism of the Formula (*De Form. Cons. Helvetica Diss. hist. theol.*: Tüb., 1723), who was answered by Prof. J. R. Salchlin of Berne (*Stricturæ et observationes in Pfaffii Diss.*, etc., 1723), whilst both were treated by rigid Lutherans as apostates (*ex. gr.*, in the treatise: *Hypomnemata in Salchlini strict. et obs.*—aut. Dan. Swillingio, 1725). The attacks of Bossuet, Clericus, but especially of the anonymous French translator (*Formulaire de Consentement des églises Réf. de Suisse. Traduit en françois avec des Remarques*: Amsterdam, 1722) were repelled at length by J. J. Hottinger (*Verthädigte Form. Cons.*, 1723.)—Notwithstanding respect for the formula declined more and more, in Schaffhausen the subscription to it had, for a long time already, not been required, as in Basle. Berne found it necessary in April 13, 1723, at least to forbid controversy about this matter, and Zurich manifested a tendency to milder practice; the clergy, it is true, left nothing undone in a memorial (July 3, 1722) to retain subscription, but the great council substituted a solemn promise with uplifted hand instead of it (July 21). This state of things continued for about ten years, till gradually the spirit of an Alph. Turretin, Sam. Werenfels, Osterwald, and others prevailed; the orthodox system lost all confidence: and the forgotten Consensus Formula finally sank into rest, one knows not rightly when or how.

The official transcript of the *Consensus Formula* (Latin and German) exists yet, according to Schweizer, in the State archives at Zurich. It was first printed there, 1714, as an appendix to the Helvetic Confession by David Gessner; but this official edition does not seem to have got into the book trade, or at least was not widely circulated; for, in 1718, it was complained in Vaudois, that the Formula existed only in one manuscript copy, and in Berne it was discussed, whether it should or dare be published. Afterwards it appeared several times in Latin, 4to.; German, 12mo., 1718 and 1722. It is found also in *Niemeyer's Collectio Confessionum in Eccl. Ref. publicat.*, p. 729, sq.; comp.

LXXXI., s. On the history of the *Consensus Formula* consult J. J. Hottinger, *Succincta et solida ac genuina Formulæ Cons.*—historiz. Latin and German, 1723, 4to. By the same, *Helvet. Kirchengeschichte*, Th. 3, p. 1086, sq.; Th. 4, p. 258.—Pfaff, in the Dissertation already mentioned. Barnaud, *Mémoires pour servir à l'Histoire des Troubles arrivés en Suisse à l'occasion du Consensus*: Amsterd., 1726.—Escher, Art. *Helvet. Consensus* in the *Allg. Encyklopädie von Ersch. u. Gruber.*, II. Sect. 5, p. 243, sq.—Schweizer, *die Protestant. Centraldogmen in ihrer Entwicklung innerhalb der Reform. Kirche*. 2. Hälfte.: Zurich, 1856, p. 439, sq.; 663, sq. Haller, *Bibliothek der Schw. Gesch.*, Thl. 3, p. 183, sq. Besides this the author of this Article has used the State and Church Archives of Berne, and a collection of manuscript materials, the property of Professor Chapuis, in Lausanne. F. TRECHSEL.—Beck.

Helvicus (*Christopher Helwig*), born Dec. 26, 1581, at Sprendlingen, Hessendarmstadt (died 1616), distinguished himself as an Oriental, especially Hebrew, scholar. He spoke Hebrew as freely as his mother tongue. In 1606 he was chosen Prof. of Greek and Hebrew, and in 1610 Prof. of Theology in the University of Giessen. He prepared several good grammars and lexicons of the ancient and Oriental languages, but is best known by his *theatrum hist. et chronolog. s. Chronol. Systema novum*, publ. 1609, and often afterwards; republ. in France and England. S.*

Helvidius, a heretic of the 4th cent., who opposed, but in an extreme way, the unevangelical ascetic tendencies of the times. A pupil of Auxentius of Milan (see Art.), he was a contemporary of Jerome, lived in Rome under Damasus (366–384), and there composed a work in which he proved from Matt. 1:18; Luke 2:7, &c., and by Tertullian, Victorinus of Petau, &c., that Mary had other children after the birth of Christ. He denied the merit of celibacy. Jerome refuted this work, in his *adv. Helvidium* (383), but in a passionate tone, and with sophistical arguments, whilst Gennadius and others, acknowledging the sincerity and zeal of H., kindly exposed his errors. Augustine calls his adherents *Helvidiani*; they are probably related to the Antidikomarianites (see Art.).—(See JEROME, l. c., in Martianay's ed., T. 4. RÜSSLER, *Bibl. d. Kirchenv.* IX., 92. AUGUSTINE, *de hæres.*, c. 84. GENNADIUS, *de vir. ill.*, c. 32. WALCH, *Ketzerhist.*, III., 587, &c. NEANDER, *Ch. Hist.* GIESSELER, *Eccl. II.*). WAGENMANN.*

Heman, a descendant of Zerah (Gen. 38:29, &c.) of the tribe of Judah (1 Chron. 2:6, and 1 Kings 5:11), ranked, for his wisdom, with Ethan, Calcol, and Dara, sons of Mahol, i. e., the ring-leaders of the dances. This designation, already, and the double title of Ps. 88, seem to show an identity of this person with Heman, the Levite, son of Joel, and grandson of Samuel (1 Chron. 6:18–23; 15:17, 19; 2 Chron. 35:15). Then the Ezrahite Ethan (Ps. 89; 1 Kings 5:11) must be identical with the Levite Ethen (= Jeduthum?) in 1 Chron. 6:28, &c. But even admitting that the title *Ezrahite* does not make Heman, המנין.

necessarily a descendant of Zerah, but simply a Levitical attendant in the family of the Zerahites (like Zuph, 1 Sam. 1 : 1; cf. Judges 17 : 7), 1 Chron. 2 : 6, forbids this view. Neither does Ewald's (*Alterth.*, p. 305; *Gesch.* III., 355, &c.) explanation, that in early times skilful persons of other tribes were admitted into the remoter branches of Levi, meet the difficulty. (For various interpretations of 1 Chron. 2 : 6, see MOYERS on Chron., p. 237. KEIL, *apol. Vers.*, p. 164. HÄVERNICK, *Einl.* II., 1, p. 100. WINER, *B.W.B.*). In 1 Chron. 25 : 1, &c., Heman, Jeduthun (Ethan), and Asaph are mentioned as leaders of the three classes of singers. To "lift up his horn" the Lord had given him 14 sons and three daughters. The rebellion of Absalom, as well as the latter part of Solomon's reign, might have given occasion to the lamentations of Ps. 88. Modern critics deny that either Heman the Ezrahite, or Levite wrote this Psalm, and ascribe it either to Uzziah (2 Chron. 26 : 20), or to the period of national humiliation after the death of Josiah, or under Zedekiah. They suppose Heman is called the author, because of its resemblance to Psalms of his then extant, or to give it a worthy name.—(See EWALD, *poet. Bücher* I., 213). LEYER.*

Hemmerlin, Felix (*Malleolus*), was born in Zurich, 1389, and died in the Franciscan prison in Luzerne, after Whitsuntide, 1457. Of his youth but little is known. He became an ecclesiastic, and in 1412 was appointed canon in the Münster of Zurich, a *dulce pondus*, as he called it. Afterwards he went to Bologna to pursue higher studies; during the Council was in Constance; and in 1421 became provost of St. Ursus in Solothurn. In 1427 he returned to Zurich, and became provost of the cathedral. His life possesses ecclesiastical interest mainly on account of his position and labors with reference to the condition of the Church in his day. His endless disputes with his colleagues need not be recited. But he unsparingly reprov'd the clergy for their gross immoralities, and endeavored to effect a reformation in this respect. He possessed an unusual fund of scholastic lore, and was never at a loss for pertinent quotations and anecdotes. Still he was a zealous churchman, and could far better appreciate external forms, than vital piety. He never broke through the barriers of the dogma; he only desired to see excrescences and parasites cut from the spiring tree of the hierarchy. His views agreed with those of the Councils of Constance and Basel; of the latter he was a member.—A natural result of his assaults upon clerical immoralities was the animosity of the clergy against him. Even his life was threatened.—He began his career as a writer with the tract *Contra validos mendicantes*, 1438. His writings, 39 in number (most of them but a few pages) are either ecclesiastical, juridical, political, or purely personal. Of five only the titles are known. Four others, the most important as sources for his personal history: *Passionale*, and *Registrum verele*, were never printed, but exist in MS. in Zurich. The rest exists in three different editions; that by *Seb. Brand*, Basel, 1497, in 177 fol. leaves, is the oldest. In the war between Austria, allied with Zurich, and the Confede-

rates, Hemmerlin violently advocated the cause of the nobles; especially in the largest and best written of his productions, *De nobilitate*. When Zurich withdrew from Austria, Hemmerlin, on Ash-Wednesday, 1454, was seized by the peasants, against whom he had said bitter things, and handed over to the Vicar-General, Gundelfinger, who sent him bound to Constance. Afterwards he was transferred to Luzerne. Hemmerlin did not die a martyr to the evangelical cause. He gives a more correct account of the matter in his *Dialogus de consolatione inique suppressorum*, saying: I suffer for my own error, though I meant it well.—(See B. REBER, *Felix Hemmerlin von Zürich*: Zür., 1846).

GÜDER.*

Hemming, Nicolas (*Præceptor Daniæ*), for a time the leader of Melanchthonianism in Denmark, and the forerunner of George Calixtus, was born in 1513, on the Danish island Lolland. Having early acquired the necessary qualifications, he spent five years at the University of Wittenberg, under Melanchthon. His success in studies is the more remarkable, as he was compelled to gather means by teaching, and as a copyist. After finishing his course, he became tutor in the family of a Danish nobleman, and subsequently, with great acceptance, minister of the church of the Holy Ghost in Copenhagen, and Prof. of Greek and Hebrew in the University there; 1557, D. D., and Prof. of Theology, and finally Vice-chancellor; which posts he filled with honor until 1579. At the same time he was a fertile writer. His works treat of methodological, philosophical, dogmatic, exegetical, and practical subjects, are written in elegant Latin, and exhibit thorough familiarity with classic literature. His theological writings, especially the *Opusc. theolog.*, are pervaded, also, by a spirit of gentle piety, reminding one of John Gerhard. The first class of isagogical and practical works includes: *de methodis* (resembling Augustine's *de doctr. christ.*); the *Pastor*; *Catechismi Quæstiones*; *de lege Naturæ apodictica methodus*. They are interspersed with devotional meditations and forms. His *dogmatical* writings subjected him to the suspicion of crypto-Calvinism. He opposed ubiquitarianism as unscriptural, and adds: *nequi necesse est ea quæ unita sunt æque omnibus partibus patere*. Not the form, but the reality of Christ's presence is the object of faith. Other errors were detected by some zealots in his *Enchirid. theol.*: (Viteb., 1558-9; Lips., 1581); *Syntagma instit. Christ.*: (Hafniæ, 1574; Genev., 1578; Ludg. Bat., 1585). His *Demonstratio indubitæ veritatis de Domino Jesu*, &c., 1571, exhibits his pious, gentle spirit. In his *Antichristomachia* he refutes Romanism, and in his *Admonitio de superstitionibus magicis vitandis*, superstition in an admirable manner. His *de Conjugio, repudio et divortio* is practical. The *de jure naturæ* (Vit., 1566), and *de gratia universali* (Frankf., 1553), are remarkable productions. His *exegetical* works consist of comment on some Psalms, the minor Prophets, (Lps., 1564, 4to.), and on nearly all the books of the New Test., a *Hist. J. Christi* (1562, Opp. 1255-1336), directed against the magical arts.—Notwithstanding his peaceableness, Hemming was

assailed for his crypto-Calvinism. To avoid dissensions he modified some offensive expressions found in the *Syntagma*, and avowed *et hoc corpus et hunc sanguinem vere et realiter cum pane et vino a communicantibus sumi, ita ut sit verus cibus ac potus, quo homo pascitur, reficitur et vivificatur ad vitam æternam*, as his belief.—In his last years he became blind. He died May 23, 1600. *

Henry III., son of Conrad II., reigned from 1031 to 1056, and distinguished himself by his opposition to the sadly prevalent evils of simony (see Art.), and an attempt to effect a thorough reformation of the Papacy; and although his plans may have involved political aims, they nevertheless originated in a sincere desire to improve the condition of the Church. The best clergymen were his friends, and he supported their efforts to restore discipline. Three Popes were striving for the mastery, and through their discords, as well as the attendant abominations, the office has been deeply degraded. Henry became the deliverer of the Church, at the earnest entreaties of its friends. The papal schism was terminated by the Council of Sutri, 1046, and Suidgar, B. of Bamberg, assumed the chair (see *Clemens II.*; *Gregory VI.*). Thenceforth H. exerted more influence upon the election of Popes than even Charlemagne had done. The choice by the clergy and people was abolished, and the Emperor selected from among the bishops the most suitable person. But under Leo IX. (see Art.) there was a reaction against this power of Henry. He died in 1056, greatly lamented by the people, though less by some German princes whom he had held in an iron grasp. — (See FLORO, *Kaiser Heinr. IV.*, &c., 1 Bd., 1855. STENZEL, *Gesch. Deutschl. unter d. fränk. Kaisern*, 1 Bd., 1827). T. P.*

Henry of Ghent (*Henricus de Gandavo*), born 1222, near Ghent. His patronymic was Göthaldo (*Bonicollus*). He was a pupil of Albert the Great, lectured at the Sorbonne upon theology and philosophy, and acquired the title *Doctor solemnis*. He opposed the determinism of John Duns Scotus. *Ritter* (*Gesch. d. Philos.*, VIII., p. 355) describes his doctrine of ideas as remarkable, reminding one of Platonism, but differing from it in ascribing to man, not a natural, but a supernatural knowledge of ideas. His works are: *Summa theologiae*, and *Quodlibeta theol.*; commentaries on Aristotle's *Physics* and *Metaphysics*; a biogr. of St. Eleutherus; *de viris illustr. s. de scriptoribus eccles.* He died June 29, 1293, being at the time Archdeacon of Tournay.—(See DU PIN, *nouv. biblioth. des aut. eccl.*, X., 85. CAVE, *script. eccl. hist. liter.*, p. 649). T. P.*

Henry of Gorcum (*Gorcomus s. Gorichemius*), of Gorcum, Holland, lived c. 1450; a distinguished theologian, and at last Vice-chancellor of the Academy at Cologne. He wrote: *Tract. de superst. quibusdam casibus seu ceremoniis eccl.*; *de celebritate festorum: conclusiones et concord. biblicorum*; *contra Hussitas*; comm. in part on Aristotle, Th. Aquinas, and Peter Lomb.—(See TRITHEM., *de script. eccl.* CAVE, *hist. liter. in append.*, p. 118). P.*

Henry of Huntingdon, canon of Lincoln, then Archdeacon of the diocese of Huntingdon,

lived c. 1150, under King Stephan, wrote several histories, the chief that of England, in 10 books. His *Historia Anglorum* begins with the landing of Julius Cæsar and reaches to 1154. It is dedicated to B. Alexander of Lincoln, whom Galfried of Monmouth addresses in his *hist. Britonum*. William of Malmesbury acknowledges its merits, and later English chronicists often draw upon it. It is still valuable for its apparent use of Norman sources. But Lappenberg (*Gesch. v. England*, I., p. LX.) says his chronology, as well as his genealogical statements, are confused and erroneous. The work is included in the collection of *Henry Sacule: Rerum angl. scriptores post Bedam principes* (Lond., 1596). A *Libellus de contemptu mundi* in *D'Achery Spicil.*, is also ascribed to him. P.*

Henry of Langenstein, so-called, either because born in a village in Upper Hesse, or of an extinct noble family of that name, studied in Paris, and there, c. 1363, became master and teacher of philosophy, in 1375 licentiate of theology, taught in both capacities, and then was appointed Vice-chancellor of the University. Duke Albrecht III., of Austria, called him, 1390, to the new High-school of Vienna, where he taught theology, astronomy, mathematics, physics, &c. In 1393 he became Rector, and died in 1397. He professed extensive learning, and is lauded as the transplanter of mathematics and physics into Germany. His works are: *Contra astrologos*; *tract. de contractibus emtionis et venditionis*; *consilium pacis de unione ac reformat. eccl. in concilio univ. quærenda*, 1381 (printed in *Hermann v. d. Hardt T. II., rerum conc. œcum. const.*), in which he sharply rebukes the evils of the Church; *summa de republica*; *secreta sacerdotum quæ in missa teneri debent*, the best known and at the time most read. Other productions were of inferior merit.—(See FASSIUS, *bibl. med. et inf. lat. lib. VIII.* HERMANN V. D. HARDT, l. c., *prolegomena*, p. 10, &c. *Ersch and Gruber*). H.*

Henry of Lausanne, *Henricians*, (1116-1148), of the order of Cluniacensians, so violently assailed in Lausanne the disorders of monasticism, the merely external ceremonies, and some of the peculiar errors of the Romish: the merits of good works, prayers for the dead, the worship of the crucifix, transubstantiation, &c., that the anger of the hierarchy was strongly excited against him. Having left the monastery, and cast away his cowl and cassock, he commenced preaching with an overwhelming eloquence, which soon produced such effects upon multitudes that the people were ready to lay violent hands upon the priests. At first Hildebert, B. of Mans (*Cenomanis*), countenanced him, but before long was so pressed himself by the fanaticism which Henry aroused, that he was compelled to interfere. Henry was sent away from Mans, and probably joined Peter of Bruis. Afterwards he labored with great success in Poitiers and Bordeaux. Whilst scattering his views in Provence, the Archbishop of Arlate had him imprisoned, and at the council of Pisa, 1134, under Innocent II., he was condemned as a heretic, but again liberated, on promise of leaving the district. Forthwith he

assumed his efforts in Languedoc, &c. Hugo, Archb. of Rouen, having directed his *Dogmatum Christianæ fidei contra hæreticos sui temporis* Lib. III. (1145), against Henry, also, and the Henricians, Eugene III. sent Cardinal Albericus, B. of Ostia, and St. Bernard to suppress the heretics. Henry was taken and handed over to the B. of Toulouse for punishment, but soon after this he died. Still the Cathari of South France were greatly strengthened by him.—(See *Acta Episcoporum Cenoman. c. 35, de Hildeberto Episc.*, in MABILL., *Vet. Analecta*, III., 112. St. Bernard's Epp., 241, *ad Hildephonium Comitem S. Aegidii* (1147). CH. U. HAHN, *Gesch. d. Ketzers im Mittelalter*, especially in the 11, 12, and 13 cent.: Stuttg., 1845, 1847, I. *Gesch. d. neumanichäischen Ketzers*, p. 450).

NEUDECKER.*

Henry, the Lion, son of Henry the Proud, Duke of Bavaria, and Saxony: and Gertrude, the wealthy heiress of Lothaire II., was born 1129, probably at Ravensburg, Suabia. His father having died in 1139, Henry at once bravely pressed his claims to his hereditary rights, and in 1142 was recognized as Duke of Saxony by the Diet of Würzburg. Immediately he began his heroic career, and after his mother's death, he entered Bavaria and endeavored to recover that dukedom, which had been wrested from his father. In 1144 he assumed the title Duke of Saxony and Bavaria, and in 1148 strengthened his political schemes by marrying Clementina, daughter of Duke Conrad of Zähringen. But he did not acquire undisputed possession of both dukedoms until 1156. Thenceforth he rapidly gained power and influence, and was second only to the Emperor. The North of Germany is greatly indebted to his public spirit. Munich, Lübeck, Braunschweig, and Hamburg, owe partly their origin, and much of the subsequent prosperity, to him. He promoted commerce, manufactures, and agriculture. But his good fortune soon vanished. His envious foes took advantage of a dissension between the Emperor and himself, and succeeded in having him stripped of all his dignities. At first he took refuge with Henry of England, the father of his second wife, the noble Matilda; but soon he returned to his remaining hereditary estates, and there spent his days in deeds of piety and beneficence. It was chiefly, however, on account of his zeal for the spread of Christianity among the Slavonian tribes of northern Germany that Henry merits place in this work.—Various attempts to convert the Wends, Wagriens, Obotrites, and Lucians, had resulted in but partial success, when their prince, *Gottschalk*, who sought to unite them under one kingdom, and to promote the welfare of his subjects by the establishment of Christianity among them, was murdered by them, and their heathen altars were consecrated new by the blood of Christian priests. Gottschalk's son Henry, indeed, renewed these attempts, by the aid of *Vicelin* (see Art.), but after his death, the princes *Pribislaw* and *Nielot*, who were devoted to idolatry, rose to power, and threatened to extirpate Christianity. This evil was averted by a crusade under Henry the Lion, Duke Conrad of Zähringen, Archb. Adalbert II., and other confederates. Henry restored

the bishoprics of Aldenburg, Mecklenburg, and Ratzeburg. *Evermodus*, a pupil and friend of St. Norbert, was appointed Bishop of Ratzeburg, and (1154) *Gerold*, his chaplain, B. of Aldenburg. But the difficulty of inculcating Christian truths upon the minds of those heathen is forcibly illustrated by the answer of Pribislaw and Nielot to an exhortation of Henry, urging them to promote the interests of the Gospel: "The God of heaven is your God, but you are our God, and that is enough for us; you pray to him, but we will pray to you (*HELMOLDI Chronicon Slavorum*, I., 87).—It cannot seem surprising that such rulers would seize every opportunity to cast off the yoke of Christianity. Tidings of an insurrection summoned Henry (in 1159) to an expedition against Nielot, in which the Danish king aided with money. The country of the Obotrites was soon subdued, and for future security Schwerin was fortified (1160). Saxon Counts and Knights were, likewise, placed in various citadels, and other measures adopted to prevent further insurrections. Still a fresh war broke out in 1163, under Nielot's sons *Wertislaw* and *Pribislaw*, which, although soon suppressed, was followed by horrid cruelties in the following years; and several generations passed before heathenism was wholly subverted. In 1172, after having committed the temporary government of his Saxon countries to Archb. *Wigman* of Magdeburg, Henry started on a pilgrimage to Jerusalem, in company with a numerous retinue of ecclesiastics and nobles. The Greek Emperor at Constantinople gave them a splendid reception, and sumptuously entertained the pilgrims during the Easter festival. When they approached Jerusalem they were met by Templers, Knights of St. John, and a great multitude of people, and escorted into the city with singing. Henry spent two months there, as the guest of King Amalrich, visiting all the sacred places in the vicinity, and then started on his return home, which he reached early in 1173, having received numerous honorable attentions on the way, from the Sultan of Iconium, the Greek Emperor Emanuel, King Bela III. of Hungary, and the Emperor at Augsburg. The relics and other precious articles which he brought back, were given to the Cathedral of St. Blasius, which was soon afterwards built. He died Aug. 6, 1195, in Braunschweig, leaving three energetic sons, *Henry*, *Otto*, and *William*.—(See HELMOLD, *l. c.* ARNOLDI *Lubeccensis Contin.* (to 1209) in *Leibnitz. Script. Brunsv.* II. PATJE, *Recherches historiques et philos. &c.*: Hanovre, 1786, 8vo. BÖRTIGER, *Heinrich d. Löwe, &c.*: Hannov., 1819, 8vo. FR. V. RAUWER, *Gesch. d. Hohenstaufen*, 2 Aufl. Thl. 2. HAVEMANN, *Gesch. d. Lande Braunschw. u. Lüneb.* I.: Götting., 1853.)

G. II. KLIPPEL.*

Heracles, a native of Alexandria, a convert from heathenism, and brother of St. Plutarch, who suffered martyrdom, c. 204, under Septimius Severus. In company with Longinus, Plotinus, Origen, and others, he was taught the new Platonic philosophy by Ammonius Saccas; subsequently Origen appointed him a catechist in Alexandria, where, in 232, he became Bishop, and died 274.—(EUSEB. *H. E.*, I, I. P—)

de vir. illustr. TILLEMONT, *H. E.*, t. 3. BAILLET, *S.**
Vie des Saints.)

Heracleon, a Gnostic of the 2d century; a pupil of Valentine (CLEM. *Alex. Strom.* IV., 502), who distinguished himself in Alexandria by his acute learning. Nothing certain is known of his personal history, but he probably abode in Egypt. He devoted himself chiefly to exegesis, and wrote a commentary on St. John's gospel, from which Origen largely quoted. GRABE has collected the fragments of H. in the *spicileg. patr. et haeret.* II., 80, sq. He seems, also, to have written a commentary upon Luke (CLEM. *Alex. Strom.* IV., 503. See NEANDER, Ch. H. I., 434-6). TH. PRESSEL.*

Heraclius, Emperor of the East, 610-641, son of the African governor Heraclius, rebelled against Phocas, whom he had put to death, and then succeeded to the empire. He found it weak and disordered. On the one side the Avari were besieging Constantinople itself (618); on the other, the Persians under Chosroes had overflowed the Asiatic States, and conquered Egypt. Even Jerusalem had fallen (614) into their hands, many Christians had been murdered, made slaves, or forced to join the Nestorian Church. Having paid the Avari large sums to withdraw, Heraclius marched against the Persians, after a nine years' war conquered Chosroes, and (628) compelled C.'s son and successor Siroes to accept a peace which restored all the Persians had taken, including the wood of the Saviour's cross. Heraclius' detailed account of this matter (still extant) was read in the church of St. Sophia on May 15. Soon after he entered the city in a triumphal car, drawn by elephants, and having laid off all ornaments, walked barefooted, bearing the cross, up Mt. Calvary. Since 631, Sept. 14 has been observed as the anniversary of this incident (*festum exaltationis sanctae crucis*). An unreliable account of Eutychius and Elmacinius (cf. HORTINGER, *hist. eccl.* N. J. P. I., 222) says that after retaking Jerusalem Heraclius had all the Jews there cut to pieces, in violation of a previous oath of protection; and that he was instigated to this deed by the Patriarchs and clergy of the city, who assumed the guilt of the act, and promised to do penance for it by an annual fast, thence called the fast of Heraclius. The rest of Heraclius' reign was disturbed by ecclesiastical disputes, in which he mingled with the hope of reconciling the hostile parties in his empire (see *Monothelites*), and its close, especially, by the invasions of the Arabs, who successively wrested Syria, Palestine, and Egypt from his dominion. He died Feb. 11, 641, of dropsy, aged 66. His descendants held the throne until 711.

TH. PRESSEL.*

Herard, Archbishop of Tours from 855, distinguished for his energy and learning, honored with commissions by Nicholas I., and Charles the Bald, and a member of numerous synods, at which he exercised great influence. He prepared *capitula episcopalia*, *capitularia*, which he published at a synod in 858. In these he enjoins that all the faithful shall be taught by the priests concerning the incarnation of the Son of God, his passion, resurrection, ascension, the outpouring of the Holy Ghost, and the for-

givenness of sins obtained through the Spirit and baptism in the bosom of the church; also that they shall be warned against sins, especially grosser sins, and instructed in Christian virtues. He likewise requires his curates to establish schools, and see to having books correctly written. He died 870 or 871. — (See *Grand Diction. hist. du Moreri*, ed. M. Drouet, t. V.).

TH. PRESSEL.*

Herder (*Joh. Gottfr.*).—We rarely meet with a name in the history of theological science, which is so intimately associated with all its departments, as *Herder's*. He possessed a universal, encyclopediacal nature. His expansive spirit laid hold of philosophy, history, language, literature, religion and theology, with a freshness, and youthful geniality, which cannot fail to be seen in all his writings. With this universality of talent, which, in some branches, of course could not be equally profound, he combined, nevertheless, a penetration into the essence of things, which clearly distinguishes him from superficial polymathists. With an occasionally dogmatic boldness of judgment, he united a maiden gentleness, which secured him against all the asperities of controversy, and was attractive even when his assertions lacked satisfactory proof. With liberal and broad views, he courageously resisted the destructive tendencies of the age, and vindicated the Bible, both against the scoffs of infidelity and the spiritless pedantry of the schools. Thus, at different periods in his life, and according to the character of the theory he was controverting, he seems at one time the defender of Biblical orthodoxy and churchly conservatism, at another as the advocate of illumination, humanity and progress. He has, therefore, been properly designated "the prophetic forerunner of the theology of our times;" that theology, whose standpoint is above the abstract antithesis of rationalism, and supranaturalism, and which strives not only externally to reconcile it, but inwardly to overcome it. Whatever judgment may, therefore, be passed upon Herder and his theology, it must be admitted that he forms an important link in the development of our later theology, and that the study of his works must commend itself to all the disciples of science.

Herder, the son of a poor cantor and teacher of a girls' school, was born August 25, 1744, at Mohrungen, in East Prussia. His father was strict and conscientious, his mother a woman of fine and tender feelings. Both exercised Christian discipline, so that their son was early taught in the Scriptures. Under the somewhat gloomy, but careful *Trescho* (author of a "Sterbebibel," then much read), whom he served as a famulus, he learned much that was afterwards useful to him. His parents wished him to become a surgeon, but he fainted at the first operation, and gave up the plan. He then studied theology, at Königsberg, where *Kant* and *Hamann*, each in his way, attracted the spirit of the youth. In theology proper *Lilienthal* (author of "Die gute Sache d. Offenbarung," 1750-82) was his principal teacher. He was soon appointed a gymnasial teacher at Frederick's college, and there experienced the truth of the proverb: *docendo dis-*

imus. His mind rapidly developed, and his early bashfulness disappeared. In the fall of 1764 he became collaborator in the cathedral school at Riga, and in 1767 afternoon preacher in a suburban church. There he laid the foundation of his celebrity as a preacher (the church had to be enlarged) and writer, his friend *Hartnoch*, the publisher, aiding him. The "Fragmente über die deutsche Literatur," and "kriechende Wälder," in which Herder wrote severe criticisms upon some of the literary magnates of the day, excited considerable animosity against him. To escape this he resolved to travel abroad. He first went to Paris, and was then engaged to attend the prince of Holstein-Eutin on a tour through France and Italy. A disease of the eye detained him in Strasburg, where he underwent a painful but unavailing operation. In Strasburg he became acquainted with Goethe and Stilling, and received a call as court preacher, consistorialrath, and superintendent to Bückeberg, the residence of the Duke of Schaumburg-Lippe. He entered upon the post in 1771, and acquired considerable spiritual influence over the duchess Maria. There he founded his reputation as a theological writer, so that Heyne tried to get him to Göttingen as professor of theology. But Herder would not consent to the required colloquium. Then came an opportune call to *Weimar* as court preacher, general superintendent, and Oberconsistorialrath. Meanwhile he had married. Herder now became one of the stars of that German Athens, where Wieland, Schiller, Goethe, Jean Paul, Knebel and others shone. In 1793 he was appointed vice-president, and in 1801 president of the higher-consistory, an office which no commoner had ever filled. Shortly before his death the Elector of Bavaria elevated him to the nobility. He died December 18, 1803.

Herder's importance as a theologian is to be sought less in his services to any distinct branch of the science, than in the spirit which he sought to breathe into its several branches, and into science in general. His labors were rather suggestive than systematically constructive. It is not surprising, therefore, that he left many questions unsolved, and that we meet with some paradoxes in his writings. First of all the position which he assigns the theologian and clergyman in society, is important. Instead of regarding them as, at most, useful servants of the state, he saw types of their offices in the priests and prophets of the Old Test., and sought to awaken in the minds of students elevated views of the ordinary affairs of life, and to train a race of theologians who would know how to harmonize "humanity" with earnest piety (cf. "Provinzialblätter an Prelinger," 1774. "Briefe über das Studium d. Theol.," 1780; 2 ed., 1785). Above all he desired to render the study of the Bible useful by freeing it of the fetters of theological dogmatism, and making it subservient to a science which cordially embraced all the interests of humanity. He gave special prominence to the æsthetic-human side of the Bible, though not as at variance with its divine authority (cf. "Geist d. hebräischen Poesie," 1782). He first, Lowth not excepted, awakened a deep sense of the poetic

beauties of the Bible, which he did not consider as mere elegant ornaments, but inherent in the very substance of the Old Test. revelation, and inseparable from its inspired contents.—By his poetical interpretation of the Old Test. histories he rescued the Bible from the maltreatments of such exegetes as Michaelis, who saw in those accounts only a codex of doctrines, which they sought to fit on to the stiff forms of their school. His "älteste Urkunde d. Menschengeschl., eine nach Jahrh. enthüllte heil. Schrift," 1774, produced a revolution in the department of Old Test. exegesis. In it he attempted to explain Gen. 1, from a standpoint entirely different from that usually taken. A voyage from Riga to Nantes (1769), on which he frequently witnessed the effect of the break of day, suggested the thought, that a similar perception of objects lay at the basis of the account of the creation, which represents light as first appearing, and then successively one set of objects after another; and that to interpret the narrative as a physico-cosmological treatise did violence to it. He regarded it as a significant hieroglyphic.—But with all that was merely hypothetical in his views, to Herder belongs the undeniable merit of having opened a path in biblical studies, which more recent inquirers followed, and which seems now again to be forsaken to the disadvantage both of science and religion.—Herder also sought to enrich New Test. exegesis by treasures from the spirit of the Orient, as in his "Erläuterungen zum N. T. aus einer neu eröffneten morgenländ. Quelle" (d. Zend Avesta), 1775, in which he contended for a manifest influence of Parsism upon the Hebrew and Christian mode of thought. He wrote upon the epp. of James and Jude: "Briefe zweier Brüder Jesu in unserm Kanon (1775), and on Revelation: "Mapar 'Aḡa, das Buch von d. Zukunft d. Herrn" (Riga, 1779).—He also wrote upon several distinct exegetical and theological subjects, as (in the "christliche Schriften") upon the gift of tongues at Pentecost; the resurrection, as a matter of faith, history, and doctrine; of the Redeemer of men, according to the three Gospels; of the Son of God, the Saviour of the world; of the spirit of Christianity; of Religion, its doctrines, usages, &c. It cannot be denied, that Herder never attained to a full and clear insight into the substance of Christianity, especially that his Christological views could hardly satisfy the theology of our day, any more than his somewhat arbitrary interpretations of the resurrection and Pentecostal miracle. At the same time his efforts to apprehend and exhibit the "Son of God" as the "Son of Man" in the noblest sense of the phrase, were very significant, and form a necessary transition from the old orthodox theory, which put Christ's humanity into the background, to the theory which now prevails. Even here again, Herder may be regarded as the precursor of Schleiermacher, Ullmann, Hase, &c. A connected system of faith Herder did not write. "Herder's Dogmatik," by Augusti, is simply a selection from his writings. And yet systematic, as well as exegetical, and, mediately, historical theology were invigorated by Herder's spirit.—Upon practical theology, also, Herder's writings fur-

nish valuable homiletical, catechetical, and liturgical hints; and his opinions and pastoral letters contain valuable remarks concerning pastoral theology and ecclesiastical discipline. In his sermons, which abound in fertile thoughts, he preferred the form of the homily. Those published seem to be rather sketches, to which much may have been added in their delivery. His personal appearance and manner in the pulpit was impressive, though he had little action. How far the social influence of the court may have interfered with his ministerial duties, cannot be here discussed. It is painful, however, to hear him deplore, in his last years, that his "life had been a failure;" and yet this may merely indicate the nobleness of his nature, and the severe demands he made upon himself. — Glancing, for a moment, at the narrower circle of Herder's theological activity, we find several other productions sustaining a close relation to theology. His "*Ideen zur Philosophie d. Gesch. d. Menschheit*" (1785), a work which probably attained to the greatest celebrity among all his writings, lacks, indeed, the only true Christian basis for such a history, but still exerted a happy influence upon that age. His "*Stimmen d. Völker*," awakened a taste for national poetry, and also did service to the philosophy of religion and theology. He himself worked up many of the most beautiful Church traditions into poems, and his other effusions (though none of them are properly hymns) breathe a deep religious spirit. His "*Cid*" may be called a Christian epos. — Finally, as to Herder's position towards the philosophy of his day, he neither followed any existing system, nor invented one of his own. He was eclectic-critical. In his "*God*" he defended Spinoza against the attacks of certain philosophers and theologians, and thus came in conflict with his friend Jacobi. In his "*Metakritik*" and in other writings, he even violently denounced Kant's theory, though without much effect. To this violence he was probably led by the unhappy influence, he observed, of that system on young candidates for the ministry. He was also opposed to Fichte. Indeed he was the decided enemy of all scholasticism, and felt himself rather attracted by a mystical intuitive philosophy, like Hamann's. Hence in his own philosophemes we find rather oracular sayings, than careful dialectic definitions. Herder founded no school, but contributed largely to the formation of schools. — The best and most complete edition of his works is that of Jn. G. Müller of Schaffhausen, which contains, also, a biography of Herder by his wife (whose maiden name was *Flachland*). Tub., 1820. — See the literary histories of *Gelzer*, *Gervinus*, *Vilmar*, &c. The *Heidelb. Jahrbüch.*, 1812. *Döring*, *Herder's Leben*, Weimar, 1823. *Danz und Gruber*, *Karakteristik Herder's*, Lpz., 1805. The *Weimar-Herder-Album*, Jena, 1845. *Hagenbach's Vorles. über d. K. G. d. 18. Jahrh.*, 2 Aufl. 2 Thl. p. 11; &c. *Werke zur Rel. u. Theol.*

HAGENBACH.*

Heresy, in the wider sense, is any doctrine, which, though it bears on the one side a Christian, religious character, contains elements at war with the principle of Christianity itself. —

Just as our conception of that principle is more or less sharply defined, will our view of what is heretical vary. In modern times many of the so-called heresies have been regarded as necessary steps in the development of doctrine—by which it has been brought out into clear consciousness. A striking support for this opinion is found in the introduction to Origen's work, *de Principiis*; *Con. Gregor. Nazianz. orat. 33 fin.*, and *Aug. de lib. arb.*, III., 21. According to the evangelical view, the principle of Christianity is the absolute reconciliation of man with God, in Christ and through Christ: and as this principle is attacked in its *presumptions* we have two classes of heresies, and in its *consequences*, two more—thus, four in all: — 1. Those which do not fully acknowledge the guilt and corruption of our nature (Pelagianism and Manichæism). 2. Those which entertain such ideas of God that the necessity or possibility of atonement, or its mediation in the person of Christ, or its ethical character is contravened: here belong not only Pantheism, but Antitrinitarianism along with Ebionism and Docetism, and the Nestorian and Monophysite doctrine, so far as it concerns God in his relation to the world and man, if the atonement in Christ is to be regarded as efficacious in a *real, absolute and ethical* way. 3. Those which alter the consequences of the atonement on the side of God and in his relation to man: here belong the worship of saints, false mediation assumed by the visible Church, the sacrifice of the mass, the doctrine of the *opus operatum*, as well as the disparagement of the means of grace by the Anabaptists. 4. Those which alter the consequences of the atonement on the side of man; here belong Antinomianism, which subverts its ethical character and work, righteousness, which mars its completeness.

As the Church in the course of ages developed her faith and embodied its various points in creeds and confessions, heresy came to mean *any doctrine that conflicts with the fundamental articles thus established*. But since the evangelical Church only admits a presumption in their favor, and lays no claim to absolute infallibility and perfection, she yields to every dissenting member the right of appeal to the divine norm of the apostolic testimony. He is bound, however, to produce proof for any such *exceptio veritatis*; and if this cannot be done, or is refused, she has a right to treat such dissent as heresy. Hence, in the older books of discipline, the dissenter is enjoined, before he ventures to publish his doctrine, to hold a discussion with the organs of the Church. If the matter be old, and no new arguments are advanced, it is sufficient for the Church simply to refer to former decisions. — In its relation to existing ecclesiastical organizations heresy assumes a still narrower meaning. It exhibits an *aggressive character*, sets itself up against law and order, becomes sectarian, and so long as this is wanting, it is rather to be called *error than heresy*. As long as dissent remains mere private opinion, or sets itself forth as pure scientific speculation, it may be tolerated, although contended against and excluded from the pulpit; but when it lays claims to be considered an *article of faith*, and

invades the Church in a revolutionary way, it must be met and crushed by ecclesiastical discipline. — The question now arises, how far heresy is to be regarded as a civil crime, and punished as such. The evangelical maxim, that it is no civil crime, is, in the main, true; but when a sect promulgates in the name of religion such doctrines as lead directly to the subversion of those principles of order and morality, upon which all good government rests, it certainly becomes amenable to the civil law. The Church then exercises tolerance only toward scientific error, not heresy; the State is more liberal; yet even this liberality has its limits; and, in case the State is decidedly Christian in its fundamental laws and social order, the restriction may be greater, so that it may not only protect itself from any danger that threatens its civil life, but refuse to recognize a sect as standing on the same ground with the established Church, or churches. This has been publicly proclaimed by the *Eisenach Conference* as a leading principle of the existing ecclesiastical courts in evangelical Germany (see the protocols of the Conf. of 1853, im allgem. Kirchenblatt, 1853, p. 459, and those of the Conf. of 1855, allg. K.-blatt, 1855, p. 419–23).

We now pass on to the history of the subject. Originally the word αἵρεσις was a *vox media* for any party distinguished by peculiar principles. It was thus used in the early schools of philosophy and law in the Roman empire. In the New Test. it is applied to the conflicting religious parties of later Judaism, Acts 5:17; 15:5; 26:5; and in 24:5, by an adversary to the Christian Church. The same thing occurs in c. 24:14 (ἡν λέγουσιν αἵρεσιν), and c. 28:22, where we find it applied to Christians as a term of reproach by their enemies. On the other hand it designates (Tit. 3:10; 2 Pet. 2:1) division in the Church itself. In Gal. 3:21, Paul treats his Judaistic adversaries as heretics of this kind, and meets every corruption of the gospel with an ἀνάθεμα ἵσταω (c. 1:8, 9). Αἵρεσις, however, is not clearly distinguished from σχίσμα, as 1 Cor. 11:19, and Gal. 3:20 show; yet in both passages it is no longer a *vox media*, but implies blame. Titus 3:10, uses the word in the sense of later times, and describes the manner in which the primitive Church dealt with heretics; so, too, 2 Pet. 2:1, 2. With these passages compare Rev. 18:2, 14, 15. Ignatius (*ad Smyrnæos*, c. 3) recommends prayer for heretics, although he requires strict separation from them, and expresses little hope of their conversion (cf. c. 7); he warns his readers (*ad Trall.* c. 6) that they should ἀλλοτρίας βοτάνης ἀπίχισθαι, ἥτις ἐστὶν ἡρεσις, and styles it a deadly poison mingled with honey. He, therefore, calls heretics (*ad Philad.*, c. 2) λύκοι ἀξιόπιστοι, and as the best safeguard against their deceptive arts enjoins subordination to the episcopate. This is further developed by Irenæus, who brings to his aid apostolical succession and tradition, c. *hæres.*, V., 26, 2. All those who refuse obedience to the successors of the apostles are to be ranked as heretics and offering strange fire, i. e., strange doctrines on the altar of God, a *cælesti igne*

comburentur, quemadmodum Nadab et Abiud. Thus, where protection against heresy is demanded, special stress is laid upon that which it has in common with schism: although even this passage shows that Irenæus knew how to distinguish between them. So, also, Tertullian, who, along with Irenæus, regards it as a greater crime than schism, and ranks it with *apostasia* (*de præscript. Hæret.*, c. 4, *persecutio et martyres facit, hæresis apostatas tantum.*); still it has its uses (c. 1, *ut fides habendo tentationem habeat etiam probationem* (cf. c. 4); he sees in the vigorous growth of heresy only a sign of mischief existing in the Church itself (c. 2), and refutes those who argue its truth from the rapidity of its growth. These views of the Fathers respecting heresy, are drawn chiefly from their experience with Gnosticism. Irenæus calls attention to the differences and divisions continually breaking out amongst the heretics themselves (I., c. 9, § 5; c. 28, § 2, fin., § 1), and this phenomenon he explains by saying, that they have no discipline and order, each teacher wishing to be, and to have something peculiar: they betray their origin from subjective caprice (c. 28, § 1, *velut e terra fungi manifestati sunt*) without any hold on historical traditions; and this is plain from the propensity each one has to invent a new terminology (I., c. 11, § 3). In bold contrast with these endless divisions springing from unholy ambition (II., c. 30, 1), Irenæus lays the greater stress on the unity revealed in the traditions of the Church (III., 12, 7). He shows, too, how they deal with the SS., either mutilating them or interpreting them in a capricious and fantastical way (I., *præf.*, 1; III., 12, 12); and that their miracles, instead of having the beneficial, quickening tendency of those wrought in the Church, are merely magic and show, and thus betray their diabolical character (II., 31, 2; I., 27, 4), and point back to Simon Magus (I., 22, 2; 23, 24; 27, 4; III., *Præf.*). From views like these the ancient Church imbibed a profound abhorrence of heresy. Yet it appears from what Irenæus says of Cerdon (III., 4, 3), that penitent heretics were often, even in cases of relapse, restored to the full privileges of the Church; but the custom soon spread, not to restore those who had relapsed, and the effects of this custom are seen in the middle ages, when the relapsed, on profession of penitence, were again admitted into the communion of the Church, without preventing their execution by the civil law. — To the further development of the views and practice of the Church in regard to heretics, the controversy touching heretical baptism essentially aided; then the Donatistic controversy, of which it is worthy of remark, that for a long time the Donatists were not considered heretics, but merely schismatics; and then finally the Trinitarian and Christological controversies. As dogmas came to be more clearly defined, the differences existing among the older fathers, as well as the discovery, that many of the doctrines condemned as heresies by the later Church were found in their pages, led to interesting discussions upon the idea of heresy. It was now seen that there could be heterodox views, which were neither heretical nor preju-

dicial to church-communion or the salvation of the soul. But it was only so, until the Church had uttered her decision concerning them; and in this way obstinate resistance to the authority of the Church in such matters soon came to be regarded as the most essential feature in the idea of heresy. This appears particularly in the writings of *Vincentius*, of Lirinum (see his *Commonitorium*). *Augustine's* view of heresy deserves special consideration, because it formed the ground of the later doctrine and practice of the middle ages (see his work, *de Civit. Dei*, XVIII., 51). Whilst earlier Church-doctors rejected all use of the civil power against heresy (*Hilarius*, *Pictav. ad Constant.*, I., 2, 7; *contra Auxent. lib. init.*; *Athanasius*, *Hist. Arian.*, § 33), and at most only labored by this means to prevent the organization of heretical communities (*Chrysostom.*, *Homil.*, 29, 46, in *Matt.*); *Augustine* (*Retractat.*, II., c. 5; *ep.*, 93, *ad Vincentium*, § 17; *ep.* 185, *ad Bonifac.*, § 21; *Opus imperf.*, 2, 2), appealing to the passage, *Luke 14: 23* (*cogite intrare, etc.*), wholly renounced his earlier opinion, that heretics and schismatics should not be compelled to recant by the civil magistrate, and planted himself upon the maxim: *damnata hæresis ab episcopis non adhuc examinanda, sed coercenda est potestatibus Christianis*. He is unwilling, however, that heretics should be put to death, not because he thought they did not deserve it, but because the ancient Church was altogether averse to this mode of punishment: hence it is not to be wondered at, if, in spite of this protest, it should find approval (*e. g.*, *Leo M.*, *ep.* 15, *ad Turribium*; *Hieronymus*, *ep.* 37; *ad Bipar.*). In the middle ages, as in the Romish Church at the present day, the difficulty was easily avoided, by shifting the responsibility upon the State. — If now we consider the conduct of the secular powers, for a long time we find it varying between the grant of full liberty for the formation of sects, degrees of limitation in their worship, the withdrawal of certain civil rights and privileges, formal prohibition and criminal punishment. Still the right was claimed to deal with heresy according to their own pleasure. The numerous laws contained in the *Codex Theodosianus*, XVI., *tit. V., de Hæreticis*, to which is to be added XVI., *tit. I., 2 and 3*, are the chief sources for the history of legislation in regard to the sects in the most ancient time. It appears that the civil power then even went beyond the Church in its severity, except during the reign of Julian, the Apostate. In the 5th cent. the authority of *Augustine* brought about an agreement between the Church and the State upon this question, without any surrendry of its freedom on the part of the latter. This may be learned from the *Code of Justinian*. — In the middle ages a great change took place. The authority assumed by the Popes in matters of faith, and the doctrine of *fides implicita* and *explicita*, modified the doctrine of heresy, which now received a scientific elaboration at the hands of the schoolmen. At length the Church denied the right of the State to suffer within its borders any heresy which had been condemned and punished by her, and compelled the expulsion and extirpation of heretics, by the menace

of ecclesiastical censures, yea even the stirring up of violent invasions and insurrections, and the threat of civil punishments, such as the confiscation of estates and the withdrawal of all municipal and political right and protection from the secular power and its bearers (see *Art. Innocent III.*). Nevertheless, the Church retained the custom of praying the secular power to remit the penalty of death to the heretics condemned by her and handed over for execution; but this was a mere formality, and had so little earnestness in it, that the admissibility of such punishment became one of her most cherished dogmas, for the bull of *Leo X.* against *Luther*, 1520, among other points, condemns this: *Hæreticos comburere est contra salutem Spiritus* (art. 33). At the same time a great impulse was given to denunciation and false accusation by a peculiar rule, which lays the burden of proof upon the person accused of heresy; and by the establishment of the Inquisition the persecution of heretics was reduced to a system, so that at length many secular punishments were looked for as the direct results of those inflicted by the Church. Hence the Romish Church finds it necessary, to place every converted heretic before her court, and remit, after a formal recantation, ecclesiastical and secular penalties, so far as she sees fit. Here belong the provisions of the Canon Law in *X. de hæretic. V., tit. 7; c. 49. X. de sentent. excomm.*, V., 39; then *tit. de Hær. in VI. V., 2; de hæret. in Clement. V., 3; de hæret. in Extravag. V., 3; comp. liber septimus, V., 3 and 4*; then the laws enacted by *Frederick II.*, which closely follow those of the Church (*Pertz, Monum.*, II., p. 244, 287, 288, 327, 328); also the provisions of the *Schwabenspiegel* (c. 261). Consult, too, the laws respecting mixed marriages and the marriages of heretics. — All these enactments, although on account of the pressure of circumstances they are not now universally enforced, are still far from being regarded as a dead letter by the Roman Catholic Church (see *Benedict XIV., de Synod. Diœc. VI., 5; IX., 14, 3; XIII., 24, 21*). *Muratori* likewise, even in the 18th cent. (*de ingeniorum moderatione in religionis negotio*, II., 7), defends the position that civil rulers are bound to punish heretics in the severest manner. In the beginning of the 19th cent., in the negotiations respecting the coronation of *Napoleon*, *Pius VII.* declared that he could not set foot upon the soil of a country where freedom of worship was permitted by law. The same Pope wrote, in 1805, to his nuncio in Vienna: "the Church has not only sought to prevent heretics from becoming possessed of church-property, but has even made confiscation a punishment for the crime of heresy; for private estates in c. 10, *X. de hæret. (V., 7)*, for principalities and fiefs in c. 16, *eod.*: the latter law contains the canonical provision, that the subjects of a heretical prince are absolved from every oath, as fidelity and obedience; and any one who has even a moderate acquaintance with history knows of the decrees of Popes and councils deposing obstinate heretical princes. True, indeed, we find ourselves now, alas! in times of so great adversity and humiliation for the Bride of Christ,

that the Church is not only unable to enforce these most sacred maxims of hers in regard to the rebellious enemies of the faith, but durst not even name them without injury; but, though she cannot exercise her right to deprive heretics of their principalities and declare their states forfeited, she yet can," etc. Compare with this, how in 1724 (*Bullar., Propagandæ* II., 4, 56) the Roman See granted beforehand to the Ruthenians, in case of their conversion, the privilege of retaining estates forfeited by heresy; its rejoicings over the expulsion of the evangelical Salzburgers (*Bull., Propag.* II., 246), and what happens now in strictly Catholic States. To this day, where the State allows, bishops swear to the Pope: *hæreticos schismaticos et reuelles eidem Domino nostro vel successoribus prælictis pro posse persequar et impugnabo*. The Roman See, however, since Sept. 17, 1824, in its official acts no longer speaks of "Protestant heretics," but only of "*A catholici*," and has often acknowledged that the pressure of circumstances excuses the secular power, if it tolerates heretics: yet as soon as these circumstances change, the old laws—now only suspended, not abolished—shall be put in force.—With this practice of the Catholic Church and the Catholic State, as we see it now under the pressure of public opinion, it may be well to compare the dogmatic theory of the middle ages, as contained in the works of *Thomas Aquinas*. In *lib.* II., 2^{da} qu. 2, art. 5, 6 qu. 11, art. 1, he details the theory at large, and then proceeds to the question (art. 3): *utrum hæretici sint tolerandi?* The answer is, that heresy has its uses for the Church, in so far as it proves the *constantia fidelium* and serves this end, *ut exequiamus pigrum, divinas scripturas sollicitius intuentes*: but this *utilitas est præter intentionem hæreticorum*, who rather seek *corrumpere fidem*: hence, if heretics are to be regarded by themselves, they deserve at once *non solum ab Ecclesia per excommunicationem separari, sed etiam per mortem a mundo excludi*. But keeping in view the interest of the Church, she may exercise special *miseriordia*, so that one *non statim condemnatur, sed post primam et secundam correptionem*. Heretics are only to be tolerated, when their extirpation will cause injury to the Church; in which case the tares may be allowed to stand with the wheat (cf. *Art. 3, fin.*, with *qu. 10, art. 11, fin.*). In what follows (*qu. 12, art. 4*) *Thomas* now defends the principle, that ecclesiastical and secular punishments may often be wholly remitted to heretics for the first offence, but in case of relapse, even if they be again reconciled to the Church, they should be put to death, because by the evil example of *inconstantia circa fidem* others may be infected and encouraged to fall away.

Against this doctrine the Reformation now raised its protest. From the very first Luther opposed those, who fought against heresy with fire and sword instead of the Word of God, because unable to sustain their faith by Scripture (*Grund u. Ursach aller Artikel, so durch die Römische Bulle etc., zu Art. 33; Walch, XV., p., 1853. &c.*); and was inclined to ask the civil authorities to make over heretics to the evan-

gelical Church to vanquish them by convincing and persuading: thus in opposition to *Carlstadt's* violent measures he gave counsel in favor of mild reproof and instruction. And yet he did not intend thereby to encourage the State quietly to suffer its subjects to be misled by a heretical propaganda. It was a cardinal principle with all the Reformers, that the State was bound not to tolerate blasphemy, but to use all lawful measures to prevent the growth of sectarianism. Only in certain cases, Luther admitted the employment of civil penalties against heretics, less however on account of their doctrines, than of the practice flowing from them. *Zwingli* stands near to him in this respect, although he favored the bloody vengeance which overtook the Anabaptists in Switzerland. *Calvin* goes further, and with his theocratical ideas makes it obligatory upon the State, to treat heresy like blasphemy with the severest punishments. The execution of *Servetus*, approved and partly brought about by him, gave rise to a controversy upon the question, whether it was lawful to punish heresy with the sword (cf. *Calvini defensio orthodoxæ fidei de sacra trinitate contra prodig. errores Mich. Serveti hispani, ubi ostenditur, hæreticos jure gladii coercendos esse et nominatim de homine hoc tam impio juste et merito sumtum Genevæ supplicium*, 1554). For this act and his principles, not only was he attacked by *Bolsec*, but *Castellio* wrote against him, under the assumed name of *Martin Bellius*, the work: *de hæreticis, an sint persequendi*, etc.: *Magdeb.*, 1554, in which he makes use of the authority of Luther and Brenz. *Melanchthon* alone, of all the theologians of Germany, sided with Calvin (*Corp. Ref.*, II., 18, an. 1530; and III., 195, an. 1536), having long contended against the milder view of *Brenz* (see *Hartmann* and *Jäger*, *Johann Brenz*, I., p. 299, sqq.). In the evangelical Church of Germany this milder view prevailed, whilst in Scotland the principles of Calvin were applied even against the Papists.—*Sources*:—Those already named, and the various works on Church-law; *Thomasius*, *de jure Principis circa hæreticos*, and *an hæresis sit crimen*; *Bæhmeri, jus eccles. Protest.*, Tom. IV., *lib.* 5, *tit.* 7, § 167, sqq., and his *dissertatio preliminaris de jure circa libertatem conscientie* (l. c., t. II.); also the articles of the Peace of Westphalia, and the protocols of the Eisenach Church Conference already referred to.

C. JÄGER.—Porter.

Heretical Baptism.—*Controversy on the subject.*—They who believed salvation to be unattainable in a heretical communion, also believed its baptism to be invalid. Such insisted on the rebaptism of all who renounced it to join the Cath. Church. Numerous authorities belonging to the first part of the 3d century favor this view. *Clement of Alexandria* refused the baptism of heretics the character of genuineness (*οὐκ οὐκείον καὶ γνήσιον ὕδωρ*, *Strom.* I, 375). So, also, *Tertullian* (*de baptismo*, cap. 15). In the beginning of the 3d century, a Synod of Bishops at Carthage, under the presidency of *Agrippinus* unanimously voted it to be null and void (*Cyr. ep.* 71, 4. 73, 3). So, also, the Synods of Iconium and Synnada, in 235 (*Firm. in Cypr-*

ep. 75, 7. *Euseb. H. E., VII., cap. 7, § 5*). The Apostolical Constitutions (VI., 15) affirm its invalidity.

Rome, on the other hand, regarded heretics as fallen Christians, and received them into the Church by the laying on of hands; whilst two synods (255), which met at Carthage, under Cyprian, passed decrees against heretical baptism (ep. 70), and forwarded them to the Romish bishop, Stephen (ep. 72), who, at this very time was engaged in a controversy on this subject with the Orientals. The strife now waxed in strength. Stephen branded Cyprian as a pseudo-apostle, and deprived him of Church fellowship. Cyprian convened (Sept. 1, 256) a third council, which was attended by 85 bishops of North Africa, and a large number of presbyters, deacons, and laymen. It reprimanded the arrogant behavior of Stephen, who, it was said, made himself an *episcopus episcoporum*, and, in vehement terms, declared against the genuineness of heretical baptism. Cyprian, however, repeated an opinion previously expressed (ep. 72, 4), that the opposite practice should not be excluded from the Church (comp: Acts of Council in Augustine, *de baptismo*, lib. VI. et VII. *Cypr. opera genuina*, ed. Goldhorn II., 265 seq.). Firmilian of Cæsarea coincided with this action, and the Church in Asia Minor sustained the Church in North Africa. The breach between Stephen and Cyprian was never healed. The former died a martyr, 257; the latter, 258, the same year with Sixtus, B. of Rome, with whom he was on friendly terms.

The first point to be considered in this controversy is: *Did Stephen wish that all heretics, who applied for admission into the Church, should not be baptized, or did he distinguish between them?* Furnier (later Benedict XII.) Bannage, Alix, Dupin, Launoy, Pearson, Blondell, Pfaff, Höfling, affirm the former; Natalis Alexander, Tillemont, Pagi, Maran, and others, affirm the latter. Stephen wrote (74, 7): *si quis ergo a quacunque hæresi venerit ad vos, nihil innovetur, nisi quod traditum est, ut manus illi imponatur in pœnitentiam*; and this, because heretics, in the case of such as went over to them, did not, strictly speaking, re-baptize, but simply received them (communicant). It would seem, then, Stephen merely thought of completing the baptism of heretics by the laying on of hands. On the other hand, however, from cap. 8 of the same epistle, and ep. 73, cap. 4, it is plain he regarded it as genuine because performed in the name of Jesus; and from 75, 9, because of the invocation of the Trinity upon the subject whose disposition and faith qualified him for baptismal grace (*mente et fide sua baptismi gratiam consequi posse*). Add to this his declaration: *non quærendum esse, quis sit ille, qui baptizaverit*, and we are warranted in concluding that he approximated the later view of this dogma. The contradictions in these different sentiments may be reconciled, if we admit, with *Retberg*, that, as the controversy went forward, Stephen gave to his views greater precision of expression, and supposed that all sects, in baptism, made use of the formula prescribed by Christ.

The second point is: *What grace did Stephen*

suppose was conferred on them by the laying on of hands? a grace he designated by the affix of *pœnitentiam*, his opponents, by the affix of *accipiendum spiritum sanctum*. An impartial judgment of authorities compels us to the view that but one laying on of hands — not two, as Mattes and others imagine — was intended, as well in *pœnitentiam* as *ad accip. sp. s.*, which, standing between the usual seal of baptism and public penance, partook of the nature of both. The meaning of "laying on of hands" confirms this opinion. In the ancient Church, it was joined to baptism, reconciliation, and ordination. According to Tertullian (*de baptismo* 6, 8), baptism denoted the forgiveness of sins and the preparation for the receiving of the Holy Ghost; the laying on of hands, the indwelling of the Holy Spirit; and *anointing*, the symbol of the spiritual priesthood. These three were regarded as parts of one and the same sacrament, and it was only at a later period they were separated into two acts. In the ceremony of reconciliation, the laying on of hands was merely the repetition of the *manus impositio* of baptism (comp. August. *de baptismo* III., 15: *manus impositio non sicut baptismus repeti non potest*, with an expression in beginning of the c.: *spiritus sanctus in sola Catholica per manus impositionem dari dicitur*; also Const. ap. II. 41, § 2). It is, thus, easy to see that, when these closely related parts of divine worship had not yet been separated into distinct sacraments, persons would attribute to the one laying on of hands, in the reception of heretics, the meaning implied both in the rite of reconciliation and of ordination. Whilst, therefore, Stephen ascribed to the baptism of heretics, when properly received, the power of forgiving sins, he could not allow them the right of imparting the Spirit, since they themselves did not possess Him, not having the lawful episcopate. This defect he supposed was supplied by the laying on of hands, as with the new-baptized, or penitents. Hence his language to Firmilian (75, 14): *hæresis quidem parit et exponit, expositos autem ecclesia suscipit, et quos non ipsa peperit, pro suis nutrit*.

We will now turn to the position taken by his opponents, Cyprian and Firmilian. Their fundamental principle was: *Extra ecclesiam nulla salus*. They argued that, as the conceptions—Church and Baptism—were inseparable, they who allowed heretics the latter, must also allow them the former (73, 25. 75, 17. 71, 1.); that, as there is but one Church, there could be but one baptism (69, 2); that, as heretics worshipped at false altars and had no lawful priesthood, baptism, the efficiency of which rested on a normal episcopate, by them must necessarily be null (73, 4. 75, 7. 69, 1. 73, 1.); that, as the ark of Noah typified the oneness of Church and baptism, no one could be saved by heretical baptism, just as no one, outside the ark, was saved in the time of the deluge (69, 2. 74, 11. 75, 15.); that, like Church and Baptism, baptism and laying on of hands, forgiveness of sins and imparting of the Holy Ghost were inseparably connected; that, if heretics were able to communicate in baptism the forgiveness of sin, so, too, the Holy Ghost; that, as the Church only can beget children to God, he who has not

the Church for his mother has not God for his father; that as in the Church only are the Holy host and the keys, her officers alone can bless the baptismal water and the oil (73, 9. 69, 10. 1. 70, 3. 75, 14. 74, 6. 8. 70, 1. 2). From the language: *pro baptizato quam precem facere potest sacerdos sacrilegus et peccator*, it is plain Cyprian laid great stress on the moral character of the person baptizing, making it a condition of the sacrament.

With the opening of the 4th century, this question again became a subject of dispute. The Council of Arelate, convened by Constantine, 314, condemned the practice of the African Church, and decreed that persons baptized by heretics in the name of the Trinity should be received by the "laying on of hands." On the other hand, in the East, the Council of Nice, 325, ordered that the Paulicians, in case of a return to the Church, should be rebaptized. That of Laodicea (about 363) put the Montanists under the same rule, but excepted the Photians, the Quartodecimans, and Novatians. That of Constantinople (381) made necessary the baptism of Eunomians, Sabellians, and others, but recognized that of Arians, Macedonians, Novatians, Quartodecimans and Apollinarists. The Trullan Council (Can. 95), 692, repeated this, and ordered that the Manichæans, Valentinians, Marcionites (!), Nestorians, Eutychians, together with the disciples of Dioscurus and Severus, should be received on the recantation of their errors. Moreover, the Synodical decree of Carthage, in the time of Cyprian, the canons of Basil the Great, and the 85 Apostolic canons were recognized. Gieseler justly directs attention to the obscurity of these distinctions, ., § 69, Notes.

More stringent views were entertained by the chief teachers of the Greek Church: Athanasius, Gregory of Nazianzum, Basil the Great, Cyril of Jerusalem, who were of one mind with Cyprian and Firmilian (Comp. *Theiner*, das Heiligsdogma der kath. Kirche, p. 217. *Fass*, in *Illgens Zeitschrift*, 1828, IV., p. 121). They held that not only was the unchanged form of baptism, but, also, the orthodox faith of the Trinity on the part of the society baptizing, essential to the validity of the baptismal act. The Apostolical Canons, also, occupy the same position with these fathers, the 45th threatening with excommunication those who received heretics without the repetition of baptism. A milder view, however, gradually obtained, as may be inferred from the *quæst. et resp. ad Orthodox.*, according to which (qu. 14) error in faith could be corrected by a recantation of it, in baptism, by the *anointing*, in ordination by laying on of hands.—In the ceremony of receiving heretics who were subject to a second baptism, the Eastern Church anointed with consecrated oil (ἁγίον ἔλαιον) the forehead, the eyes, the nostrils, the mouth, and ears. It signified the same as the *manus impositio ad accipiendum sp. s.* of the Western, the reference to *pœnitentiam* excepted.

The controversy in North Africa broke out afresh, when the Donatists, who held that the acts of a priest in a state of mortal sin were invalid, rejected Catholic baptism and rebap-

tized Catholics who joined them. As they appealed to Cyprian, the Church found it necessary to reconsider the question. The language (Can. 14) with which Bishop Gratus concluded the Council at Carthage, 348, shows that the views both of Cyprian and Stephen were now considered extreme. (Comp. *Höfling*, l. c., p. 73.)

Hitherto, opinions on this subject had been more or less confused, and to Augustine belongs the credit of having reduced them to a system by means of a consistent logical theory. His fundamental thought on baptism in general is based on the objectiveness of the sacrament, and may be thus stated: As baptism was instituted by Christ, when administered in the name of the Trinity, it is His, of which men can only be stewards (*contra litt. Petil.* I., 5 Nro. 6; II., 24 Nro. 57). A distinction must be made between the sacrament as such (the external transaction), and its grace (*gratia, virtus*) which is independent of the character both of the administrator and the recipient, so that salvation is in no sense the work of human merit, but of Christ only (*de bapt.* V., 21 Nr. 29). The redemption that is mediated by the sacrament, is bestowed only on the converted (*ibid.* IV., 14 Nr. 21). Neither the misbelief and sin of the distributor, nor of the receiver, destroys the truth and integrity of the sacrament (*ibid.* IV. 15, Nr. 22). Unworthy persons receive it, but not its *gratia* or *virtus*, which becomes to them a cause of condemnation (*ibid.* IV., 9 Nr. 13).

On the basis of these truths, Augustine maintained the validity of heretical baptism by the following argumentation: 1) Baptism impresses an indelible character on the recipient, who may desert the Church. It can, therefore, exist out of the Church, (*ibid.* V., 14 Nr. 20) and Cyprian was wrong in arguing to the contrary from the close relationship between the Church and Baptism. The possession of the Church must be denied heretics and schismatics, but not baptism and the sacraments which they have taken with them from her (*ibid.* V., 16 Nr. 21), and, as the devil can have his own in the Church, so Christ, His, out of her (IV., 7 Nr. 10). When, therefore, a heretic baptizes in the name of the Trinity, the Church recognizes the baptism as that of Christ; and Cyprian was wrong in calling it *aqua adultera et profana*, because the holiness of the Sacrament cannot be stained by human sins (*ibid.* III., 10 Nr. 15). If the prayer of a sinful priest be heard on behalf of the recipient, so is that of a heretic (*ibid.* VII., 26 Nr. 51); if the former, in virtue of the Sacrament, can forgive sin, so can the latter (*ibid.* IV., 4 Nr. 5). Should a catholically minded Christian, in danger of death, and unable to procure a priest, be baptized by an heretic or schismatic, such baptism would be not only valid but also spiritually effective.—2) Though Augustine adopted Cyprian's maxim: *Extra ecclesiam nulla salus*, he did not from it infer the nullity of heretical baptism, but contended that it was of no profit so long as a man remained outside of the Church which alone had the *munus beatæ vitæ* (*ibid.* IV., 1 Nr. 1. cf. I., cap. 1–3). As love is the fulfilment of the law (*ibid.* III., 19 Nr. 26) he argued that they who separated from the unity of the Church,

disowned it, and, though they should possess everything, as the Apostle writes, 1 Cor, 13 : 1-3, even the sacraments (*μυστήρια* v. 2), without charity they were nothing (III., 16 Nr. 21). As the knowledge of God the heathen may have had served to increase their condemnation because of their idolatry (*de unico baptismo*, VI., Nr. 8), so the sacrament did but injure heretics, because of their perverseness. In the moment of their return, however, to the Church, the baptism received began to put forth its saving energy (*de baptismo* III., 13 Nr. 18).—3) As the hypocrite, or mere formalist (*fictus*), on his conversion, needs not a second baptism, so, likewise, the heretic, or schismatic. Upon the latter, by the laying on of hands and prayer, are conferred the gifts of Catholic unity, the Holy Ghost, and the love of God out of a pure heart and faith unfeigned (*de fide non ficta*), by means of which is opened up the way for the working of the grace of baptism (*ibid.* III., 16 Nr. 21). With Augustine this laying on of hands meant not simply Confirmation, but, also, reconciliation to the Church. In this sense he wrote (*ibid.* V., 23 Nr. 33): *Manus impositio si non adhiberetur ab hæresi venienti, tanquam extra omnem culpam esse judicaretur; propter charitatis autem copulationem, quod est maximum donum spiritus sancti, sine quo non valent ad salutem quacumque alia sancta in homine fuerint, manus hæreticis correctis imponitur.*—4) Through baptism are generated children unto God; whether derived, like Ishmael, from the servant that is, from heresy, or, like Isaac, from the lawful wife, that is, the Church, they belong to God and the Church. Ishmael, as later, Esau, became the son of a legitimate spouse, and was rejected because he would not keep the peace with his brother. Heresy is thus a servant to beget children unto God and his Church. If these preserve the fellowship with the brethren, they will not be excluded from the Church; if not, they will incur the fate of Ishmael (*ibid.* I., 14-15, Nr. 22-23).—5) In baptism, whether administered in or out of the Church, is given a character which can never be destroyed nor repeated; called by Augustine, *character dominicus* (VI., 1) or *regius* (contr. Gaudent. I., 12), and compared to the *nota militaris* impressed on the Roman warrior, which indicated his duty and witnessed against the deserter (*de baptismo* I., 4, Nr. 5).

So completely had Augustine determined the nature and limits of this subject, that nothing was left the Middle Ages to do but to develop more fully some of his inferences. In the following sentence, Leo the Great only repeats Augustine, this excepted, that he limits the laying on of hands to confirmation: *Qui baptismum ab hæreticis acceperunt, cum antea baptizati non fuissent sola invocatione sp. s. per impositionem manuum confirmandi sunt, quia formam tantum baptismi sine sanctificationis virtute sumpserunt* (ep. 129 ad Nicet., cap. 7). Peter Lombard expresses himself on laying on of hands in the following exact terms: *Ex his aperte colligitur, quod qui etiam ab hæreticis baptizati sunt, servato characterе Christi, rebaptizandi non sunt, sed tantum impositione manus reconciliandi, ut spiritum sanctum accipiant et*

in signum detestationis hæreticorum. According to Thomas Aquinas, who distinguished between the *sacramentum* (the bapt. act) and the *res sacramenti*, if heretics administered the sacraments according to the form of the Church, they imparted simply the *sacramentum*, not the *res sacramenti*; if not, neither; whilst they who received them at their hands restrained their effect (*Summa* p. III., qu. 66, Art. 9., qu. 64, Art. 9). If they used the form of the Church, Bonaventure acknowledged their baptism to be a true one, but affirmed their heresy to be a bar to its efficacy (*Comment. lib. IV., Dist. V., Art. 2. qu. 2*), and, as this sacrament cannot be repeated, it impresses a character on him who receives it as a *fictus*. This *fictio* removed, it avails for the forgiveness of sins before baptism, while those after it can only be removed by the sacrament of penance. So, also, Alexander of Hales (*Summa* p. IV., quæst. 8, Membr. 6., Art. 3. § 1). The Catholic dogma of Salvation is most clearly expressed in the following decree by Eugene IV., 1441 (*b. Coleti Concilia Tom. XVIII., p. 1225*): *Firmiter credit, profitemur et prædicat (sacrosancta Rom. eccl.) nullos intra catholicam ecclesiam non existentes, non solum paganos, sed nec Judæos aut hæreticos atque schismaticos æternæ vitæ fieri posse participes, sed in ignem æternum ituros, qui paratus est diabolo et angelis ejus, nisi ante finem vitæ eidem fuerint aggregati; tantumque valere ecclesiastici corporis unitatem, ut solum in ea manentibus ad salutem ecclesiastica sacramenta proficiant, et jejunia, eleemosynæ ac cætera pietatis officia et exercitia militiæ Christianæ præmiis æterna parturiant, neminemque, quantascumque eleemosynas fecerit, etsi pro Christi nomine sanguinem effuderit, posse salvari, nisi in catholica ecclesiæ gremio et unitate permanserit.*

The acknowledgment of heretical baptism required also that baptism in *extremis* not only by laymen, but also by women, Jews, and heathen, should be regarded as valid. Nicholas I. was the first to recognize this, in the case of Jews and heathen who administered it in the name of the Trinity, or—which is the same—of Jesus (*Resp. ad Consult. Bulgar., cap. 15. l. c. Mansi XV., p. 408*). In *Decret. pro Instruct. Armen.* (*b. Coleti, Tom. XVIII., p. 547*) Eugene IV., 1440, says: *In causa necessitatis non solum sacerdos et diaconus, sed etiam laicus et mulier imo etiam paganus et hæreticus baptizare potest, dummodo formam servet ecclesiæ et facere intendat, quod facit ecclesia.*

The decrees of the Council of Trent correspond to the development of this doctrine as above stated. They acknowledge the validity of heretical baptism when administered in the name of the Trinity and with the intention of the Church (*can. 4., de baptismo*). This *intentio faciendi, quod facit ecclesia*, led to the conditional baptism of converts from Protestantism, the form used being: If thou hast not been baptized, I baptize thee in the name, &c. In the case of those Calvinists who, as they baptized in public, could not be denied the general intention, although they might err in the particular and specific intention, this rule was withdrawn by a decision of Pius V., and by decrees of Councils of Rouen, 1581 (*Coleti*

XXI., p. 623); of Rheims, 1583 (*de baptismo* 10, p. 690); of Tours, 1583 (*de bapt.*, cap. 6, p. 315); of Aix, 1585 (*ibid.*, p. 943); of Toulouse, 1590 (*ibid.*, p. 1283); of Narbonne (*ibid.*, p. 1490, : 14). Comp. *Theiner*, das Seligkeitsdogma, p. 559, Anm. Hence originated the practice of receiving by penance and confirmation such heretics as had been baptized by the use of the right material (water) and the right form.

From the Augustinian theory, which the Catholic Church adopted, it follows that heretics can validly administer the other sacraments. Though, in his time, the number of sacraments had not been determined, he says in *lib. III., de bapt.*, cap. 15, No. 20: *Sacramenta, si eadem sunt, ubique integra sunt, etiamsi prave intelliguntur et discordiose tractantur*, and in many places recognizes the validity of heretical ordination (*e. g.*, *contra epist. Parm.* II., 13, No. 28). Perrone, the distinguished Catholic theologian, says (*tract. de sacr. in genere*, § 106) that the reasons which validate heretical baptism, also validate the other sacraments administered by them, penance excepted, for which they have not jurisdiction. These admissions, however, destroy the organic connection of Catholic theology, and render its scientific demonstration a difficult task. The Romish Catechism justifies them, as regards baptism, on the ground of its necessity, *P. II., cap. II., qu. 23: quum hoc sacramentum necessario ab omnibus percipiendum sit, quemadmodum aquam ejus materiam instituit, qua nihil magis commune esse potest; sic etiam neminem ab ejus administratione excludi noluit*. But the difficulty still remains, as, according to Catholic theology, all the sacraments are *ad salutem necessaria*.

Protestantism in general confessed the validity of baptism with water, in the name of the Trinity, which became efficient through the faith of the recipient. As Luther, adopting the Augustinian view, believed that the reality of the sacrament depended on the institution of Christ, and not on the character either of the person administering or receiving it, he hesitated not in ascribing true baptism to the Papacy, and combated the Anabaptists who insisted on its repetition. As the Reformers regarded the baptismal act as a *signum promissionem exhibens* of regeneration, not as its mediating cause, and held these two separable in time, they found no difficulty in admitting the validity of a regularly administered baptism by other confessions. In regard to the duty of parents towards their children, when they could not meet with a minister of their communion, though the Lutherans did not bewail as lost, infants who, by reason of sudden death, departed unbaptized, but entrusted them to the mercy of God (*Gerhard, loc. theol. XXI., § 210. Höfling, § 24*), they, nevertheless, ascribed to baptism a *necessitas ordinata, viz.*, the *necessitas præcepti et medii*, and recommended baptism *in extremis* by laymen, women, and even by the unbaptized (*Gerhard, loc. § 31*). As the Reformed Church, on the other hand, regarded children as members of the covenant of grace, in virtue of their birth within the Christian Church (*comp. 1 Cor. 7: 14*), it laid no stress on baptism *in extremis*. Calvin rejected it as a superstition, and confined its ad-

ministration to the Church authorities (*Inst., lib. IV., cap. 15., §§ 20-22*). Hence, it is not difficult to understand how Peter Martyr could warn the English churches against allowing Lutheran ministers to baptize their children *propter diversitatem fidei, pietatis et conscientiarum*. He wrote to them: *Profecto infantes vestri de salute non periclitantur, si absque baptismo intereant, quia nec gratiæ Christi, nec prædestinationis effecta externis rebus et sacramentis sunt adligantur*. In the absence of a Reformed minister, he permitted Reformed elders to have them baptized by a Roman Catholic priest, provided it was rightly done, and they detested the accompanying superstitions (*in Calvini tractat. theol. omnes Genev. 1597, fol. 610*).

In one respect, Protestantism went back of the Augustinian position to the older dogmatic view. Though Joh. Gerhard affirmed the use of water and of the right form to be the essentials of a true baptism, yet he always presupposed that the recipient was in the bosom of an orthodox Trinitarian Church (§ 27). Höfling, also, regarded this last point as absolutely indispensable (p. 71), as by the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, names might, otherwise, be invoked to which a meaning was attached different from that intended by the true Church. The Reformed Ebrard (*christl. Dogmatik II., 600*), likewise asserts baptism by those who disbelieve the fundamentals of the Christian system to be invalid, even when administered by water and the right form. This view makes the form of baptism rest in the faith of the baptizing congregation in the Trinity; making baptism an act of the Christian Church, it allows its administration only to such persons who are members of the same, and so denies its administration to the unbaptized, to heathen, and to Jews.

A few words concerning the difference between the Catholic and Protestant view of this subject. In order to save itself from the consequences of its maxim: *Extra ecclesiam nulla Salus*, which the rejection of heretical baptism would have imposed, the Romish Church adopted the theory of Augustine. This theory is: A true baptism may be administered outside of the Church, because it is the sacrament of Christ; it does not, however, benefit the heretic or schismatic, but becomes efficient only when he returns to the Church. The error of this view lies in a one-sided conception both of the Church and of heresy, which implies deviation from doctrine and separation from the Church to be, as such, morally wrong, and mortal sins. In the time of Augustine, when there was one universal Church that opposed the sects and held to the Holy Scriptures, there was, no doubt, more or less reason for its being regarded as absolutely true. But, in our day, the Romish Church is but one of many Churches, and places her apostolic traditions above the Bible. As Protestantism opposes Catholicism that it may not oppose Christ and His word, the censure pronounced by Augustine against heretics as enemies of Christ does not affect it. If love to man is of more worth than love to God, then, indeed, does Protestantism fall under his condemnation when he says that heretics cannot receive the benefit of baptism because they

the highest gift of the Spirit, which is love. The history of Protestantism has triumphantly disproved the sophism of Augustine—the *ἀπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ* of the Romish dogma—that schism as such is a moral evil. The Roman Church has never been able to show why laymen and heretics should be competent to perform a valid baptism and marriage, and yet incompetent for the discharge of the other sacraments. When, on account of the *character indelebilis*, and *nota militaris*, this Church claims the person baptized as her property, to secure which she may even use force, she practises an abuse extremely pernicious.

Whilst Protestantism asserted the objective reality of this sacrament and its independency, touching its operation, of the character of the administrator, it based it on a more scriptural view of the Church, and improved it by distinguishing between the visible and invisible Church. To its apprehension this invisible Church was not a mere abstraction, but the body of Christ, which, as the *communio sanctorum*, embraced true believers of every age and clime, and exhibits itself in particular Churches as in so many temporary and perishable forms. To the Church alone in its most comprehensive and perfect sense belong the attributes of unity, universality, holiness, and infallibility; to its several manifestations, only so far as these are incorporated in it and partake of its ideal perfection. By means of this principle, the Augustinian theory is set free from its contradictions. As the property of Christ, baptism is designed for His Church, and can be effective to salvation only in it; but, as every ecclesiastical society intends to receive the recipient into the Church, every baptism administered in the sense of the Trinitarian creed, is a true Christian one, and, when received by a living faith, accomplishes that whereunto it was appointed. Protestantism thus acknowledges the validity of every baptism by a Christian society which believes in the Trinity and performs it in this name.

G. E. STEITZ.—*Ermentrout*.

Heriger, Abbot of Lobbes.—The revival of the sciences which marked the close of the 10th cent., has received far too little consideration, and has been unjustly attributed to the efforts of Gerbert alone. Along the Lower Rhine, in Lorraine, and North France, the classics, dialectics, and mathematics, were zealously studied at all the cathedral and monastic schools. Liege became eminent as the abode of the muses, and the monastery Lobbes or Lobach, on the Sambre, in Hennegau, which was closely connected with the See of Liege, was almost considered the high-school of the Liège clergy. And the most distinguished teacher at Lobbes was Heriger. He was born c. 960–70. He probably came to Liege from Flanders in 965, with Fulkuin (who then became abbot of L.), or with B. Notker, who, in 972, was transferred from the imperial court, or St. Gall, to Lorraine. Heriger soon acquired a reputation in Lobbes and Liege, as a teacher and writer. He paid special attention to the history of his country. At first he wrote poetical narratives for purposes of edification, and the use of the schools (as his *de S. Servatio*, and *vita S. Ursuari*).

Then he wrote *Gesta episcoporum Tungrensis, Trajectensium et Leodiensium*, c. 979; it reaches only to the 7th cent., and dwells disproportionately long upon the life of St. Remaclus. It is still extant. In 980 he prepared, at B. Notker's request, for the use of Abbot Womarus at Ghent, a *vita S. Landoaldi*.—After Fulkuin's death the monks of Lobbes chose Heriger as his successor. The Bishops of Liege and Cambrai consecrated him on Dec. 21, 990. Thenceforth he devoted himself to problems requiring mathematical and dialectical solutions, and threw himself into the midst of those scientific discussions, in which Gerbert took the lead: determining the period of Advent and Easter, &c. This led him to write: *epist. Herig. ad quemdam Hugonem monachum*; *dialogus Herig. et Adelb. Trajectensis postero tempore episcopi de aduentu Domini celebrando*. Mathematics is indebted to him for his *Regulæ de abaco*, or *Reg. numerorum super abacum Gerberti*, though subsequent advances in this science rendered it ridiculous.—Heriger also took part in the doctrinal discussions of his day. Ratherius, B. of Verona and Liege, had (957) published the work of Pasch. Radbertus on transubstantiation, the doctrine of which was far from being regarded with general favor. Its reissue by Ratherius revived the controversy on the subject. Of Heriger it is said: *concessit etiam contra Radbertum multa cathol. patrum scripta de corpore et sanguine Domini*, and there are several MSS. treatises on this subject, over Heriger's name, which were formerly ascribed to an *Anonymous Cellotianus*, and later to Gerbert. Mabillon has proven Heriger to be the author. Heriger's treatise exhibits the position of doctrinal development toward the close of the 10th cent. *Tritheimius* says Heriger also wrote two books *de divinis officiis*. He is hardly the author of *vita S. Berlandis*, *vita S. Landelini*, *vita Hadelini*.—He died Oct. 31, 1007, and was buried in the church of St. Ursmar, Lobbes, in front of the altar of St. Thomas, which he built.—(See *SIGBERT's de viris illustr.*, c. 137. *TRITHEMIUS de scriptor. ecclesiast.*, c. 306; *chron. Hirsaug. ad a.*, 979. *MABILLON's Annales ord. S. Bened.*, IV., 60, 178. *Hist. littér. de France* VII., 194–208; 472–6. *KÖPKE in Monum. Germ. histor. Script.*, VII., 134, &c. *ALBRECHT VOGEL's Ratherius von Verona u. d. 10. Jahrh.* I., 238–9; II., 8, 46–49). **ALBRECHT VOGEL.***

Hermann von dem Busche belonged to the zealous adherents of Reuchlin. He was the first German nobleman who sought to promote science and classical learning by becoming a public teacher. His attachment to the Humanists of the age, and his travels to Italy, France, the Netherlands, and England, brought him into contact with many learned men. He was born 1468, in Sassenberg; his father was Burchard v. d. Busche, and his mother Barbara v. Shedelich. He had one brother, Burchard, who became canon of Minden, and survived Hermann. After spending some time in Heidelberg in the study of Cicero's works, he went, 1485, with Rudolph v. Lange, canon of Münster, to Italy. From Italy he returned to Heidelberg, published *Carminum Lib.*, II., for which he was made *Mag. Art.* Soon afterwards his friend Count Her-

nann v. Nuenar, canon of Cologne, a Reuchlinist, called him as teacher of the classics. There he soon became involved in a bitter controversy with Hoogstraten (see Art.). He left Cologne and taught the classics successively in Hamm, Münster, Osnabrück, Bremen, Hamburg, Lübeck, and Rostock. In 1510 he received a call to Wittenberg, but there, also, became entangled in quarrels which led him to return to Leipsic. Envious opposition drove him from Leipsic to Magdeburg, thence he went to Braunschweig, Hildesheim, the Netherlands, and England. In 1517 Nuenar recalled him to Cologne, but Hoogstraten and his party compelled him to leave the second time. He then (1518) became rector of the school in Wesel. There he wrote *Vallum humanitatis*: Col., 1518; Freft. ad M., 1719, an apologetic work, and diligently read the writings of Luther and Melanchthon, which led him to study the Bible and Church Fathers. In 1522 he went to Wittenberg to pursue these studies under Luther and Melanchthon themselves. In 1526 Philip of Hessen called him as Prof. of History at the new University of Marburg. During his time he married, and became the father of one son, Jerome. After some years he retired to his estate at Dülmen, Münster, where he died in 1534, his son having departed shortly before him. Besides the works named H. wrote *Epigrammation*; *Triplex Hecatostichon*; *Scholia in Aeneida*; *Annot. ad Juvén., &c. &c.*—(See MEIER's Lebensbeschr. berühmte Männer, II., 392. *Epist. trium virorum, &c., ad Herm. Comitem, &c.*; *Ejusdem respons., &c.*: Col., 1518; *Selctadii*, 1519; *Mogunt.* KNAPP's Nützliche Urkunden zur Reformationsgesch., II., 425. HAEUPELMANN, *Oratio de vita, &c., Herm. Buschii*, in JOH. GOES, *Opusc. varia. de Westphal., &c.*: Helmst., 1668, 4to.). NEUDECKER.*

Hermann von Fritzlar, a mystic of the 14th cent. He was probably a wealthy layman, like Nicholas of Basel, and was led by political and religious disturbances, or an unhappy marriage, to retire from the world, and seek the society of likeminded friends. An earlier work of his, "Die Blume der Schauung," seems to be lost; but his "Heiligenleben," has been published in PFEIFFER's deutschen Mystik. d. 14. Jahrh. I., 258, from a MS. written under H.'s supervision. It is composed of selections from sources of which some no longer exist, and is valuable for the history of the German mysticism of that period. PFEIFFER.*

Hermann of Lehnin, is named as the author of the notorious Lehnin prophecy¹, in the inscription, and called a monk of the monastery Lehnin in Mark Brandenburg, c. 1300. In a hundred leonine hexameters, the prophecy de-

scribes the future fate of the monastery and country at large, and predicts evil to the foes of Rome, especially the successive dynasties of Brandenburg, after 1321. After much discussion as to the actual date of the poem, it is now ascertained that it first appeared in the last decades of the 17th cent., in Berlin, and was not written earlier. The Privy Councillor, Seidel († 1693), the Master of horse, Oelven († 1727), Nicholas of Zitzewitz († 1709), the Jesuit, Peter F. Wolf of Breslau († 1708), the Berlin Provost, Fromm († 1685) have been severally claimed as its author; and the extensive literature upon it, is almost more remarkable than the fiction itself. Of the works devoted to it we name: 1) Dr. GIESELER, Erfurt, 1849. 2) Dr. MEINHOLD, a) *Das Vatic. Lehninense, &c.*; b) *die Weissagung, &c.*: Lpzg., Fritzsche, 1849. 3) Dr. GUHRAUER, *die Weissag. v. Lehnin*. Breslau, 1850. 4) OTTO WOLF, *d. berühmte Lehn. Weissag.* Grünberg, 1850. 5) Dr. M. W. HEFFTER, *d. Gesch. d. Klosters Lehnin, &c.*: Brandenburg, 1851. C. F. GÖSCHEL.*

Hermann von Salza, was a descendant of a noble family of Thuringia, of that name, resident in Salza (Langensalzen). Our earliest accounts of him locate him near Jerusalem, where, 1210, he became Grand Master of the order of German Knights, established c. 1190. His zeal and ability soon made the order renowned, and we find Hermann now in the East, now in Italy, now in Germany, near the Emperor, and near the Pope, everywhere acquiring increasing influence. In 1219 he took the most prominent part in the conquest of Damietta; in 1228 he was in the crusade of Frederick II., and in 1229 entered Jerusalem with the Emperor. In the West we often find him engaged in the Emperor's service, and in that of the Pope, for which many gifts and privileges were bestowed upon his order. To all this he added earnest efforts for the Christianization of Prussia (see Art.), so that it was said of him:

Hermannus Prussos Christi sub vota coëgit.

He died on Palm Sunday, March 20, 1239. He has frequently afforded a fertile theme for poets, among whom we name Zach. Werner, and E. Raupach. — (See *Analecta Saxonica*, 1765, Th. I., p. 35–73, 111–169, 186–198, 317–330. J. F. BÖHMER, *Regesta imperii*. JOH. VOIGT, *Gesch. Preuss., &c.*, II., 68–368. FR. RAUMER, *Gesch. d. Hohenst.*, III., VI., *Die Vorzeit*: Jahrg. 1820, 21, 22, 24, 25, 26, 27. CARL VON SALZA, *d. edlen Herren v. S.*: Lpz., 1838. C. F. GÖSCHEL, *Chronik d. Stadt Langensalza*, 1818, Bd. I., *Zerstreute Blätter aus d. Hand-u. Hilfs-Acten eines Juristen*, III., Abth. 2, p. 40, &c.). C. F. GÖSCHEL.*

¹ It begins:

1) *Nec tibi cum cura, Lehnin, cano fata futura,*
2) *Quæ niki monstravit Dominus, qui cuncta creavit.*
Lines—

28) *Ex humili surgis, binis nunc inclyte Burgis*

29) *Accendisque facem, jactando nomine pacem,*

are supposed to refer to the Elector Frederic I.

But the prophetic zeal of the vaticination first blazes out strongly in view of the apostasy of the house and country of Brandenburg from Rome (1539). The Electress Elizabeth, wife of Joachim I., is described as another Eve.

42) *Inferet at tristem patrias tunc fœmina pestem,*

43) *Fœmina serpentis tæbe contacta recentia.*

This evil should extend to her eleventh descendant.

49) *Hoc et ad undenum durabit stemma venenum.*

Of Joachim II. it is said:

52) *Ecclesiam vastat, bona religiosa subhastat*

53) *Ite, meus populus, protector est tibi nullus,*

54) *Hora donec veniet, nova quæ restitutio fiet.*

It ends with a prediction of the ultimate triumph of the Papacy:

100) *Nec lupus nobili plus insidiatur ovili.*

Hermann, Elector and Archbishop of Cologne (*Count von Wied*), was distinguished as a man and a prince, for his love of justice, truth, and every good cause. Regardless of personal sacrifices, he co-operated with Melancthon, Bucer, &c., in introducing the Reformation into his principality, though an early reaction took place, and cost him his civil and ecclesiastical dignities. He was the fourth son of Count Frederick von Wied, and was born Jan. 14, 1477. After the death of his (probably eldest) brother Adam, he became canon of Cologne, and after the death of the electoral-archb. Philip, of Cologne, he was elected (1515) Archbishop of Cologne, confirmed by Leo X. as Hermann V., and recognized by the empire as Elector. He attended the Frankfort Diet which elected Charles V., presented to him the sword and sceptre at Aix-la-Chapelle, anointed and crowned him. At first he acted with the friends of Rome against the evangelical cause, but on becoming better acquainted with its merits he changed his views and plans, and devised measures for its establishment in his diocese. With a view to further reform he called a provincial Synod of his bishops at Cologne, where favorable resolutions were actually passed. *John Gropper* attended this Synod. This encouraged Hermann. After the Synod he visited the Elector of Brandenburg and Saxony. On his way back he became acquainted with Melancthon. In 1540 he went with Mettmann and Gropper, in whose sincerity he still trusted, to the diet at Hagenu, there he met Bucer, and invited him and Hedio to visit Bonn. Bucer was with him in 1542, and after some consultations with Gropper and the suffragan, B. John Stapp, he left, promising to return in the following year; but he came back only in Dec., 1542. In March, 1543, H. summoned his estates for further consultation, when Gropper and the Cologne clergy openly opposed Bucer as a heretic. Meanwhile Melancthon, Hedio, and others arrived, in concert with whom Bucer prepared a plan of reform, which provided merely for a simple, evangelical Church service, without setting forth any doctrinal confession. The temporal estates approved the scheme, but the clergy denounced it, and demanded the dismissal of Bucer and his friends. Melancthon left on July 28, but Bucer, Hedio, and Sarcerius were not dismissed until August. At the diet of Spire, Hermann was accused of favoring the Reformation, but he entered a *Libellum dimissorium*. The Emperor now, also, opposed him, and in June, 1545, issued a decree declaring that he took the Cologne clergy and Archepiscopal See under his protection. On July 10 Hermann appealed to a general Council, but on the 18th already Paul III. cited him to appear in Rome within 60 days, whilst Charles V. summoned him to Brussels within 30 days, to answer certain charges against him. Hermann sent a delegate to defend him before Charles, but disregarded the Pope's citation, who issued a brief of suspension against him on Jan. 8, 1546, and on April 16, a bull of deposition. Still H. continued to hold his See, and even on July 7, Charles addressed him by letter as Archb. H. appealed from the Papal bull to a Council, but ineffectually. A succes-

sor was appointed to his See, and to avoid further disturbances H. resigned his offices, retired to Wied, and died there, Aug. 15, 1552. Adolph of Schaumburg, his successor, restored the papacy in the land.—(See J. Str. Recl. Gesch. d. gräf. u. fürstl. Häuser Isenburg, Runkel, Wied, &c.: Weimar, 1825, p. 137, &c. J. P. Bero's Reformationsgesch. d. Länder Jülich, &c., von Ludwig Tross. Hamm, 1825, p. 64, &c. SECKENDORF, *Hist. Luth.*, III., s. 12, § 50, p. 137; s. 27, § 108, p. 443, &c. &c. PLANK, *Gesch. d. prot. Lehrbegr.*.) NEUDECKER.*

Hermann, Heriman Contractus, the lame, a monk of Reichenau, was one of the most learned men of the 11th cent., and of the best German Chronists. He was born July 18th, 1013, the son of a pious Count, Wolferat II., of Verzen, and Hiltrude, a woman of active beneficence. Being lame, and one of 14 children, he was placed, in his seventh year, in a monastery, probably that of Reichenau, then in high repute for learning, under Abbot Berno. He engaged zealously in his studies, especially mathematics, astronomy, music, poetry, and history, wrote learned books and Latin hymns, made clocks and musical and mechanical instruments. His contemporaries called him the wonder of his age. He commenced his annals 1048, having shortly before seen Henry III. on the occasion of the consecration of the Church of St. Mark in Reichenau. To 1044 his work is based on older chronicles, thence to 1054 it records personal observations, which are valuable for the history of the Emperor. He also wrote a special history of Conrad II., and Henry III., which is lost. His chronicles were first printed, from a now lost MS., in 1529, by Sichard, in Basel; the latest edition, in PERTZ, *Monum. Germ.*, Vol. V., was printed from a Reichenau and Munich MS., and has been translated by K. Nöbbe, (15. Liefg. d. Geschichtschreiber d. deutsch. Vorzeit). H. died in September, 1504, and was buried on his father's property in Alshausen, beside his ancestors. KLÜPFEL.*

Hermann, Nicholas, a hymnist and composer of the 16th cent., "der alte fromme Cantor," of Joachimthal, Bohemia, the friend of his pastor Matthesius, whose sermons furnished material for his hymns. Of his public life, little is known. He led a retired life, and in old age was sorely afflicted. His hymns exhibit him as a tried Christian, and friend of children; they have less of the objective character of strictly liturgical compositions, and are rather suited to the personal experiences of daily domestic life. He wished them to be regarded as "Kinder-u. Hauslieder." He also composed several tunes. He died May 5, 1561.—His works are: *Evangelia auf alle Sonn u. Festtage in Gesängen*, &c.: Wittenberg, 1560; *Hist. v. d. Sündfluth*, Joseph, Mose, Elia, &c., in rhymes: Lpz., 1563.—(See GERVINUS, *poet. National-Lit.*, Bd. III. WACKERNAGEL, *deutsch. K.-lied*, &c., 1841. KOCH, *Gesch. d. K.-lieds*, Bd. I. LEDDERHOSE, *Matthes u. N. Hermann*: Halle, 1855.)

J. WAGENMANN.*

Hermas, the author of an ancient writing entitled *Pastor* (ποιμήν) not to designate the character of its contents, but because the angelus penitentie, who communicated the revela-

ons to Hermas, appeared *habitu pastorali*, and ys: "*Ego sum PASTOR ille, cui traditus es*" (*land. Pro-cemium*). It was originally written Greek, but, with the exception of a few fragments (especially in the "*Doctrina ad Antiochum*" *Gallandii Bibl.*, I., XXVII.) now exists only in a Latin translation. It contains a series of apocalyptic visions, and their import. As we have it, the book is divided into three parts: *Visiones*; II. *Mandata*; III. *Similitudines*.—The *Visiones* begin with the personal relations of Hermas himself, who had committed a sin, and is exhorted to repent (*Vis.* 1), but in the first vision already the condition of the whole Church comes under review, and in *Vis.* 2 it is urged to repent, whilst in *Vis.* 3 and 4 motives for this are set forth, viz., in the 3d the approximate completion of the Church, and in the 4th the act of approaching persecutions. In part II. details are mentioned, and a number of rules revealed by obeying which the Church may secure moral renovation.¹ Part III. aims at producing the same effect, by means of simple *similitudes* and more extended visions.—In order to ascertain the significance of this book, it is indispensable to realize the condition of the Church in that age. The Church had outlived the freshness of youth, had become like an aged woman (*Vis.* I., 2; II., 11). Many had fallen away, others grown cold and carnal, others had been ensnared by the incipient errors of Gnosticism.² The original simple Church-organization still continued. Presbyters are at the head of the congregations, Hermas knows nothing of Bishops, only Clemens (*Vis.* II., 4) seems prominent in the presbyterial college as a sort of *primus inter pares*, entrusted with the correspondence with distant congregations. But Hermas complains of a hierarchical tendency in the Church, of presbyters aspiring after honorable positions (*Vis.* III., 9; *Simil.* VIII., 7, &c.); of their relaxing discipline among themselves (*Vis.* III., 9); of their dissensions (*Vis.* III., 9, &c.; the passover controversy?) Against these evils Hermas directs his admonitions, with the motives already named. The end of the world is near, "*cito consummabitur turris*" (*Vis.* III., 8), but God grants a brief delay that men may repent (*Sim.* IX., 5, 14: "*Et ideo intermissio facta est struendi, ut, si hi egerint pœnitentiam, adjiciantur in structuram turris*").

This book exhibits an ethical reaction from the growing laxity of the Church, in favor of stricter morals, and earlier simplicity in life and in the government of the Church. Hermas

belongs, therefore, to the great reactionary movement of the 2d cent., and which culminated in Montanism. Indeed his book was not alone in its kind, as an utterance of free prophecy, for the predictions of Eldad and Medad (*Numb.* 11: 26, 29) cited in *Vis.* II., 3, must have belonged to the same class of unofficial prophecies. Still we find traces of a doctrinal tendency, also, as in *Mand.* IV., 3, the discussion of the doctrine of no repentance after baptism.—But what relation did H. sustain to Montanism? COTELIER designates it as "*propugnaculum fidei cathol. adv. Montani duritiam*" (so HEFELE, *PP. AA. Proleg.*, p. 83, and others); but DORNER (*Doctr. of the person of Christ*) makes H. the forerunner of Montanism (so RITSCHL, *Gesch. d. altkathol. K.*, 546, &c.). HILGENFELD (*Apost. VV.* p. 178), however, denies all relation of the *Pastor* to Mont., whether for or against, and suggests a stronger analogy with the warnings of the Ebionites, uttered by the prophet Elxai. But whatever the external relationship between H. and Mont. may have been, the evidences of an inward affinity are obvious. The same leading subjects are prominent in both. The analogy with the Elxaitic prophecies, however, hardly holds, because they are essentially doctrinal. At the same time H. does not go the full length of Mont., but rather opposes what became its extreme views. Free prophecy does not stand in actual conflict with the regular ministry of the Church; H. desires the presbyters to communicate his revelation to the congregations. The reaction is not extra ecclesia. And further, whilst H., like the Montanists, believes himself to be in *novissimis*, there is still a *dilatatio* intervening. This delay affords time for repentance, which is possible after baptism (*Mand.* IV.). Hermas likewise admits of some progressive development in the Church, whereas Mont. is all for reaction (*Vis.* III., 11, &c.). The ascetic demands of Hermas are, also, less severe; he allows second marriages, enjoins no fasts, does not so rigidly require martyrdom, &c. (*Simil.* I.). Whilst, therefore, the *Pastor* furnishes a parallel with Montanism, it exhibits a reaction of a milder and more conservative form.—To a proper estimate of the doctrinal system of Hermas, the aim and position of the book must be kept in view. It has been too commonly regarded as judaistic. But this judgment needs limitation. The Christology of the book is decidedly not Ebionistic. The Son of God existed before all creatures, took part in the creation (*Sim.* IX., 12, 14). Hermas has been thought to identify Christ with the Holy Ghost simply as a virtue proceeding from the Father, from a misapprehension of *Sim.* V. The Son of God in *consummatione apparuit*, by his sufferings removed the sins of mankind, and opened the way to heaven, into which those who receive him, shall enter (*Sim.* IX., 12; V., 6). This is done through baptism, which is magically conceived of, and as effecting an outward union with God. *Fides* is simply *f. in Deum*, not in *Christum*; faith in one God and his law, so that all stress is laid upon obedience to it (*Sim.* VI., 1). If man sins after baptism, pardon may be *once more* obtained, but then only by rendering personal satisfaction, it must be

¹ *Mand.* I. *De fide in unum Deum*; II. *De fugienda obrectatione, et elemosyna facienda in simplicitate*; III. *De fugiendo mendacio*; IV. *De dimittenda adultera*; V. *De tristitia cordis et patientia*; VI. *De agnoscendis uniuscujusque hominis duobus genis et utriusque inspirationibus*; VII. *De Deo timendo et dæmone non timendo*; VIII. *Declinandum est a malo et facienda bona*; IX. *Postulandum a Deo assidue et sine hesitatione*; X. *De animi tristitia et non contristando Spiritum Dei, qui in nobis est*; XI. *Spiritus et prophetas probari ex operibus, et de duplici spiritu*; XII. *De duplici cupiditate. Dei mandata non esse impossibilia et diabolum non metuendum credentibus*.

² *Vis.* III., 7: "*Qui crediderunt quidem, dubitatione autem sua reliquerunt vitam suam veram, putantes se meliorem posse invenire.*"

earned (*Sim. VI.*; *Mand. IV.*, 4).—The doctrinal character of the book explains the importance it acquired. Irenæus cites it as *γραφή* (*adv. hæc.*, IV.). Clem. Alex. refers to it (*Strom.* I., 29; II., 1; VI., 15, &c.). Origen, who identifies the author with Hermas in Rom. 16: 14, says of the book, "*valde utilis et ut puto divinitus inspirata*," though not generally received (*Explan. in Ep. ad Rom.*, l. c.; *Hom.* 8, in Num.; *Hom.* 1, in Ps. 37; *ad Matth.* 24: 32, &c.), and by some rejected (*De princ.*, IV., 2, 8; *Philocal.* c. 1). The canon Muratori recommends its being read *privatim*, but not publicly in the churches. Subsequently, when the Montanist controversy arose, the book satisfied neither party. Tertullian, who names it without disapproval in *de orat.* 12, speaks of it in *de pudic.*, c. 2, as "*illo apocrypho Pastore mæchorum*," and in c. 10, says all reckon it "*inter apocrypha et falsa*." It shared the same fate in the West. Jerome, *Catal.*, c. 10, says: "*apud Latinos pæne ignotus est*." It held its position longer in the Greek Church. Athanasius, *de Incarn. verbi*, I., 3, speaks "*τῆς ὑπερμεγίστης βιβλίου τοῦ Ποιμένος*," though he does not consider it canonical (*Opp.* II., 963). Eusebius, III., 25, reckons it among the *σὺδα*, though many still esteemed it (III., 3; Jerome *Catal.*, c. 10). It may have injured its reputation that the Arians appealed to it (*Athan. ep. ad Afros*, *Opp.* I., II., 895). The stichometry of Nicephorus reckons it among the Apoc. of the New Test.—The *authorship* of the book was early in dispute. Origen on Rom. 16: 14, refers it to apostolic times, and Irenæus and Clem. Alex. must have shared this view. But the canon Muratori assigns it to a later Hermas, a brother of B. Pius of Rome (142–57; cf. van GILSE, *Disput. de antiq. ll. ss. N. T. catalogo: Amstelod.*, 1852, p. 18). Subsequently opinions are divided. That the book was not written during the Apostolic period, by the Hermas mentioned in Rom. 16, requires no proof; and yet it evidently claims this origin (*Vis.* II., 4), Clemens being named as a cotemporary. All that can be definitely said is, that the book was written about the middle of the 2d cent., and in Rome (*Vis.* I., 1; IV., 1, &c. Semler erroneously assumes Egypt). The author was not a presbyter, but a layman, and probably a tradesman (*Vis.* III., 1).—Editions: *Pastor*, 1513, by Faber Stapulensis; then by Cotelier and Clericus (*PP. App.*), this edition is chiefly the basis of later ones, as that of Gallandi in the *Bibl.*, Tom. I. The edition of Anger and Dindorf, though the Greek text may not be genuine, consulted for the Latin text, a MS. of the Dresden library not previously used (cf. ANGER, *Synopsis*, p. XXIV.—Literature: GRATZ, *Disq. in Past. Hermæ*, Bonnæ, 1820. LÜCKE, *Einl. in d. Offenb. Joh.*, p. 142. HEFELÉ *Proleg. to the PP. AA.*, and in the *Tübing. theol. Quartalschr.*, 1839, p. 169. JACHMANN, *der Hirte Hermas: Königsb.*, 1835. HILGENFELD, *Apost. VV.*: Halle, 1853, p. 125, &c. CAVE, *Hist. Liter.*). G. UHLHORN.*

Hermeneutics, Biblical.—Understanding by Hermeneutics, in the general sense of the term, a systematic theory of the laws and principles by which the sense of a written document is to be deduced from its letter, and looking at the

Bible in the light simply of an ancient writing, a portion of the world's religious literature, there might seem to be no reason to speak of any particular biblical discipline under the name: the interpretation of the Bible, in this view, would call only for an application of the general science to its special contents. But these contents are more than any ordinary human record; they involve a divine revelation; and hence the question arises, whether with this character the Bible does not require a system of interpretation materially different from that which is applied to other writings. This question then, answered as we may, makes it necessary to know and say what the principles are in truth by which the Bible, as such, is to be expounded. It is plain, moreover, that these need to be exhibited in the form of a *scientific theory*. The Bible is, indeed, sufficient of itself to make even the unlearned wise unto salvation. But the extreme assertion of certain sects, as also of particular enthusiasts and fanatics, that it needs no learned interpretation at all, is at once refuted by the simple fact, that all interior access to it supposes first an outward access—so much, at least, as is offered by a translation of it into the vernacular tongue, which is itself a process of exposition with special claims to learning. To transfer such a book from a dead to a living language, from the past to the present, from the relations and surroundings of its own origin to the wholly different circumstances of other countries and times, demands, it is easy to see, a very large amount of science. At the same time the outward is so joined here with the inward, that the religious element itself can never be fully comprehended apart from the help of such science; as in no other way can it be possible to distinguish properly between temporary form and absolute substance, so as to reach the one through the other. As we need then a science of theology for the true religion in general, so do we need also a science of biblical hermeneutics as one of its particular branches or departments. What place it must take in the general system is plain. Having to do with the determination of the sense which is contained in the letter of the Bible, regarded as a written document, it belongs to *historical* theology, and particularly to that division of this whose province it is to inquire into the origin and ground of revealed religion, called sometimes *philologia sacra*. It presupposes, of course, what goes under the name of *biblical introduction*, including all that pertains to the settlement of the canon; as also *biblical criticism*, which fixes and determines the text. Its relations to what comes after itself, in the order of theological science, will appear as we proceed.—By hermeneutics we mean a theory of interpretation. To interpret is to bring to understanding the sense contained in the written word, that is, to find this and to represent it, as a series of thoughts expressed in a given form of language. It is not enough that the sense be found; it must be represented also or expounded, so that it shall be made to pass into the understanding of others. So Augustine, *de doctrina christiana*, lib. I., c. 1, tells us: *Duc res, quibus nititur omnis tractatus scripturæ, modus inveniendi quæ intelligenda*

rent, et modus proferendi quæ intellecta sunt." The business of interpretation is then only properly complete, when the sense of Scripture is made to be intelligible for the general mind.

Considered now first as the *finding of the sense from the word*, it is plain that interpretation cannot be simply *real*, occupying itself with things and making no account comparatively of the forms of language in which they are expressed; and just as little, or still less even, can it be simply *verbal*, having to do with words only in their outward view, as a matter of lexicography and grammar. The relation between words and things, in all language, is not outward, but inward and organic, like that between the body and the soul, which are joined together in the unity of a common life. Interpretation, then, to be true and complete, must regard both at the same time. Contents and form must be allowed to interpenetrate each other. This involves again something farther. What is put into word can be fully understood, only as it is comprehended like any other fact, in its living causes, the inward and outward influences, namely, which have determined the mind of the writer in his use of language. Interpretation, thus, while it regards immediately single combinations of word and sense, cannot stop with these. The single is conditioned always by what is more general than itself; in the case before us, every text by its context, then again by the scope of the particular book to which it belongs, and through this finally by the spirit and sense of the Bible at large. The business of interpretation is not to construct the general, or the whole from the single; but to bring out rather the true sense of the single, in and by the light of the whole.

The sense of any writing is simply a matter of historical fact. In this view, interpretation aiming to determine the meaning of the Bible, must necessarily be *philological*. This includes two sides, a corporeal and a spiritual. In the first view it must be *grammatico-historical*, resting purely on the outward letter. But the case involves, besides such mere letter, the presence of a peculiar individual life, the soul of things spoken or done in a particular way; and in apprehending this, the method before us must show itself also *historico-psychological*. The conjunction of these two processes gives us in full what we are to understand by philological interpretation. It is not necessary to enter into details here in regard to its means and methods. See on the subject *Schleiermacher*, *Hermeneutik*; *Luz*, *Bib. Herm.*; and *Hahn*, *Stud. u. Krit.*, 1830, II.).

Of more account for us is the question, whether the Bible is to be interpreted *only philologically* like every other ancient writing, as some say, or also *theologically*, as others contend, in view of its being an inspired record of divine truth.

It is plain enough, on the one hand, that the interpretation of the Bible as an inspired and sacred book cannot take its start in theological exposition; it must be primarily philological, and the other method can be regarded as coming in, not to set this aside, but only to modify it, and to raise it as it were into a higher sphere. But it is equally certain, on the other hand, that

the true philological method, in the case of such a book, must of itself pass over into the theological; inasmuch as this method itself requires, that every writing should be explained from its own standpoint, and in the light of its peculiar constitution. One of the first hermeneutical canons is, that the interpreter should be in some spiritual sympathy with the book he seeks to explain, should be able to enter into its distinguishing character and life, and to have what may be called a home understanding of its proper sense. Let it be assumed then that the Bible is an inspired book, containing supernatural truth, and it will follow necessarily from this rule itself, that it can be rightly interpreted only from this posture of a mind which is in some actual correspondence with this higher region of truth by the power of faith, or in other words, that the philological method must itself become theological in order to fulfil truly its own task. The Church makes this assumption in fact, and sets as the object of biblical exposition, accordingly, the determination of divine truth. There is a modern school, on the other hand, which tells us we have no right to condition the business of interpretation—that the interpreter has only to make out the meaning of the text scientifically, without any presupposition in regard to its truth one way or another. He must be without prejudice in his work, it is said; and this is taken to mean that the text must be for him a matter of pure historical investigation only, without any theological interest whatever. It is easy to show, however, that no such view can be consistently sustained. The demand that the Bible shall be interpreted without any preconception, is itself a preconception of the most positive kind; since it takes for granted, without proving it, that there can be no such peculiar character belonging to the Bible as its supernatural pretensions imply, which any sound exegesis then must be required even scientifically to own and regard. If the Bible be the Word of God, as it claims to be, the historical system of interpretation itself requires that the fact should be practically allowed in the exposition of its contents. Not to allow it, must be considered a prejudice of the very worst sort, which cannot fail to wrest the exposition continually into conformity with its own standpoint. What the case calls for, as *Billroth* tells us in his *Commentary on the Epistles to the Corinthians*, "is not that the exegete have no views, no system, but that his views, and his system, be not subjective simply, but objectively true and right; not that he take no side, but that he take only and alone the side of truth." At the same time, however, the preconceptions on which the theological exegesis proceeds must admit also a scientific justification; it must be shown that the true theological method does not destroy the philological, but serves rather to carry it out to its proper end, and, that what the Bible offers, therefore, as a revelation of supernatural truth, instead of limiting in any way the course of human knowledge, does but help it forward in fact to its proper perfection.

In considering farther the principle of theological interpretation, it becomes necessary to notice the difference which holds between the

Catholic and Protestant Churches in the mode of its application and use.

Catholicism takes the position, that the Sacred Scriptures, being for the Church only, can be rightly and truly interpreted also by and through the Church alone; in other words, divine truth, as it has been lodged by inspiration of the Holy Ghost in these writings, can be known and understood, it is maintained, only through the presence of divine truth, as it lives continually in the Church, a presence which is supposed to have place, first in the tradition of the true doctrine handed down from age to age, and then in the power of the Holy Ghost speaking through the divinely appointed leaders of the Church, especially its councils, and consenting orthodox doctors under the supreme authority of the Pope. It is the old rule urged by Vincentius Lir. in his *Commonitorium* ep., 2, as the only security against lawless and wilful interpretation: "*Scripturam sacram pro sua altitudine non uno eodemque sensu universi accipiunt scriptores, sed ejus eloquia aliter alius interpretatur; idcirco necesse est propter tantos tam varii sensus anfractus, ut prophetice et apostolice interpretationis linea secundum ecclesiastici et catholici sensus normam dirigatur.*" So the Council of Trent, *Sessio IV.*, in the face of Protestantism: "*Præterea ad coercenda petulantia ingenia decernit ut nemo, suæ prudentiæ innixus, in rebus fidei et morum ad ædificationem doctrinæ Christianæ pertinentium, sacram scripturam ad suos sensus contorquens contra eam sensum, quem tenuit et tenet sancta mater ecclesia, cujus est judicare de vero sensu et interpretatione sacrarum scripturarum, aut etiam contra unanimem consensum Patrum, ipsam sacram scripturam interpretari audeat.*"

Protestantism, on the other hand, as it owns no source of divine truth and no rule of faith beyond the Bible, will not allow tradition, of course, to be the norm of its sense, and refuses also to make it dependent on the mere authority of the Church. "*Papismus,*" Luther says in this view, "*est merus enthusiasmus.*" For the like reason, in the same place, *art. Smalc.*, p. 331, the pretension of false spiritualism is rejected, which affects to make the *lumen internum*, the illumination of the Holy Spirit, the principle of interpretation, without regard to the written Word. Neither can the natural reason of man be held sufficient of itself to explain the Scriptures, for it is declared to be in spiritual things blind and powerless (*Form. Conc.*, p. 579, 822). As God's Word, the Bible cannot be subjected for its exposition to any outward foreign rule; it must interpret itself. So Quenstädt I., 137: "*Non aliunde quam ex ipsa sacra scriptura certa et infallibilis potest haberi interpretatio; scriptura enim, vel potius Spiritus Sanctus in scriptura loquens est sui ipsius legitimus interpres.*" This general Protestant view gathers itself up in the fundamental maxim, that the Scriptures must be interpreted *secundum analogiam fidei* (an expression resting on Rom. 12: 6, on which comp. *Luz, bibl. Herm.*, p. 78). The conception of the "analogy of faith" includes again, however, different senses. It may be taken more formally, so as to mean that the sense of each particular passage of

Scripture must agree with the sense of all other passages referring to the same subject; or more materially, as denoting a certain type of doctrine, made of fundamental articles, according to which all besides is to be explained; or in such a way that the formal and material qualifications may be joined together in the same rule. In any case the rule is held to be simply the sum of the clearest utterances of the Bible itself. It is often spoken of as resting on a purely grammatical and logical operation; but at other times a distinction is made between the *claritas externa et interna*, and the *perspicuitas* of the Bible is defined as being not absolute, but conditioned by the use of the right means for understanding it, which include then not simply grammar and logic, but especially the possession also of the Holy Ghost, who is the authentic interpreter of his own Word.

This theological interpretation *secundum analogiam fidei*, with the assistance of the Holy Ghost, includes the philological, presupposes it as the necessary basis of its own processes. It must be allowed, however, that the older Protestantism failed to do full justice here to the union of the two interests. In the beginning, confessional questions gave all exposition a predominantly theological turn, so that the claims of philology were in some measure overlooked. Then, again, they were made to suffer material embarrassment from the old theory of inspiration; which resolved the whole texture of Scripture so completely into abstract supernatural agency, that no room was left really for the idea of any properly human and natural side in its composition. It became impossible, in this view, to read the Bible in any sort of analogy with other books; interpretation could not be truly either historical or psychological, could not recognize in full any simply human peculiarity whatever. The view taken of the unity of the Bible, moreover, was too mechanical. No proper account was made of its progressive organic character; the form which belongs to it as a scheme of life, in which differences of measure and degree, the various and the manifold in history and doctrine, go to make up at last the full proper conception of the whole. There was a defect also in the old Protestant conception of the "analogy of faith," as related to the sacred text from which it was to be derived; inasmuch as the rule was supposed to be openly at hand on the face of the text itself and capable of being drawn from this therefore at once, with fixed form, and in an immediate way; whereas it needed in truth conditions and experiences going before, in the case of Protestantism itself, to prepare it for thus drawing from the Scriptures what had not been apprehended in the same way previously. The *analogia fidei*, along with its objective side is the inspired text, supposes in the nature of the case a subjective side also in the religious life and experience of the Church, which as such is relatively movable, and thus capable of progress and improvement. Not considering this Protestantism was led to *dogmatize* its rule of interpretation; its biblical analogy became dogmatic analogy, the harmony of a system of doctrines, supposed to be of like authority with the

Bible; the end of which was, of course, that interpretation became not simply theological, but ecclesiastico-confessional.

Such in general are some of the difficulties of the older Protestant system. The later theology has endeavored to overcome them, by a more profound analysis of the elements and relations with which they are concerned; a process that has been found to bring with it again new difficulties of its own, and whose issues are still far enough from being ultimate and complete. We cannot be expected, moreover, to pursue the subject any farther now in this direction; it would carry us quite beyond the proper bounds of the present article.

Biblical hermeneutics in general regard the Bible as a whole. The Bible is made up, however, of different writings, including no small difference of constitution and character. Hence the necessity of what is called *special hermeneutics*, embracing the application of the general science to particular books and classes of books. The main distinction, of course, is that which holds between the Old and New Testaments.

The second branch of interpretation, the subject of which is to represent the sense of an author to others, resolves itself naturally into translation, paraphrase, and commentary. *Translation* is the immediate reproduction of a writing in another language, causing the author as it were himself to speak in this new tongue; this demands *truth*. As, however, it is a foreign language, and every language has its own peculiar genius, the case requires that the author should be made to speak in it as he would have done if it had been his own; this demands *freedom* of translation, which must be joined with the other quality of truth. What is needed is not just a daguerreotype of original text, but an artistic copy. The translation of the Bible has its special difficulties, which lie not simply in the depth and grandeur of its matter, but in the fact that its original language is instinct with the Spirit of God; without the transfusion of which into the new tongue, we can have no version properly of the sacred text. In this view we may say, that true translations of the Bible are not simply to be made, however much of laborious and faithful work they presuppose; they must also make themselves, especially if they are for common use, under the powerful impulse of religious feeling. The *paraphrase* does not simply translate the text, but seeks to make the meaning of it more clear by filling it out with explanatory words and clauses. Erasmus, himself a model in such exposition, describes it simply so: *hiantia committere, abrupta mollire, involuta evolvere — sic libenter dicere ut non dicas alia*. The use of it is precarious, as being easily liable always to run into tautology or a watery dilution of the text. In the *commentary* (beginning rudely in the imperfect form of *scholia* and *glosses*), the interpreter speaks, not in the name of his author, but in his own person, unfolding the sense of the text in hand with methodical explanation.

It remains to notice now briefly the *history of interpretation and its theories*. Compare, for the earlier period, *Rosenmüller, Hist. interp.*

lib. sacror. in ecclesia chr., 1795–1812; for the time since the Reformation, *Meyer, Gesch. d. Bibelerklärung seit d. Wiederherstellung d. Wissenschaften*, 1802, 5 vols.; also the fine survey of the whole subject by *Reuss*, in his *Gesch. d. heil. Schr. d. Neuen Testaments*, 2d ed., 1853.

In the case of the Old Testament, interpretation may be said to have begun first with the Jews in *Palestine* after their return from the captivity; when their changed circumstances made it necessary to call in such help, for the purpose of placing themselves in right understanding with their own Scriptures. Among the *Alexandrian* Jews, the desire of reconciling the Old Test. religion with Grecian culture, accompanied with some spirit of philosophical speculation, promoted especially the allegorical method of interpretation; although it is still a question, whether this was derived at first from *Palestine*, or rose originally in *Alexandria* itself under Grecian influences.

There is a difficulty, it is well known, in regard to the interpretation of Old Test. passages in the *New Testament*. To get over it, some, in our time, have taken the broad ground, that Christ and his Apostles, as true children of their own age, interpreted the Old Test. in the full spirit of the Rabbinical Jewish exegesis. But no such assumption can stand. It is easy to see that there is a specific difference between the two modes of handling Scripture, both in matter and form. Christ and his Apostles quote the Old Test. always in the service of truth only—their exposition moves always within the orbit of the Christian doctrine, and is in keeping with the spirit of the Old Testament as we find it fulfilled in the New; with all the freedom in the use of particular texts, they show themselves far removed at the same time from the general wilfulness and perverseness of the Jewish method. To understand the way in which the Old Test. is quoted and applied in the New Test. it must be borne in mind that Christianity, while it appeared originally as a new creation, carrying in itself first in the form of religious life what was to be afterwards developed into full scientific knowledge, grew forth at the same time historically from the old Jewish economy, in the bosom of which it had its heavenly birth. Christ was, in this view, the personal living truth, in which the universal sense of the Old Test. centered and became complete. It was not for him, in this relation, to speak as the outward expositor merely of the sacred text. Interpretation with him became necessarily application, an unfolding of the spirit rather than of the letter. With the Apostles the case is of course not just the same; they were not themselves the central truth of religion; still they stood so near to this centre, in the person of their Master, that their consciousness might be said to take in also some part of its force and power. Their standpoint, too, is in its measure, that of immediate spiritual discernment, doing away with the distinction between interpretation and application; they are the Old Test. pneumatically, and in doing so allow themselves at times to deal with the mere letter of it in a very free way.—(Comp. *Bleek*, on the dog-

matic use of Old Testament passages in the New Testament, Stud. u. Krit., 1835; *Tholuck*, the Old Test. in the New, 1849.

In the Christian Church the history of interpretation runs parallel, in the nature of the case, with the course of dogmatic theology. Down to the time of the Reformation, the philological interest was made to suffer in favor of the theological; and altogether, being bound by the authority of the Church and its traditions, interpretation was never able to rise to any independent and truly scientific character. In the first ages, its elements show themselves in general confused and chaotic. Before the formation of the New Test. canon, it occupied itself exclusively, of course, with the Old Test., and seeking to make this the immediate witness of Christian truth, it became not only dogmatical, but prevailingly allegorical also (*Barnabas*, Epistles of *Clement*); to such an extent, that the power of understanding Scripture is made by *Justin* to stand especially in the gift of allegorical interpretation. The first interpretation of the New Test., also, as it proceeded from the Gnostics, was in a style of allegory that left the grammatico-historical sense completely out of sight. Against this heretical arbitrariness the judgment prevailed, that the Scriptures must be explained according to the living tradition of the true Christian doctrine in the Church itself (*Irenæus*; *Tertullian*, *de præscript. adv. hæc.*). But this did not overthrow the use of allegory; it only held it to a certain general rule. *Origen*, as all know, made it the soul of his entire method of interpretation; and his authority served to canonize it in the Church generally. As the doctrinal system defined itself more and more, biblical exegesis took still more decidedly the ecclesiastico-allegorical form. So we have it in *Augustine*, who, with all his judicious observations on the subject of grammatical interpretation, turns hermeneutics continually more or less into the passive instrument of his own theology (cf. *Clausen*, *Augustinus Hipp. SS. interpre. Havn.*, 1837). An opposite interest in the West appears among the *Pelagians*; with whom, however, the anti-ecclesiastical tendency took an openly rationalistic character. Also, in the East, in what Gieseler calls the Syrian historico-exegetical school, known commonly as the school of *Antioch*; although here, too, the "*demissa et humilis interpretatio*," so common to the simply rational method, became, not without cause, an occasion for reproach. Its representatives are, *Diodorus*, of Tarsus; *Theodore*, of Mopsuestia; and others. Something of the same sober spirit shows itself in *Chrysostom*; with whom stand connected *Theodoret* and the Syrians, particularly *Ephraem Syrus*. Toward the close of this period, a conspicuous place belongs to *Gregory the Great*, who adopted the Origenistic threefold sense, and acquired an authority as a model of mystical interpretation, which extended itself afterwards far into the middle ages. For centuries afterwards, biblical exegesis, like theology in general, had no independent character, but became almost entirely a business of collection and compilation from older sources. Here may be mentioned *Walafrid Strabo* († 849), in the

Western Church; *Oecumenius*, of the 10th cent. and *Theophylact*, and *Euthymius Zigabenus*, of the 12th cent., in the Greek Church; also the so-called *catenæ*, chains of different exegetical views put together in the convents, which, with no original merit of their own, are still of some worth as collections, in which much is preserved that might otherwise have been lost. The age of the *Schoolmen* was too much bound by tradition and authority, and too destitute at the same time of all necessary hermeneutical resources, to add anything very important to the cause of biblical interpretation. The expositions of *Thomas Aquinas* are mainly matter of compilation. The most respectable products of the period are the *postillæ* or brief annotations of *Nicolas Lyra* († 1340). With the revival of learning in the 15th century, a better period begins; and the opening of a new era in the interpretation of the Scriptures is proclaimed in the efforts of *Laurentius Valla*, *Faber Staplensis*, and especially *Erasmus* of Rotterdam.

This new era was inaugurated in full by the Reformation. All the Reformers took an active part in the exposition of the Scriptures. *Luther* is more dogmatic than philological. *Calvin* stands unsurpassed in his power of unfolding the sense from its connections, as well as in the general freedom and independence of his exegesis. The main work on the theory of interpretation, in this century, was the *Clavis Script. Sacræ* (1567) by *Matthias Flaccius*—a work of very considerable merit, which was not free, however, from the imperfections of its age. Next comes the period of *Protestant scholasticism*; when interpretation took again a dogmatic, more particularly a polemico-dogmatic, character and tone, ruled by the Established Church theology. This, with a too mechanical view of inspiration, led to a full disregard of the organic, historical constitution of the Bible, in which no proper account was made of the difference between the Old Testament and the New, or of the relation generally between the form of Scripture and its contents. We may refer to the *Biblia illustrata* of the very learned *Abraham Calovius*, as an able example of this style. To the same period, in the Reformed Church, belongs the *Coccian* tendency (see Art. *Coccius*). It found Christ everywhere in the Old Test., as well as in the New. Among the *Arminians*, on the contrary, just the opposite tendency prevailed; they had no sense for anything deeper than the historical, antiquarian outside of the Old Test.; and their exegesis generally assumed a cold, shallow, more and more rationalistic character; which had little to distinguish it in the end from the naked poverty of *Socinianism* itself.

With the rise of *Pietism*, toward the close of the 17th cent., a reactionary movement appeared over against the stiffness of the reigning Church system, which by laying all stress on the study of the Bible, seemed to promise well for the interest of biblical exegesis. The moderation of *Spener*, however, and the earlier Pietists was soon forgotten; and having no power of theological thought to give it force, the use of the Scriptures degenerated with the whole school into an arbitrary, typical method, which aimed

be edifying, but was too often, in fact, insipid and flat.

Other causes wrought, about the beginning of the 18th century, to unsettle the authority of the dogmatic system, which had previously controlled so generally the interpretation of the Bible; among them, the increase of helps and materials for the proper use of philology, better knowledge of the Hebrew language and of the Greek idiom of the New Test., fuller acquaintance with archæology and history in general, also the freedom of thinking introduced by the course of philosophy in Germany and England. The result was what may be termed an *exegetical revolution* of the most momentous kind. The transition to it is represented by *Ernesti*, in his *Institutio interpretis N. T.*, 1761; where the hermeneutical principle is laid down, that the sense of the inspired writings must be sought and found, just as it sought and found in merely human books (cf. Art. *Ernesti*). The revolution itself, however, begins properly with the name of *J. S. Semler*. According to him, the Bible must be interpreted *historically* only — that is, the writers must be understood in the sense of the thinking with which they were surrounded in their time, that of their own Jewish education and custom. What is of permanent doctrinal value as truth must be determined by its adaptation to the purposes of "moral improvement." What may not appear to be of this character in the teachings of Christ and his Apostles, must be regarded as an *accommodation* merely to the popular prejudices of the age in which they lived, and is to be subjected to a liberal exegesis accordingly. Such became the standpoint of the so-called subjective, empirical *Rationalism*, with its various modifications; an inconsistent, pedantic system, which may be said to have gone down to the grave finally with its last notable representative, *Paulus*, judged and condemned by the common reason and good taste of the world, no less than its sense of religion.

It is interesting to observe how, in opposition to this revolutionary tendency, the old supernaturalistic theology, bent on preserving the heritage of the fathers, endeavored to maintain its exegetical ground. It did its best to withstand the wilfulness of the rationalistic method; but while it thus struggled for the forms of the traditional faith, the proper matter of this faith, it became too plain, was allowed to glide more and more out of its hands. What it defended, became in fact a poor shadow only of the old system; and the so-called grammatico-historical interpretation with which it operated for this purpose, in the *Storr* and *Flatt* style, ran into a form as arbitrary almost and artificial as the exegesis employed on the other side.

In the midst of this unsatisfactory course of things the way was opened for a new spirit, bringing with it the conditions of an advance in hermeneutics — an improved spirit both in science and religion. *Science* in general, quickened by the philosophical ideas of the 19th cent., became more full and deep. *Religion*, at the same time, grew to be more seriously thoughtful and earnest. Various outward and inward causes wrought together to produce this result,

and the change has revealed itself under different aspects and phases of Christian belief; but the effect of it all round has been the common conviction, that the interpretation of the Scriptures, while it should be, in the first place, truly philological to the full extent of the scientific resources of the age, must become again *theological* also, dealing with the Bible as a divine revelation for the Church. This brings us to the exegetical systems and schools of our own time, in which the general principle now stated is found to be carried out practically in different ways.

The most strictly theological scheme prevails, of course, where the Church doctrine, if not always confessedly, yet in fact, forms the material canon for interpretation, so that it is made to assume in the whole an openly dogmatic character. So with *Hengstenberg*, *Hüvernick*, *Harless*, *Steiger*, &c. The construction of the historical and doctrinal sense of the Old Test., regarded in its relations to the idea of a gradually progressive revelation, may be said to come here too little to its proper rights. Another way of explaining the Old Test., under what we may call the biblico-theological view, in which regard is had to the historical movement of the sacred oracles, as well as to their inward life and soul, is exhibited to us in *Delitzsch*, *Hoffmann*, *Baumgarten*, *Beck*, *Tholuck*, with various not inconsiderable modifications. Others again in the same general direction, as *Olshausen* and *Stier*, lay more stress on the interior, deeper sense of the Scripture, as that through which the right unison of the Old and New Testaments, the proper idea of inspiration, and the true import of the divine Word, are first brought out with full effect.

Another order of thinking is presented in the theological movement, which has grown forth from the influence of *Schleiermacher*. He gave a new impulse first to the development of dogmatic theology, by referring religion to feeling and experience as its source; and thus modified the interpretation of the Scriptures also, by giving it a psychological turn, and urging the distinction between religious life and religious doctrine. Owing to his own wrong theological standpoint, however, his exegesis resolved itself into a sort of logical subtlety. His strong subjectivity, joined with his dialectic understanding, impaired in him, personally, the genuine historical feeling which he himself so much insists upon as a hermeneutical necessity. But what most of all unfitted him to be a sound exegete, was his almost idiosyncratic aversion toward the Old Testament, which he did not, and one might say even, *would* not understand. His posture was of too individual a character for any full discipleship, wide as the school is which stands loosely connected with his name. The most distinguished representatives of his general standpoint, exegetically considered, are *Lücke* and *Neander*. Altogether, service rendered by this tendency to the cause of biblical interpretation, must be regarded as holding principally in what it has done, or is doing still, for biblical theology, and the construction of doctrines, especially those which tell strongly on the sense of the Scriptures, such as revela-

tion, inspiration, and the constitution of Christ's person.

The *speculative* tendency, led off by the notorious *Strauss*, and ending in the destructive processes of the new *Tübingen* school—more critical, however, than exegetical—needs to be noticed only as a movement which has run its course.

The Romish Church, since the Reformation, has had its exegetical literature too, more or less full and worthy of consideration; which, however, we cannot pretend to notice more particularly in the present article.

LANDERER. — *Nevin.*

Hermes and Hermesianism.—George Hermes, born April 22, 1775, in Dreyerwalde, Westphalia, after studying philosophy and theology at Münster, became, 1798, teacher at St. Paul's Gymnasium, in 1799 was consecrated a priest, and from 1807 lectured upon theology there. His favorite study was philosophy, but in the interest of religion and Christianity. His system was based upon the principles of Kant. This is manifest in his "Philosophische Einleitung," to theology, first published in 1819, 2d edition, 1831. He was appointed the Roman Catholic prof. of theol. at the Frederick William University of Bonn, and remained there, in the enjoyment of the love and respect of the students, until his death in 1831. One of his oldest and most worthy pupils published his "Christkathol. Dogmatik," in 1834, in three parts. — His system occasioned the bitter Hermesianistic controversy in the Rom. Catholic Church of Germany, and found so many adherents, that Church authority interposed to suppress a philosophy which stood in such strong conflict with the Romish faith. A papal breve, condemning the writings of H. was issued Sept. 26, 1835; and as the controversy continued to rage, especially through Braun's and Achterfeld's (professors at Bonn) persistent defence of Hermesianism, Pius IX. issued another letter to the Archb. of Cologne, confirming the judgment of Greg. XVI. — (See ESSER, *Hermes Leben u. Lehre*. Köln, 1832. *Acta Hermesiana* by ELVENICH, 1837, and *Acta Romana* by ELVENICH and BRAUN: Hanover, 1838. The letter of Pius IX. is published in the *Kathol. Vierteljahrsschr.*: Bonn, 1847, IV., Heft. STUPP, *Pius IX. u. d. kath. Kirche in Deutschland*, 1848). K. SUDHOFF.*

Hermias, Ἑρμίας, a name which occurs in Greek literature, both profane and Christian (see FABRIC. *bibl. gr.*, VII., p. 114, ed. Harless). A so-called philosopher Hermias is mentioned as the author of: *διασυρμὸς τῶν ἐξω φιλοσόφων*, an apologetico-polemic treatise, in which heathen philosophies are ridiculed. The work is destitute of all philosophical and theological merit. As neither the book nor the author are referred to by any ancient writer, we are left to conjecture the age of both. It is very probably an invention of the 5th or 6th cent.—(Edit.: ed. princ., with a Latin transl., 1553, 1560; in many ed. of M. JUSTIN, 1615, 36, 86, 1742, c. not. Marani, and of TATIAN, by Worth, Oxford, 1700, in the *Auctuar. bibl. Patr.*: Paris, 1624; alone, by DOMMERICH: Halle, 1764; in German by THIE-NEMANN: Lpz., 1828; latest ed. by W. F. MENZEL: Leyden, 1840, 8vo.—See CAVE, *Scr. eccl.*,

I. 81. DUPIN, *Nouv. bibl.*, I., 65. FABRIC. I. 1. NEANDER, *Ch. Hist.* BÄHR in Pauly's *R. Encl. d. klass. Altenth.*, III., 1215).

WAGENHAFF.*

Hermogenes, an African errorist against whom Tertullian directed his *adv. Hermog.*, which furnishes the main authority for H.'s views. Other accounts are obscure and contradictory. He was living when Tertull. wrote against him (c. 1, "*ad hodiernum homo in seculo*"); and in *De Præscr. Hæret.* Tertullian mentions him as still alive, c. 206, 207 (cf. UPHORN, *Fundam. Chronol. Tertull.*). He was doubtless an African, probably lived in Carthage, hence Tertullian's personal knowledge of him (cf. AUGUST., *de hær.*, c. 41). The reproaches of Tertullian (c. 1: "*Pingit illic nubit assidue, legem Dei in libidinem decessu in artem contemnit*;" so c. 45, i. f.) doubtless sprang in part from Montanistic asceticism, still H. probably led a rather free life, as we may infer from his occupation (a painter, cf. 1, 33, &c.) and his philosophical pursuits and errors. He does not seem to have had a system, but sought simply to complete that of the Church by adding some speculative ideas of Aristotle's philosophy to it, believing that this could be done without violence to the doctrines of the Church (RITTER, *Gesch. d. Philos.*, V., 178, &c.). He cannot, therefore, be reckoned among the Gnostics, but only among the gnosticising teachers of that period. His chief doctrine was the eternity of matter (TERT., *adv. Hermog.*, c. 1, "*nolens Deum ex nihilo universa fecisse*"). He assumes that God must have made everything either out of himself, out of nothing, or out of existing eternal matter. The first he declares impossible, because God is unchangeable ("*Negat illum ex semet ipso facere potuisse, qui partes ipsius fuissent, quæcunque ex semet ipso fecisset dominus; porro in partes non decessit ut indivisibilem et indemutabilem et eundem semper qua dominus*." The second he rejects because God would then, *ex arbitrio et voluntate*, be the author of evil. We are, therefore, constrained to assume the eternity of matter, in which evil must be inherent. This eternal matter, proof of whose existence he finds in Gen. 1, is without any qualities, c. 35, *neque corporalem, neque incorporalem*, c. 37, neither good nor bad. Still, there is something corporeal in it out of which bodies are formed, and something soul-like, an irregular motion, out of which souls are formed. In this unregulated agitation (like that of a seething pot, c. 41) H. perceives the possibility of its organization, because by this it is related to God, who is regulated activity. This formation of matter was not effected by God's penetrating it, but simply by the magnetic attraction of his approximation to it (c. 44). At this point H. places the origin of evil; c. 38, "*nec tota materia fabricatur, sed partes ejus*." It is only superficially effected by the divine agency, and in each particle of matter contains the quality of the whole (c. 39), there remains in all something of the reigning disorder out of which, probably, H. supposed evil to spring. Intimately connected with this is H.'s view of the soul as of material, not divine, origin (TERTULL., *de*

mima, 11), and of the mortality of the soul, unless the Spirit impart immortality to it. More than this we cannot gather from Tertullian.—I. appears to have propagated his views by writing as well as orally (*adv. H.*, c. 1). He had doubtless disciples, but founded no sect.—Statements concerning him are found in other Church Fathers, which can hardly be reconciled with those of Tertullian. In the *excerptis Theodoti* in Clem. Alex., it is said H. referred Ps. 19 : 5 — “In them hath he set a tabernacle for the sun,” to Christ; that Christ had laid down his body in the sun (ἐν τοῖς μὲν οὐρανοῖς, τὸ σῶμα τοῦ κυρίου ἐν τῷ ἡλίῳ αὐτὸν ἀποτίθεσθαι, ὡς Ερμολένης). So THEODORET, *hær. fabb. Comp.* I., 19, who evidently refers to this same Hermog. Christological errors are ascribed to H. by Philastrius and Augustine, also, who reckon him among the Patripassians (PHIL., *de hær.*, c. 44; AUGUST., *de hær.*, c. 41). Theod., l. c., says Origen and Theophilus of Antioch also wrote against H. (cf. EUSEB., *H. E.*, IV., 24). To reconcile these statements with Tertullian's account of H.'s orthodoxy in Christology, MOSHEIM, *Comm. de rebus Christ. ante Const. M.*; WALCH, *Ketzerhist.*, I., 580, and others have assumed a second H. But this view is unlikely (see TILLEMONT, *Mémoires pour servir*, etc., III., 65; BÜHMER, *Hermog. Afric. Sundia*, 1832, p. 104, sqq.), as Theodoret distinctly identifies him. Possibly H. may have developed his system in a more anti-Christological form. G. UHLHORN.*

Hermon (=a projecting summit), the name given by the Israelites to the main crest of Anti-Lebanon, *Jebel esh-Shiorki*. This chain separated, by the valley of Bikeah from Lebanon, and lying between Bikeah and the plain of Damascus, is divided, about the latitude of Damascus, and above Râsheiya, into two ridges; the eastern, and higher, stretching southwest in the same direction with the general range, is the proper extension of Anti-Lebanon, and is now called *Jebel esh-Sheikh*, which gradually declines south of Râsheiya towards W.S.W., and terminates in the plain near Bâniâs; a south-eastern branch, the *Jebel Heish*, stretches over the northern extremity of the Sea of Tiberias. But this latter, lower ridge, is not the Hermon of the ancients (as WINKER supposes, according to Seetzen and Burkhardt), but the entire chain of the Sheikh mountains, of which *Jebel Heish* is only a continuation, though it is the central ridge, containing the loftiest summit. Hence the plural form in Ps. 42 : 6, and the different names applied to this chain accordingly as one or another portion was meant (Deut. 3 : 9; 4 : 48; 1 Chron. 5 : 23; Josh. 11 : 3, 17; 13 : 5, &c.). From the main crest the summits are visible at a certain distance (WILSON, *the Lands of the Bible*, II., 161), covered with perpetual snow, and hence called in Arabic (*Abulfeda, tab. Syr.*, p. 18, 163 sq.), and in Chaldaic (*Targg. ad.*, Deut. 3 : 9; Cant. 1 : 8) Snow mountain (*Jebel el-Thaldj; tur alga*), whence the Tyrians (*Hieron. Onom.* of Hermon) obtained snow. These summits have never yet been accurately measured; *Russieger* (Reiser III., 130), estimated, from Tabor, Hermon's height to be 9500 feet. Its lower peaks were covered with cypress (Ezek. 27 : 5). The

Bible reckons Hermon in general with Lebanon, and calls it the extreme northern limit of the land of Israel east of the Jordan (Josh. 12 : 1; Deut. 3 : 8, &c.). Ancient tradition unnecessarily inferred, from Ps. 89 : 12; 42 : 6; 133 : 3, that there must have been a second Hermon, near Tabor, where *Jebel ed-Duhy* is still pointed out as “little Hermon” (Robinson II., 326). The “dew of Hermon that descended upon the mountains of Zion,” Ps. 133 : 3, has been well explained by Olshausen: “the refreshing dew upon Zion is traced by the poet to the influence of the cool, lofty mountains in the north of the land.”—(See HERDER, *Geist d. ebr. Poesie*, II., 9; *Werke zur Theol.* III., 186 of the pocket ed.—RELAND, *Palæst.* 323, 610, 920.—HOFFMANN in the *Hall. Allg. Encykl.* II., Th. 6, 361.—ROBINSON, *Palæst.* II., 337, 354, &c.; III., 48, 58, 376, &c.—LENGERKE, *Kanaan I.*, 30; RITTER's *Erdk.* XV., I, p. 156, 178, 406). RÜETSCHL.*

Herod, Ἡρώδης (see *Simon. Onomast. N. T.*, p. 69), the name of several Jewish Kings of Idumean descent, who succeeded the Asmonean dynasty. The first of these, usually called “the great,” to distinguish him from his successor of that name, was the son of Antipater (Antipater), a wealthy, influential Idumean, whom flattery to Herod represented as a descendant of the first Jews who returned from Babylon (Jos. *Antt.* XIV., 1, 3), whilst others traced his descent to some Philistine captives brought to Judea (JUCHASIN, fol. 139, 6; EUSEB. II. E., I., 7; EPIPH. *hær.*, X. 1; Cf. EWALD, *Gesch. d. Volkes Isr.*, IV., 448). Antipater, a friend of Hyrcanus II., managed to gain such favor with Cæsar, that he was appointed procurator (ἐπίτροπος, *Antt.* XIV., 8, 5; *B. J.*, I., 10, 3) along with Hyrcanus (47 B. C.), and as such exercised the supreme authority, while that of Hyrcanus was only nominal. In this capacity he appointed his elder son, Phasælus, Governor (σπαρτηγός) of Jerusalem; the younger Herod, 25 years old (not 15; see *Havercamp* on Jos. *Antt.*, XIV. 9, 2; *B. J.*, I., 10, 4; and the Dindorf ed. of Jos.), ruler of Galilee. There the younger Herod energetically strove to extirpate the robbers who infested the country; that is, such Jews as resisted the rule of the Romans and Antipater, and, forming themselves into bands, made war on their own responsibility, and practised all manner of robberies and oppressions. One of their leaders, Hezekiah, with his entire band, was taken and executed. And as security was thus restored in the country, Herod won the regard of the people, as well as the friendship of Sextus Cæsar, a relative of the great Cæsar, and then Governor of Syria. Envy, and dread of the ambition, arbitrariness, and growing power of Antipater and his sons, led to accusations against Herod for the execution of a Jew without trial or justice. He was summoned before the Sanhedrim, but presented himself in such regal state, and attended by so many armed followers, that none ventured to open the prosecution, until Samens, an aged member, rose and complained that Herod presented himself not as a defendant, but as one who defied the authority of the Sanhedrim; then he added that Hyrcanus and the court had reason to accuse themselves, for allowing Herod to ac-

quire power which he would one day use to their destruction (*Antt.* XIV., 9, 4; XV., 1, 1). Hyrcanus postponed the decision, and, by his advice, Herod escaped the sentence by fleeing to Damascus. There he bought from Sextus Cæsar the governorship of Cœlosyria and Samaria, and then to avenge himself upon the Jews; approached Jerusalem with an army, but was persuaded to withdraw by his father and brother. Cæsar's assassination (March 15th, 44 B. C.) caused great excitement and confusion throughout the empire; in Palestine, also, parties arose. Cassius entered Judea, and demanded 700 talents in tribute, which Antipater tried speedily to collect. Herod paid his portion, 100 talents, to Cassius first, and thus gained his favor. In the war of Antony and Octavius against Cæsar's murderers, Cassius and Marcus (or Marcus), who had succeeded the murdered Sextus Cæsar, as Governor of Syria, gathered an army, in forming which Herod was most active, for which they made him procurator of all Syria (*B. J.* I., 11, 4; but cf. *Antt.* XIV., 11, 4), and promised, on the successful termination of the war, to make him King of Judea. At this time the Arabian King, Malichos (Mâlik), poisoned Antipater, for which Herod induced Cassius to have him murdered by some Roman soldiers. After Cassius withdrew from Syria, an insurrection in Jerusalem, headed by one Helix ("Ἑλξ, or "Ελξ; Josephus always writes Felix, Φίλιξ), was soon quelled by Phasaelus. Herod also speedily took the border fortresses which had been seized by the brother of Malichos, including Masada; drove Marion, whom Cassius had placed over Tyre, from Galilee; and when Marion aided Antigonus, the Asmonean, in his pretensions to the crown of Judea, Herod overcame them on the confines of Judea, put Antigonus to flight, and was received into Jerusalem with honors. By betrothing Mariamne, daughter of Antigonus' brother Alexander, and granddaughter of Hyrcanus by his daughter Alexandra, he won many disaffected Jews, but still, like Phasaelus, had zealous enemies, who hated them as foreign rulers. When, therefore, Antony, after conquering Brutus and Cassius, came to Asia, some Jewish rulers presented themselves before him with complaints against both brothers, for injustice and violence. But Herod also appeared, and by making large presents to Antony, frustrated the attempts of his accusers. A subsequent appeal proved equally fruitless. Antony even appointed the brothers tetrarchs, and invested them with the government of all Judea. A third embassy of 1000 persons, sent to Tyre, was nearly hewn to pieces by Roman soldiers. Two years later, the Parthians, led by Barzapharnes, and Pacoras, their king's son, seized upon Syria, and Lysanias, son of Ptolemy of Chalcis, secured their aid in a scheme for the restoration of Antigonus. They overran Judea, took Phasaelus and Hyrcanus captive, and besieged Jerusalem, which, after Herod had fled with his family to Masada, they plundered. Antigonus was enthroned; Hyrcanus, with his ears cut off, to disqualify him for the priesthood, was sent to Parthia; and Phasaelus killed himself. Herod first turned for aid to Malichus, the Arabian

king, and, failing in this, went to Egypt, where Cleopatra, who hoped to find in him a good commander for her army, received him most favorably. Thence he went to Rome, to lay his troubles before Antony and Octavius. Both took his part, and induced the Senate to declare Antigonus an enemy of Rome, but Herod King of Judea (40 B. C.)—to the enjoyment of which dignity, however, he did not attain until 37 B. C. Having returned to Palestine, he quickly collected a large army, marched to the relief of Masada, and compelled Antigonus to raise the siege of it. He then besieged Jerusalem, but the Roman General, Silo, having been bribed by Antigonus, Herod could only take Jericho. The Roman army was wintered in cities of Idumea, Galilee, and Samaria, which had joined Herod. Towards the close of winter he went to Galilee, destroyed the adherents of Antigonus, and thence went to Antony at Samosata, and efficiently aided him by his bravery in reducing that city. Meanwhile the party of Antigonus excited new troubles in Judea and Galilee, in which Josephus, Herod's brother, was slain. Herod hastened back, and assisted by the Roman General, Sosius, whom Antony had appointed Governor of Syria, and so completely routed his foes, that but for the severity of the winter he would at once have fallen upon Jerusalem. The winter abating, Herod forthwith began a siege of the city. During the preparations for this he went to Samaria and married Mariamne. The besieged resisted for five months, through the summer of 37; finally it was taken on the anniversary of its entry by Pompey (64 B. C., *Antt.* XIV., 16, 4), with great carnage, the Roman soldiers having been infuriated by the delay. Herod rewarded the soldiers out of his private treasury to keep them from plundering the city. Antigonus surrendered himself to Sosius, who delivered him to Antony in Antioch, where, at Herod's solicitation, he was beheaded (*Jos. Ant.* XV., 1, 2; *PLUTARCH, Anton.*, 36; *DIO CASS.*, XLIX., 22). When the war broke out between Antony and Octavius (31 B. C.), Herod prepared to aid the former; but Cleopatra contrived to have him charged by Antony with the conquest of the Arabian King, Malichus. At first Herod was victorious, but being betrayed by Athenion, a General of Cleopatra, he was beaten and lost many men. He avenged himself for this defeat by invading their country, and totally subjugating them. Antony was defeated (in Sept., 31 B. C.) at Actium. To secure the victor's favor, Herod went to Octavius at Rhodes, confessed he had aided Antony, but promised, as Antony had abandoned himself to his passion for Cleopatra, to transfer his friendship to Octavius. By this seeming candor he gained his point, so that Octavius not only confirmed his royal authority, but considerably enlarged his borders, and gave him the life-guards of Cleopatra as his own body-guards (*Antt.*, XV., 7, 3; *B. J.*, I., 20, 3; *DIO CASS.*, LIV., 9). This favor of the Emperor, which soon grew into personal friendship (the saying, *melius est Herodis porcum esse quam filium*, *MACROB.*, *Saturn.* II, 2, does not necessarily imply disparagement), continued. Subsequently he appointed Herod Governor of all

lyria, to whom all other governors of the country were subordinate, and added Trachonitis, Batanea, and Auranitis. Herod's brother, Pheroras, was made a tetrarch.

In his government, Herod displayed full devotion to his Roman patrons, prodigal liberality towards his friends, and fearful cruelty to his enemies (*Antt.* XV., 10, 4), and a love of splendor, indulged especially in the erection of magnificent buildings. — He restored Solomon's temple in great grandeur (*Jos.*, *B. J.*, V., 5). He rebuilt the citadel Baris on the north of the temple, and called it Antonio, and erected a palace for himself more magnificent than the temple. He surrounded Samaria with a beautiful wall, placed 6000 colonists there, built a large temple in its midst in honor of the Emperor, and changed its name to Sebaste (*Augusta*). Indeed there was hardly a place in the kingdom where he did not erect some memorial to the Emperor (*Antt.*, XIII., 9, 1; *B. J.*, I., 2, 7; 20, 1; 21, 4). Straton's tower, then dilapidated, he rebuilt with white stone, adorned with splendid palaces, furnished with an artificial port, and called Cæsarea. Anthedon, on the seacoast, he raised from its ruins, and called it Agrippæon. In honor of his father he founded a city on the plain of Sharon, and called it Antipatris. To his mother, Cypron, he dedicated the newly-fortified and beautiful citadel in Jericho, and called it Cypros; and, in honor of his brother and wife, called one of the splendid towers of his citadel in Jerusalem Phasaelus, another Mariamne, and northward from Jericho he founded a city Phasaelis. A fortress built on the mountain towards Arabia, and the splendid edifice built on an elevated hill (Frankenberg), Ostadia south of Jerusalem, he called Herodion. But in all this love of architecture may also be discovered great precautions against any future insurrections (*Antt.* XV., 8, 5). And yet he displayed similar munificence in the decoration of foreign cities — Askalon, Damascus, Tripolis, Berytus, Tyre, Sidon, Laodicea, Antioch, Pergamus, &c. The burnt-down Pythian temple on Rhodes he rebuilt at his own expense, and furnished money for the revival of the Olympic games (*Antt.* XVI., 5; *B. J.*, I., 21). Of course the means for such munificent operations were raised by oppressive taxations (although he suspended these in seasons of public calamity, and otherwise relieved the distressed people), which occasioned insurrections, but these were soon quelled. In an extremity he took the golden and silver vessels from David's tomb (*Antt.* XVI. 7, 1). — All this public magnificence, however, was attended with great domestic troubles. Lending a suspicious ear to the complaints which the members of his family brought against each other, he became so furious that he resembled a tiger more than a man. Herod's wives and children were: 1) Doris, son Antipater; 2) Mariamne, the Asmonean, sons Aristobulus, Alexander Herod (died in Rome), daughters Cypros, Salamsio; 3) Mariamne, daughter of the High-priest Simon, son Herod Philip; 4) Malthake, a Samaritan, sons Herod Antipas, Archelaus, daughter Olympias; 5) Cleopatra of Jerusalem, sons Philip, tetrarch, Herod; 6) Pallas, son Phasaelus; 7) Phædra, daughter Roxane; 8)

Elpis, daughter Salome; 9, 10) two nieces, childless (*Antt.* XVIII., 5, 4; *B. J.*, I., 28, 1). Herod's sister, Salome, was first married to Costobarus, then to Josephus, her father's brother, last to Alexias, Herod's friend. Now the original cause of his sad domestic history lay not only in the suspicious nature of the king, but in his political position. Knowing well that as a foreigner he exercised arrogated power, and that the hearts of the people hung upon the Asmoneans, his first aim was to exterminate these. Conscious of Hyrcanus' right to the crown, he soon dispatched him, on the charge of a conspiracy (*Antt.*, XV., 6, 1-4). Mariamne's brother, Aristobulus, he had, at her and her mother's (Alexandra) request, made Highpriest in his 17th year; but soon afterwards, when Aristobulus, at the feast of tabernacles, avowed his sympathy for the people, Herod had him drowned in Jericho (*Antt.* XV., 6, 3, 4). This inflamed Mariamne and Alexandra against Herod. Opposed to them were Herod's mother and sister, who, being despised by the beautiful but haughty Mariamne, retorted with the worst accusations, among them adultery. This took effect on Herod, and thinking the foul charge confirmed by the fact that Mariamne had learned a secret which Herod confided to his brother-in-law, Josephus (that in case Antony should put him to death for the murder of Aristobulus, Josephus should murder Mariamne, and so prevent her becoming another's wife), he had both put to death (*Cf.* *B. J.*, I., 22, 3, 4, with *Antt.* XV., 3, 5-9; 5, 7, 1, &c.; the latter may be a correct, fuller statement). The atrocity was followed by a remorse which brought on a dangerous illness. Aristobulus and Alexander inherited their mother's hatred; Herod had them educated in Rome. When they returned, the former married Berenice, Salome's daughter; the latter, Glaphyra, daughter of the Cappadocian King, Archelaus. Thoughtless expressions of their sentiments were reported to Herod, and, to preserve a balance of influence between his sons, he recalled Antipater, with his mother, Doris (whom he had discarded when he married Mariamne), to the court, and in every way promoted him. With Antipater, a monster of wickedness, there entered a proper demon into the family, and began a series of family intrigues which involved nearly all of them in ruin. First of all, Mariamne's sons, after two reconciliations, were, by Herod's orders, put to death in Samaria. In the palace, one after another was tortured and killed (see *B. J.*, I., 24, 8). At last, Antipater, the guilty cause of these horrors, fell by the stroke of Providence. Herod, towards the end of his life, had sent Antipater to Rome, to obtain from Augustus the confirmation of his will, in which Antipater was named his successor. During Antipater's absence Herod discovered that he had laid plots to poison him, through his uncle Pheroras (whom Herod probably poisoned). On his return, therefore, Antipater was seized, condemned, and executed, five days before the death of Herod (in the 37th year of his reign, 750 u. c. On the murder of the children at Bethlehem, see art. *Jesus Christ*), caused by a painful disease in his bowels and genitals, in which worms bred. He

vainly sought relief in the warm baths of Calirhoe, and on his return thence he expired in Jericho in the greatest agonies. To make his death, in which he knew his subjects would rejoice, a season of lamentation, he had the most respected persons from all his cities collected in the amphitheatre in Jericho, surrounded with soldiers, and enjoined his sister, and her husband Alexis, to have them all murdered instantly after his death. Of course the command was disobeyed. His will made his son Archelaus, heir to the throne; Antipas, brother of Archelaus, became tetrarch of Galilee and Peræa; another son, Philip, tetrarch of Gaulonitis, Trachonitis, Batanea, and Panias; to Salome he gave Jamnia, Ashdod, Phasaelia, and a large sum of money; to other relatives, money and annual revenues. To the Emperor and Empress, also, he bequeathed immense sums (to Augustus ten millions, besides his golden and silver vessels and garments of great value). He was buried with great pomp in Herodion.—Herod possessed great physical and intellectual powers, which might have been made a blessing to his subjects, but for his monstrous selfishness, to which must be traced all that was great, as well as all that was hideous in his character; a selfishness which was cruel even to those dearest to him (*Antt.*, XVI., 5, 4).—(Benides JOSEPHUS, see NOLDII, *hist. Idumæa s. de vita et gestis Herod. Franeg.*, 1660, 12mo., (also in *Joseph. opp. ed. Havercamp*, II., 331, &c.). SERRARI *Herodes*, in *Ugolini Thes.*, XXIV. DEYLING, *observ. sacræ.*, II., 322, &c. JOST, *Gesch. d. Israel*, I., 160, &c. *Ersch u. Gruber*, *Encycl. Sect.* II., 6, p. 369. EWALD, *Gesch. d. Volkes Isr.*, IV., 459, &c.—On Herod's successors, see *Antipas*, *Archelaus*, *Agrippa*, I. and II.).

ARNOLD.*

Herodians are named with the Pharisees as opponents of Jesus, in Matt. 22 : 16; Mark 3 : 6; 12 : 13. They were probably adherents of Antipas, or the Herodian dynasty, and in league with the Romans, whilst other Jews hated the foreign yoke (so ORIGEN, in Matt. c. 17, III., p. 805. THEOPHYLACT. in Matt., JUSTIN. MART. *dial. c. Tryph.*, p. 272, ed. Paris.). Others thought them a distinct Jewish sect, which regarded Herod (M. or Antipas) as the Messiah (so PHILASTR. *de hæc.*, EPIPHAN. *Hæc.* XX. TERTULL. *de præscr. Append.*). not to name later views. But neither Philo nor Josephus name such a sect, and most probably none existed.—(See commentaries on the passages. WOLFF, *curæ phil. et critt.*, I., 311, &c. *Biblioth. Hebr.*, II., 818. OTHO, *Lex Rabbin.*, p. 275. NOLDII, *hist. Idum.*, 206. J. STEUCH, *dissert. de Herod. Lund.*, 1706, 4to. J. FEODER, *dissert. de Herod. Ups.*, 1764, 4to. C. F. SCHMID, *epist. de Herod. Lips.*, 1764, 4to. LEUSCHNER, *de secta Herod. Hirschberg*, 1751, II., 4to.).

ARNOLD.*

Herodias, daughter of Herod's son Aristobulus, and Berenice (see *Herod*). At her grandfather's request (Jos., *B. J.*, I., 28, 2), she married his son Herod Philip (see *Herod*), who, disinherited by his father, lived privately. Their daughter Salome is mentioned in Matt. 14 : 6; Mark 6 : 22. Antipas (see art.) visiting his brother Philip, was seized with a passion for Herodias, who yielded to his advances, prefer-

ring the prince to the private citizen. Antipas put away his wife, a daughter of the Arabian King Aretas, and lived incestuously with Herodias, for rebuking which John the Baptist was beheaded. Subsequently she shared her seducer's exile.—(See NOLDII, *hist. Idum.*, 350-1).

ARNOLD.*

Heruli (*Eruli*, *Aeruli*), a German tribe which are first seen with the Goths, at the Black Sea, and was most active in all the invasions of the Goths into the eastern provinces of the Roman empire. Subsequently they appear with the Turcilingi and Rugians in Attila's army. After Attila's fall they founded on the Danube a mighty kingdom, to which the Lombards became tributary. Procopius (*de bello Goth.*, II., 11) describes them as a barbarous people. Long after the Lombards and other neighboring German tribes became Christians, the Heruli adhered to their ancient faith, offering human sacrifices to their gods. Under the command of Odoacer, who is once called a Herulian, but oftener a King of the H., they, with the Turcilingi, Scyri, and Rugians, overthrew the Western empire. About 495 the Lombards conquered them. *Paulus Diacon. de gest. Longob.*, reports the tradition, that in their flight after this defeat they were so blinded by the wrath of God, that they mistook green fields for a river, and whilst spreading out their arms to swim, many were put to the sword by the pursuing foe. Some, after seeking a home in Rugiland on the Danube, concluded to settle within the Eastern empire. Anastasius, the Emperor, welcomed them, and assigned them a residence near Illyria. But as they would not cease their plundering, he was compelled to send an army against them. Those who survived this punishment became subject to Roman rule, and greatly assisted in subverting the Ostrogoth dominion in Italy. Under Justinian I., they, with the Ahalgi, Alani, Lazi, and Zani, joined the Romish Church, laid aside their barbarous manners, but also lost their historical prominence. P.*

Hervæus, *Natalis Brito*, born in Brittany, early entered the Dominican monastery at Morlaix, studied in Paris, and was then employed as a teacher in various provinces of France. From 1307-9 he was regent and professor at Paris, and lectured upon the sentences of Peter Lombard. In 1309 he became Provincial and in 1318 General of the Order. He died 1323 at Narbonne. He was a zealous Thomist, and was esteemed one of the first theologians of his day. But few of his many works were printed: 1) Comm. on the four books of the sentences of P. Lomb. (Venice, 1503; Paris, 1647); 2) A tract, *de potestate eccl. et papali* (Paris, 1500, 1647).—See *Script. Ord. Præd.*, by Quetif and Echard, I., 533.—Hervæus is also the name of a learned Benedictine monk of *Bourg-Dieu*, c. 1130, who wrote Comm. on Paul's Epp. and on Isaiah. Cf. *Grand Dict. of Moreri ed. Droux*: Paris, 1759, T. V.

TH. P.*

Heshbon (= wisdom. LXX., Ἑσέβων; Vulg. *Hesebon*; Joseph., Euseb. Ἑσέβων), a city beyond the Jordan, on the parallel of its entrance into the Dead Sea, and 20 Rom. miles E. of it, is situated upon a limestone hill commanding the elevated plain, central between the districts

watered by the Jabbok and Arnon, above the sources of Wady Heshbon, which empties into the Jordan near its mouth. It belonged originally to the Moabites, from whom it was taken by the Amorites shortly before the Israelitish invasion. Sihon resided there (Numb. 21 : 26, c.; Jer. 48 : 45; Josh. 13 : 10; Deut. 2 : 24) when Moses took it (Numb. 21 : 23). The battle-field was the elevated plain of Medeba, S. of Heshbon. It was then made a Levitical city, and apportioned to Gad (Josh. 21 : 39; 1 Chron. 5 : 81) or Reuben (Numb. 32 : 37); it lay on the borders of both (Josh. 13 : 17, 26), and seems to have been mainly inhabited by Levites, and not to have belonged exclusively to either tribe (Ewald thinks it belonged to each at different times). After the downfall of the kingdom of the ten tribes, the Moabites again got possession of the city (Is. 15 : 4; 16 : 8; Jer. 48 : 2, 4, 45; 49 : 3), after which the Chaldeans overthrew it. Under Alex. Jannæus the Jews again inhabited it (Jos. *Antt.*, XIII., 15, 4), and subsequently it became a Christian See. At the time of Jerome and Eusebius it was called *Ἐσβών* (but differs from that in *Plom.* V. 16, 6, who, in 17, 6, calls Heshbon *Ἐσβόρρα*). The ruins found on the side of the hill occupied by the city still bears its name (ABULFEDA, *Ityr.*, p. 11, names it as the small capital of Belka). The country around, once called *Essebonitis* (*Antt.*, XII., 4, 11; *B. J.*, II., 18, 1; *Plin.*, 5, 12), now covered with ruins (cf. Is. 5 : 4) was fertile, especially in wheat (Ezek. 7 : 17). The traveller *Legh* took Heshbon wheat to England, the stems of which measured five feet two inches, with 84 grains in the ear, which was four times heavier than a head of English wheat. The plateau around Heshbon was furnished with wells or pools of clear water, for common use, of which recent travellers found a number hewn in the rocks (Cant. 7 : 4; RBY and MANGLES, *Travels in Egypt, &c.*: London, 1847). BUCKINGHAM, *Travels in Syria, &c.*, II., 108, found a large cistern a half mile from the S. base of the hill, well built in, like the pools in Jerusalem, which Solomon may have constructed in imitation of those of Heshbon.—(See *Seetzen*, *Reisen*, XVIII., 431; BURKHARDT, 365; ROBINSON, I., 551). LEYER.*

Hessen.—Although the Landgrave Philip opposed the Reformation at the Diet of Worms, and even in 1524, yet his mind soon after underwent a change, through the influence mainly of Zwingli's writings, but partly, also, of Melancthon's Epitome. That his sympathies preponderated in favor of the views and order of the Reformed rather than the Lutherans, is so evident from the tenor of his explicit declarations, by letters and orally, that the opposite view needs no refutation (see ZWINGLI, *Opp.*, Schuler and Schulthess ed., VIII., 664. RICHTER, *Gesch. der ev. K.-verfass. Corp. Ref.*, II., 100. HOTTINGER, *hist. eccl.*, VI., 509. FUESLIN, *Epist. ref.*, 1740, p. 71. ROMMEL, *Phil.*, III., 35, 52. HASENKAMP, *Hess. K.-G.*, I., 230). It is true he subscribed the *Augustana* and not the *Tetrapolitana*, but this was done for political purposes, and with avowed reluctance, and a protest against Art. X. (J. JONAS, *Corp. ref.*, II., 155). The Catechism of Luther may also

have been used in Hessen, but only along with others, and not by authority. The introduction of the *Augustana*, moreover, was neutralized by the recognition of the *Concordia Bucer*, and modified by the Liturgy of 1539. And as soon as the *variata* to the Augsburg Confession were published, Philip declared his full approval of them. If further evidence of his position were needed, the Church Directory of 1566 affords it, by its explicit statement of the Reformed doctrine concerning the person of Christ, and the sacraments. And in Dec., 1576, the theologians of Hessen, in an opinion on the *Form. Conc.* declare: "Wir sind geblieben und bleiben bei dieser Concordia, so Bucer, a. 36, zwischen den Wittenbergern u. oberländ. Theologen aufgerichtet hat." In 1577 the four Landgraves of Hessen protested both against the *Form. Conc.* and unaltered Augsburg Confession, Landgrave William pronouncing some passages in it from Luther: "Schrecklich Gerede." Another attempt to introduce the *Form. Conc.* in 1579 also failed. At the 11th General Synod, 1580, Landgrave William had 21 writings and declarations read against it, hoping to gain Upper Hessen; and though he failed in this, the measure served to keep Lutheranism from his own State. William's son, the Landgrave Moritz, perfected what had thus been introduced by his grandfather and further developed by his father. He made the Church of Hessen *expressly and exclusively Reformed*. He did this by expunging all ambiguities from previous doctrinal results, and giving them dogmatical definiteness. His improvements may be set forth in three points: 1) All the preachers of the land should rigidly adhere, in regard to the doctrine of the person of Christ, to the old Hessen synodal decrees, exhibit it only *in concreto*, and not use *ubiquitarian* phraseology; 2) the prohibition of images to be restored in the decalogue, and all images to be removed from the churches; 3) the custom of breaking bread be restored in the Lord's Supper. These regulations must, to all but mere superficial observers, clearly show that Prince Moritz contemplated doctrinal as well as liturgical results. But his most important and conclusive measure was the convocation of the *General Synod of Hessen, in Cassel*, 1607, the authoritative framer of the confessional faith of the present Reformed Church of Lower Hessen. That Synod adopted a *confession of faith* and a *catechism*, both of equal authority, and forming an integral part of the Synod's official acts (see *Consist.-Ordnung* of 1610 and 1657, c. 13; *Marburger Gutachten*, 76–79); and both, likewise, harmonizing throughout with other Reformed confessions, upon all the distinctive doctrines of the Reformed Church. The first consequence of this measure was the introduction of the *Heidelberg Catechism* into Lower Hessen. It would have been officially introduced in 1607, but for political considerations. It is certain that it was used in the Marburg pedagogium in 1616, in Smalcald before 1627, and in 1655 it was used not only in all the high-schools, but in nearly all the State schools, and an ordinance of Feb. 1, 1726, enjoins all ministers and teachers to adhere to it, as a *symbol approved by the Reformed Church*. They were to use the Hessen

catechism as a primary book, and gradually lead their pupils and people to the Heidelberg Catechism as a higher book. Subsequent acts and ordinances confirm this course. — As the Church of Hessen thus adhered to the general symbol of the Reformed Church, it also maintained fraternal intercourse with the Reformed Churches of other countries, as did these with that of Hessen, students of the different countries promiscuously entering the schools of each. Representatives from Hessen attended the Synod of Dort, 1618, and there proved themselves true to the Reformed faith, and at the *Leipsic colloquium*, 1630, Hessen took part as a Reformed C. — Indeed the Reformed character of the confessional basis and organization of the Church in Hessen, was not disputed until recently, and more especially by Dr. Vilmar, who, in 1851, became superintendent of Cassel, and forthwith endeavored to carry out strictly Lutheran measures.

Hessen-Darmstadt became, from the first, decidedly Lutheran. In 1609 the Lutheran University of Giessen was established in opposition to the Reformed measures of Landgrave Moritz. In 1624 the Landgrave of Hesse-Darmstadt, aided by the predominant Catholic party in Germany, compelled Moritz to give up the half of the Upper principalities of Hessen, Schmalkalden, and some smaller districts belonging to Lower Hessen. The imperial Reichshofrath acknowledged that Moritz had forfeited his possessions by introducing the changes at Marburg. In all these territories Darmstadt abolished everything Reformed, expelled Reformed ministers and teachers, and published a Lutheran confession which reiterated the doctrines of the *Form. Conc.* in the most decided antagonism to the Conf. of the Cassel Synod of 1607 (see SUDHOFF, *Das gute Recht d. ref. Kirche in Kurhessen*: Frankf., 1855).

ECCLESIASTICAL STATISTICS.—**THE ELECTORATE OF HESSEN.**—The present evangelical Church of this State consist: 1) of the Reformed Church of Hessen and the Earldom of Ziegenhain; 2) the Lutheran Church of the province of Marburg, the Earldom of Schaumburg, the dominion of Schmalkalden, and some congregations in Lower Hessen; 3) the United Church of Hanau, where, however, the Reformed and Lutheran confessions are used respectively in the congregations. The ecclesiastical organization of the Hessen Church may be gathered from the following sketch.

A. The Consistory at Cassel comprises the superintendencies of Cassel, Allendorf, and Rinteln, and the inspectorates of Hersfeld and Schmalkalden.—*The Suprt. of Cassel*; residence Cassel, with 7 Reformed congregations, and 14 Reformed clergymen, and one Luth. congregation and two Luth. clergymen. This suprt. is divided in the classes of Ahna, Borken, Felsberg, Gottsbüren, Gudensb., Hofgeismar, Homberg, Kaufungen, Trendelb., Wilhelmshöhe, Wolfshagen, Zierenberg, with 123 Ref. congregations. In Wenzigerode, Nieste, and Karlshafen there are small Luth. congregations.—*The Suprt. of Allendorf* embraces the classes of Allendorf, Eschwege, Lichtenau, Melsungen, Rotenburg, Sontra, Spangenberg, Waldkappel, Witzenhau-

sen, with 106 Ref. and three Luth. congregations.—*In Rinteln*, including the classes of Rinteln and Obernkirchen, the Lutherans predominate, though in the city of Rinteln there is a Ref. church with two ministers.—*The Inspectorate of Hersfeld* is Ref. with 15 congregations.—In Schmalkalden there are two inspectors, a Ref. and Luth., and in *Schmalkalden* and *Steinberg* there are congregations of both denominations, excepting that those in Floh, Kleinschmalk, Herrenbreitungen, and Asbach are purely Reformed, and those in Brotterode, Springstille, Fambach, Trusen, and Barchfeld are purely Lutheran.

B. The Consistory at Marburg embraces the province of Upper Hessen, and is divided into a Lutheran and a Reformed diocese, each with its own superintendent.—*The Lutheran diocese* includes, besides the Luth. congregation in Marburg, the classes of Frankenberg, Fronhausen, Kirchhain, Rauschenberg, and Wetter, with 55 congregations. In Marburg, Frankenb., Cappel, Kirchhain, Rauschenberg, Gemünden, and Wetter there are, also, Ref. congregations.—*The Reformed diocese* embraces, besides the congregation at Marburg with two ministers, the classes of Neukirchen, Treysa, Ziegenhain, with 27 congregations.

C. The Consistory at Hanau comprehends the suprt. of Hanau and the inspectorate of Fulda. *The Suprt. of Hanau* embraces, besides the congregation at Hanau, the classes of Bergen, Birstein, Bockenheim, Bücherthal, Gelnhausen, Meerholz, Schlüchtern, Schwarzenfels, Wächtersbach, and Windecken, with 71 congregations, including the French and Dutch Reformed of Hanau, neither of which joined the Union.—*The Inspectorate of Fulda* has seven congregations, including that in Fulda with two ministers.

The theol. faculty of the State University at Marburg, which was once wholly Reformed, is composed, since the restoration of the Elector William I., of Ref. and Lutherans, and it serves both the evang. Churches of the Electorate.

THE GRAND-DUCHY OF HESSEN was, until 1802, almost exclusively Lutheran; after that several political measures served to increase the Reformed and Rom. Cath. population. The edict of organization for 1832 placed the entire evang. Church of the Duchy under a common eccl. government. The Minister of the Interior and Justice has supreme supervision, and exercises his control through the following Boards: 1) A supreme Consistory; 2) the Superintendents; 3) the District Counsellors; 4) the Deans; 5) the clergy; 6) the congregational officers.—The Union has been only partially introduced, owing to unfavorable rules adopted regarding it (see Prälat KÖHLER's *Handbuch* II., 363).—The entire Church of the Duchy is divided into three provinces, each with its superintendent; and each province into deaneries.

A. The province of Starkenburg has 16 deaneries: Darmstadt, Babenhausen, Breuberg, Dornheim, Erbach, Grosgerau, Langen, Lindenfels, Michelstadt, Offenbach, Pfungstadt, Reinheim, Rossdorf, Umstadt, Wimpfen, Zwingenberg. The congregations are all Lutheran excepting one Ref. church in Oberklingen, one in Walldorf, one in Mohrbach, one in Hering, one in

engfeld, and two in Umstadt, three Union, and one French Ref. church.

B. The province of Upper Hessen with the deaneries Giessen, 10 Luth. congregations; Alsdorf, 15 L. c.; Assenheim, 4 L., 4 Union c.; Biebrich, 12 L. c.; Büdingen, 13 Union c.; Butzbach, 11 L., 1 Ref. c.; Friedberg, 14 L., 1 Union c.; Gedern, 10 L., 6 Union c.; Gladenbach, 12 L. c.; Grossenlinden, 14 L. c.; Grünberg, 10 L. c.; Hungen, 12 Ref., 2 L. c.; Kirtorf, 13 L. c.; Laubach, 14 L., 1 Ref. c.; Lauterbach, 13 L. c.; Lidda, 15 L., 1 Union c.; Rodheim, 6 Union, 2 L., 1 Ref. c.; Schlitz, 5 L. c.; Schotten, 10 L. c.; Ulrichstein, 8 L. c.; Vöhl, 7 L. c.; total, 207 Luth., 31 Union, 15 Ref. congregations.

C. The province of Rhine Hessen with the deaneries Mayence, 1 congregation; Alzey, 12 c.; Oberingelheim, 9 c.; Oppenheim, 14 c.; Rhodfen, 12 c.; Wöllstein, 11 c.; Wörrstadt, 14 c.; Worms, 11 c.—The State University at Gießen, founded as a citadel of Lutheranism, has recently been severely assailed by the Luth. clergy of Darmstadt, on account of *Dr. Credner's* work, "Philipps d. Grossm. Hess. K.-reform.-Ordnung." K. SUDHOFF.*

Hesshus, Tilemann, born Nov. 3, 1527, at Nieder-Wesol, Cleves, of honorable parentage, was early sent on a tour through France, England, Denmark, Germany, and Austria, after which he went to Wittenberg, joined Melanchthon's *convictus*, in 1550 became *Magister*, and obtained permission to lecture on Matthew and Melanchthon's *Loci*, and preached. In 1552 he was chosen superintendent and first pastor of Goslar, which town, in 1553, furnished him means to procure the D. D. This early promotion, however, awakened in him an arrogant self-importance which made his career one of vicissitudes. He obtained prominent appointments in nine different German territories, but was driven from each after a short stay; from Goslar, May 6, 1556; from Magdeburg in 1557; from Heidelberg in 1559; from Bremen, 1560; again from Magdeburg in 1552; from his native place Wesel, to which he had last fled, in 1564. In May, 1565, he was called to Neuburg, as court-preacher, and enjoyed a season of peace. After the death of his patron, Count Palatine Wolfgang, in 1569, H. accepted a call to Jena as Prof. of Theology. In 1573 John William of Saxony died, and the Elector Augustus expelled H. and his Flaccian colleague, Wigand, from Jena, for their hostility to the theologians of electoral Saxony. Through Chemnitz H. was appointed in the same year, *B. of Sameland*, at Königsberg, whither he got Wigand as Prof. of Theology. But Wigand's envy of H.'s higher post, prompted him to lay schemes for his fall. He accused H. of teaching a heresy concerning the attributes of the human nature of Christ (its omnipotence, omniscience, &c.), which was condemned by a Synod in Jan., 1577, and as he refused to retract, he was deposed. Driven from Prussia, he was appointed second Prof. of Theology at the new University of Helmstädt, 1578, and in 1579, when his senior colleague Kirchner was expelled, became Prof. prim. There he effected the gradual withdrawal of the University from the Form. Conc. (which he himself had subscribed in 1578) on pretence of cer-

tain changes made in it as published, though Chemnitz showed the insignificance of these changes. He died in Helmstädt, Sept. 25, 1588, indefatigable to the last in his struggles for his peculiar views. His writings are partly controversial, in defence of his course in matters which led to his frequent changes of place, or in opposition to moderate Lutheran theologians, partly exegetical and dogmatical—comm. on the Psalms, on Isaiah, and Paul's Epp.; also *de justificatione peccatoris coram Deo*, 1587, above all *Examen theolog., continens præcipuos locos doctr. Christ.*, 1571, also 1586, 8vo., Helmst.—(See JOH. G. LEVCKFELD'S Biogr., *hist. Hessh.*: Quedlinb., 1716. CHRYSANDER'S *diptycha profess., qui in acad. Julia docuerunt*: Helmst., 1748, 4to. PLANCK'S *Gesch. d. prot. Lehrb.*.)

HENKE.*

Hesychasts, the name of a party of mystic monks of the Greek Church, in the 14th and 15th centuries. — After the Paleologi became Emperors the Greek Church became greatly distracted. The *Arsenian* party, originating in the contest between the Patriarch Arsenius and Mich. Paleologus, had been strengthened by the monks, and opponents of union with the Latin Church. The government wavered between union and hostility to the Latins, and the Patriarchs of the capital moved with the government. In the first half of the 14th cent. a violent civil discord broke out, which resulted in the younger Andronicus taking the throne. After his death the energetic John Cantacuzene seized the government, and continued the struggle against the Empress Anna, widow of the elder Andronicus. In this period the Hesychasts arose; and as the political conflicts involved the Church, we cannot wonder that the Hesychast movement has been differently judged by the opposite parties. Even the Arsenians had devoted themselves in part to a mystical life, but still more the monks on Mt. Athos (see Art.), who had influence in the cities, especially Thessalonica. The leader of these Hesychasts (*ἡσυχασταί, ἡσυχαστοί*) was *Palamas*, subsequent *B. of Thessalonica*. They were forthwith assailed by the learned monk *Barlaam*, who had come from Calabria to Constantinople. He spoke and wrote against those quietists as heretics. The controversy became public. The matter came before the Synod of Constantinople, 1341; Barlaam's courage failed, he recalled his charges, and returned to Italy. A second Synod condemned Greg. *Acindynus*, an adherent of B. and opponent of the Hesychasts; the majority having been no little influenced by the fact that Barlaam was an Italian, and that the monks had the orthodoxy in their favor. We have two diverse accounts of these things; that by Cantacuzene, which is partial to the monks (*lib. II.*, 39; *IV.*, 23, 24), and that of *Nic. Gregoras*, which is unfavorable to them (*Nic. Greg., lib. XV.*, *XVIII.*, *XIX.*, *XXII.*). Still the Barlaamites multiplied, and as Andron. had died 1341, they might have prevailed under the influence of the Empress Anna, who had the Patr. John deposed at the *third* Synod of Constantin., if Cantacuzene had not triumphed, in the succeeding war. C. insisted upon having the controversy decided. *Acindynus* shunned every summons; but in 1351 a *fourth* Synod

investigated four points touching the doctrines of the H., and approved of them in each (HARDUIN, *Acta Conc.*, XI., 283, &c.). The Archb. of Ephesus, who had appeared instead of Acindynus, and others were deposed; Barlaam and Acindynus were excommunicated.

The aim of these mystics was a morbid indulgence of the same mystical impulse which, from the first, had been cherished by Greek theology. Pseudo-Dionysius, to go no further back, sought for an organ of closer approximation to God, than was attainable by the ordinary means of knowledge and meditation. Monastic life among the Greeks favored these views. But the monks on Mt. Athos must have made the appropriation of the *θεῖον φῶς*, a special study. They wished, by full abstraction from the world, introverted thought, and asceticism (*ἀμπαρόθυμοι*), to experience the illumination of that light which shone around the Lord on Tabor, and appeared to St. Anthony and other saints. All this, under other circumstances, might have remained confined to their own secret circle, had not Barlaam's opposition demanded a theoretical vindication of their views. From the controversy which followed it appears, that the light after which they aspired, was supernatural and divine, not God himself, for to aim at identification with him would have been blasphemous, but an emanation from God, partaking of his nature yet distinct in essence. To make out their case they distinguished between God's *being* and *activities* (*ἐνέργεια γὰρ ἔστιν ἡ φερούσα ἐκείνου οὐσίας ὁράματα καὶ κινήσεις*. Thus Palamas. HARDUIN, l. c., 303). These, as the attributes in exercise, are radiations from God, or emanating divinities (*θεόρρητες*), which penetrate the sphere of human perception, and may be substantially contemplated. The capacity for seeing this light can be acquired only by long, devout, introverted thought.—Their opponents objected that God's activities and attributes could not be thus separated from his being; the uncreated light must either be self-subsistent, or a divine attribute; if the former a fourth hypostasis must be assumed, if the latter it could not be separate from its subject. On both assumptions, therefore, the doctrine of the H. was to be rejected as heretical.—It is obvious from this statement, that as the case came before the several Synods, it involved two points, 1) the distinction between being and activity, 2) the manner in which the H. converted the divine energies into *θεόρρητες*, and made them the principle of a mysterious self-deification. Had the latter point alone been involved the monastic party would doubtless have been defeated. But the Synods kept the speculative point mainly in view, and as the distinction of *οὐσία* and *ἐνέργεια* was current and familiar, it seemed safest to sustain the party which appealed to it, and adduced numerous quotations from the Greek Fathers in its support (HARDUIN, l. c., 302, 310, 331. ENGELHARDT, *Die Arsenianer*, &c., in Bd. VIII. of Illgen's *Ztschr. f. hist. Theol.*, p. 48, &c. PETAVIUS, *De theol. dogm.*, I., cp. 12, p. 76, 81: *Antw.*, 1700. GASS, *Kabasilas*, p. 8, 20–24. *Append. II.*, *Marci Eugenici cap. syllog.*). GASS.*

Hetzer, Lewis, a native of Bischofzell, Thurgau, was a youth when the Reformation first passed through Switzerland and Germany. Possessed of high thoughts, great energy, and strong passions, ever fluctuating between piety and carnality, he was easily drawn into the whirlpool of the extreme radicalism which in that period of religious agitation engulfed so many. About 1523 he was a chaplain in Wädenschwyl, on lake Zurich. At the second Zurich discussion (Oct., 1523) he was appointed to record and publish the transactions. A month before he had issued a small work: "*Urb. Gottes, unsers Ehegemahels, wie man sich zu allen Götzen und Bildnissen halten soll, an der heil. Schrift entzogen*," which, though lacking in ability, was popular in its style, and exerted so much influence that several editions were published. His views and ambition led him to join the extreme radicals, and subsequently to sympathize with the Anabaptists. Having been found guilty, in 1529, of gross immoral practices, he was condemned to death by the authorities of Constance. Whilst awaiting execution, in prison, he seemed to have become truly penitent. He was beheaded Feb. 3, 1529. During his life he had frequent intercourse with Zwingli, Oecolampadius, &c., until they discovered his true character. Among other writings he translated the Old Testament prophets into German, which he regarded as his best service to religion.—(See ZWINGLI'S Works, ed. Schuler and Schulthess, VII., 406, 419, 433. HETZER'S Schriften. Letters of *Urb. Reginus* and *Joh. Zwick* in the Simler. Samml. THOS. BLANCHER'S rare work: *L. Hetzer zu Const.*, &c.: Strasb. Beck, 1529. SEE. FRANK'S *Chronik Museum Helvet.*, VI., 100, &c.: *Anecdota quædam de L. Hetz.*, by BREITINGER. *Füssli Beiträge*, V., 146, &c. BOCK, *hist. Antitria. Ortu. annal. anab.* RIEDERER, *Nachrichten*, II. TRECHSEL'S *Antitria.*, I., 13, &c. HEBERLE on Denk, in the *Stud. u. Krit.*, 1851, I., 148, &c. 1855; IV., 817, &c.) TH. KEIM.*

Hezekiah, King of Judah, the successor of Ahas (2 Kings 18–20; 2 Chron. 29–32; Is. 35–39; Micah 1), reigned from 725–696, B. C., according to the usual chronology, which, however, has been recently assailed (for synchronistic data see MOVER'S *Phœnix*, II., I, p. 154, &c. v. GUMPACH, d. *Zeitrechn. d. Babylon. u. Assyrr.*, p. 105. BRANDIS, *über d. histor. Gewinn aus d. Entzifferung d. assyr. Inschriften*, p. 46). When Hezekiah, at the age of 25 years, ascended the throne, Judah was politically prostrated, being tributary to Assyria, and morally under the bondage of idolatry. He accordingly, at once tried to remedy both these evils. In 2 Chron. 29, &c., he is said, in the first month of the new year after he began to reign, to have ordered the priests and Levites to purify the temple. The brazen serpent of Moses, which had become an object of worship, was probably then destroyed (2 Kings 18:4). The temple purified, the true worship of Jehovah was reinstated with impressive services, in connection with a general celebration of the passover (chapt. 30). Previously the altars of the idols in Jerusalem were torn down, and

ter the festival this work of demolition was done all over the land. — That Hezekiah was sincere in all this is evident from the record. But in the case of the people generally the change seems to have been only from idolatry to empty ceremonies (Is. 1 : 10, &c. ; 29 : 13 ; Isaiah 6 : 6). Persons in authority, especially, seem to have been mercenary extortioners (Isaiah 3 ; Is. 1 : 15, &c. ; 28 : 7, &c. ; 22 : 15-17), against H.'s first minister, Shebna). Upon the political state of the kingdom a powerful party of nobles, favorable to the policy of Ahaz, had a pernicious influence. Instead of bearing the Assyrian yoke as a divine judgment, and waiting for God's promised help (Is. 10 : 24, 25 ; 30 : 15, &c.) this party was ever urging an alliance with Egypt, as the best means of getting rid of Assyria (Is. 28 : 15, &c.) Their counsels finally prevailed; though the precise time when Hezekiah revolted from Assyria cannot be fixed; but it probably occurred when Sennacherib was engaged in his expedition against Babylonia and Media. Three years later (in the 14th of Hezekiah, a. 712, 711) S. may have resumed his predecessor's plan of invading Egypt, and then punished Judah for its defection. The Assyrian army in its march through Judah, laid waste the country and took one fortress after another. H. sent ambassadors to sue for peace, and agreed to pay 300 talents of silver and 30 talents of gold to secure it (2 Kings 18 : 13, &c.). After receiving the money Sennacherib broke his compact, and sent his general, Tartan, with a party of soldiers to demand the surrender of Jerusalem, and threaten the transportation of the nation (Is. 36 ; 2 Kings 18 : 17, &c.). H. adopted measures to defend the city (2 Chron. 32 : 2-6 ; cf. Is. 22 : 9-11). Still the city seemed in a hopeless condition (Is. 37 : 3). The danger, also, reached its height, as Sennacherib, hearing of the approach of Tirhaka, moved from Lachish nearer to Jerusalem. Then it was that divine deliverance came. The Lord sent a fatal pestilence among the Assyrians, by which 185,000 men perished in a single night (Is. 37 : 8, 26 ; 2 Kings 19 : 8, 15, &c.). Concerning the time of this event see KEIL, Com. on Kings, 541 ; DRECHSLER, do. From Is. 10 : 32 ; 37 : 33, and Ps. 76 : 3, we infer that it took place near Jerusalem. It is worthy of note that Herod., II., 141, reports that a great disaster befel Sennacherib's army on this expedition (cf. Jos. Antt., X., 1, 5) ; and mice, the instrument of the evil, according to Herod., were a symbol of ἀπαρχμός (1 Sam. 5 : 4 ; cf. HIRTZIG, Urgesch. u. Mythol. d. Philist., 201). The deep impression made by this divine interpretation is indicated by Psa. 46, 75, and 76, which were probably then written. Even surrounding heathen nations recognized in it the power of Judah's God, and brought costly offerings to Hezekiah (2 Chron. 32 : 23 ; Is. 18 : 7 ; Ps. 76 : 11). The event was subsequently referred to (Tobit 1 : 18 ; 1 Macc. 7 : 41, &c.). — In the same year of this invasion (Is. 38 ; 2 Kings 20) the sickness of Hezekiah occurred, in which he received the promise of recovery, confirmed by a remarkable token, which some have foolishly attempted to explain by supposing that Isaiah took advantage of a simul-

taneous eclipse of the sun (THENIUS on 2 Kings 20 : 9). — Upon H.'s prayer see, besides others, DRECHSLER's Comm. II., 2, p. 219. — After his recovery, Merod.-Baladan, King of Babylon, sent messengers to congratulate him (2 Kings 20 : 12, &c. ; Is. 39), to whom he vainly displayed his treasures — (recovered from Sennacherib's army after its destruction, and received as gifts from adjacent nations). For this vanity he was rebuked by Isaiah, and told that his posterity, and all those treasures would ere long be carried away to Babylon (see *Chaldea*). — Upon the latter part of Hezekiah's reign the Scriptures say but little. In 2 Kings 18 : 7, 8, a victorious battle with the Philistines is named (cf. Is. 14 : 28, &c.), and in 2 Chron. 32 : 22, it is intimated that he secured peace with the neighboring nations. Beyond this the Chronicles simply report his wealth, activity in fortifying the cities, &c., and (2 Chron. 29 : 30) provision for the use of the Psalms at public worship. Prov. 25 : 1, also, mentions a compilation of proverbs made under his reign. He died at the time predicted, and the high regard in which he was held was shown by burying him "in the chiefest of the sepulchres of the sons of David." OEHLEK.*

Hierapolis, a city of Phrygia major, not far N. of Laodicea, and E. of Colossæ (*Itiner. Auton.*, 6 Rom. miles ; Fellows, 6 Engl. miles), where one of the first churches was planted (Col. 4 : 13). Anciently the city was celebrated for its warm baths, and for a cave, Plutonium, whence issued a deadly black vapor, the effects of which none but eunuch priests of the great Mother, the Galli, could escape (STRABO, XIII., 629. PLIN., *H. N.*, II., 95, (93). DIO, 252. AMMIAN. MARCELL., XIII., 6. APULEJ., *de mundo*, p. 65). Stalactites were formed by the water which was used in building. The water was also well adapted for coloring (STRABO, *l. c.* VITRUV., VIII., 3). The locality is now occupied by a village called Pambuk Kalesi, amid numerous and important ruins. The springs are still there, but the cave has disappeared. — (POCOCKE. RICHTER, *Wallfahrten*, p. 523, &c. v. SCHUBERT, *Reise*, I., 283. FELLOWS, *Asia Minor*, p. 283, &c.). ARNOLD.*

Hierax, an Egyptian who lived in or near Leontopolis, c. 280, a man of learning (EPIPH., *hær.*, 64, 65), and celebrated for his chirography, being equally skilful in writing Coptic and Greek. He was also familiar with the literature of both languages, and so well versed in the Scriptures that his enemies said he could repeat the whole from memory. Moreover he was poet, physician, astrologist, and magician. He wrote commentaries on the Bible in Greek and Coptic, and composed many hymns. It is said he lived to be more than 90 years old. His manner of life was rigidly ascetic; and he founded a society to which none but the unmarried, continent, virgins and widows, were admitted. The contents of his works are known only through Epiph., who represents H. as an offshoot of the Manichean heresy. But from E.'s statements we should rather infer that H.'s system of Hierax was Origenism run into extremes. His method of interpretation was allegorical (thus of paradise, and the relation of

Adam and Eve there). He rejected marriage, and argued that if Christ did not teach and enjoin celibacy, he revealed nothing new. His ascetic theory led him to lay stress on the importance of each one conquering his flesh by moral efforts, and thus gaining a participation in the kingdom of heaven. Holding that none could win the crown who did not strive for it, he denied salvation to children dying young; but he supposed that they occupied an intermediate condition. He denied a supernatural influence to baptism. His views concerning the Trinity were, also, denounced. He considered Melchisedec a type of the Holy Spirit, who (Rom. 8 : 26) is called an intercessor, and therefore must be a priest. Many monks in Egypt joined H., but gradually they abated their ascetic severities.—(See WALCH, *Hist. d. Ketzereien*, I., 815–23. NEANDER, *Ch. Hist.* GIESELER, *Eccl. Hist.*).

DR. PRESSEL.*

Hierocles, a Roman governor of Bithynia, and afterwards (from 306) of Alexandria, an enemy of Christianity under Diocletian. A philosopher and politician, he opposed Chr. on both grounds, writing against its adherents, *λόγοι φιλαλήδεις πρὸς τοὺς Χριστιανούς* (lost) and, in part, instigating the Diocletian persecution against them (LACTANT., *de mortib. persec.*, 16. *Acta Martyr. ed. Assemani*). The abovenamed work (known through LACTANT., *Inst. div.*, V., 2, and especially EUSEB., of Cæs., *contra Hieroc.*: Paris, 1628, and in OLEAR., ed. of Philostrates, 1709, p. 428) was not original, and of little account. Euseb. thought it deserving of an answer only on account of the parallel drawn in it between Jesus Christ and Apollonius of Tyana (see Art.).—A Neo-Platonist named Hierocles (confounded with the previous one, by Pearson, *Tillemont*) taught in Alexandria in the 5th cent., and wrote some philosophical works (cf. BÄHR, in Pauly's *Realenc.*, III., 1311).—(See FABRICIUS, *bibl. gr.*, I., 791. CAVE, *hist. lit.*, I., 131; II., 99. SCHRÖCKH, *K.-gesch.*, V., 201. NEANDER, *Ch. Hist.* BAUR, *Apollon. of T.*, &c., p. 3, &c.).

WAGENMANN.*

High Places.—*Worship of the Hebrews on*

High places.—The term **הַרְבָּ**, signifying a mountain-height, is of uncertain origin, and gives simply the idea of a high place for sacrifice. The root does not occur, but must have been **רָבָ**. The word belongs most probably to the Indo-Germanic languages, as being transplanted by the northern immigration of the proper Semitics (the Arian) into the tongues called Semitic, but correctly Hamitic. In the Doric dialect, **βᾶμα**, for which the other dialects employed **βῆμα**, denoted any elevated place; and with this word we may compare **βωμός**, probably also **βουρός**, a hill [the Gaelic *ben*, as in *Ben Nevis*, *Ben Lomond*], and the Persian *dam*, an elevation. The word as it exists in the Chaldee and the Syriac, was derived, we may readily suppose, from the Holy Scriptures. But tradition very plainly points to a mountain-height. The LXX. usually render it by **ὄρος**, **ὄψος**, also **βουρός**, or by transliteration make it **βᾶμα** (**ἀδάμα**). The Vulgate translates it by *excelsum*, and that the Vulgate does not blindly follow the LXX. in this matter, is evident from the fact that

where the LXX. give it by **ὄρος**, as is the case in the Pentateuch (Lev. 26 : 30; Numb. 21 : 28; 22 : 41; 33 : 52), the Vulgate there as usual has *excelsum*. The *usus loquendi* also implies the idea of a mountain-height. It is a place ascended and descended (1 Sam. 9 : 13, 14, 19; 10 : 5); **הַרְבָּ** and **הַרְבָּ**, both meaning a hill, are employed as synonymes of it (Is. 65 : 7; Ezek. 20 : 28, 29; Deut. 12 : 2; 2 Kings 7 : 9; Numb. 23 : 3, and often elsewhere); also **הַרְבָּ** a mountain, and even a high mountain (Deut. 12 : 2; Ezek. 18 : 11, sqq.), and **הַרְבָּ** a height (Ezek. 16 : 24, 25, 39). Where, however, this word does not denote a place of worship, it invariably signifies a mountain height (*Genesius Thes.*). Further explanations of its use will be given as we proceed.

The history of worship on high places has often been discussed in a critical manner. During the *First Period*, the Patriarchal, the word *bamah* does not appear, but we find the worship of God on mountains spoken of. On Bethel, which, according to Josh. 16 : 1; 1 Sam. 13 : 2, was a mountain, sacrifice was offered by Abraham and Jacob (Gen. 12 : 7; 13 : 3, 4; 28 : 16, sqq.; 35 : 15), and on Mt. Moriah, Isaac was to be offered up (Gen. 22 : 2). De Wette, Winer, and Gramberg, indeed, supposed that later tradition first gave a patriarchal sanctity to Mt. Moriah, the mountain of the Lord's house. But the worship on mountains is everywhere a matter of primeval antiquity, and afterward temples were commonly erected on heights already considered as sacred, as, on the other hand, the appellation Bethel has in modern times often been bestowed on a sanctuary. A later age also would have designated Mt. Moriah much more fully than is done in Genesis, had not that age preferred to use the name of Zion, the name so dear in the Prophets and the Psalms. That worship on high places should have arisen at a very early period, is altogether probable in itself. It everywhere springs from the immediate worship of nature, and grows up before service in temples. It is a favorite practice with Indians to go up a mountain to pray, and they believe that a spirit dwells within the mountain. So the ancient Germans. And this service on mountains has remained as intelligible in itself as any part of the older worship. Even our Saviour often went up a mountain to pray. The nations of antiquity instituted a regular service on mountains, as the Persians, *Herod.*, 1, 131; 7, 43. The Greeks had *proceSSIONS on mountains*, *ὄρεβασίαι*. Throughout ancient Europe, among the Germani, the Esthoni, the Finns, the Cours, and the Slavonians, mountains were places of worship. Among the Chinese, down to the latest times, the chief religious rites have been performed on mountains. Hence there were conceived to be special gods of the mountains, as the *thalocs* among the Mexicans; the *oreads* among the Greeks; and among the Romans, *dii montenses*, *dii montium*, *montinus*, and *dea Collina*. The Syrians, too, according to 1 Kings 20 : 23, must have believed in particular deities of the mountains. Some single mountains were held sacred rather than

ers, as in Peru and Hayti; while in the old world Zeus, Pan, Hera, Athene, Aphrodite, and Jupiter received various appellations from such mountains. Mountains were regarded as dwellings of the gods, as for instance, Caucasus (*Philostr., Apoll., Thya., II., 5*); and it was a conceit of the Emperor Julian that *the father of all gods* had his abode on a mountain-peak. Hence it is that mountains are often adorned with myths as celestial abodes; as the Culcan and the four Yo of the Chinese, Albordi and Gedenelmets of the Persians, Aherman in Turan, Caucasus, Menu, Yamnotri, and Sansadhare of the Hindoos. As Menu, as Summr Oola, and Rieghiel Lunbo of the people of Thibet, so Sumeru of the Buddhist Mongolians is surrounded by seven mythical mountains of gold. The Greek Olympus, Parnassus, Helicon, and Ida were famous as abodes of divinities. To this head is to be referred the Babylonian mythical mountain of the gods, mentioned in *Is. 4:13, the mount of the congregation in the sides of the North*, which is supposed to be Albordi of the Persians. In this way various mountains became objects of worship and even themselves gods. Hence arose the myths of the transformation of kings and giants into mountains, as the myth of Mt. Atlas, which was worshipped as a deity by the Mauritanians. Libanus, Libanus, and Anti-Libanus, according to Philo B., derived their names from giants, and were gods among the Syrians, as was also Carmel. From all this it appears that the people of Palestine, even in a very remote age, were addicted to the worship on high places, which is of earlier origin than idolatry, the latter having been consummated only in after ages.

As among the Patriarchs a holy place was called *Peniel*, so a Phœnician promontory was designated *ἱεὺν πρόσωπον*, that is, *Peniel* (*Strabo, XVI., p. 754*). The worship of the goddesses of Asia Minor on Mt. Pessinus, Berycynthus, Syphelus, Cybelus, and Ida, is also of very early antiquity. It follows at the same time from what we have now presented, that the high place was not an altar, as Ugolini (*Thes., X., 588*) asserts on the authority of the Talmudists. In later times it is, moreover, expressly distinguished from the artificial heights (*1 Kings 13:32*).

In the *Second Period*, between the time of Moses and that of Solomon, the tabernacle, the tent of the Hebrews in their wanderings, was the central seat of worship, along with which, however, the high places still continued. Thus, Horeb is called a Mount of God, a Holy Place, on which by divine command the Israelites were to worship God (*Exod. 3:1, sqq.; 12:4, 27; 18:15*), and in several passages in *Deut.*, and also in *Mal. 4:4*, Horeb, as well as its twin-peak, Sinai, is spoken of as the mount of the Covenant or mount of the Law. Sinai itself, in like manner, is called the Mount of God (*Exod. 24:13*); on it God appears continually; before it the people are filled with holy awe. On Ebal, too, an altar was set up by the inspired command of Moses (*Deut. 27:4*), and there Joshua performed holy rites (*Josh. 8:33*). During this same period heathen worship on high

places was more fully constituted. We meet with the height of Baal (*Numb. 22:19, 41, 44; Josh. 13:17*); the twin-heights, Pisgah and Nebo, were sacred to the Moabitish god Nebo, and there Balaam made an offering on a high place (*Numb. 23:4; Deut. 33:49; Is. 15:2; 16:12; Jer. 48:35*); and the peak of Peor (Beth-Peor) may be mentioned, on which the wanton rites of Baal-Peor (*9 v.*) took place; and among this people we know that human offerings were then made. Baal-Hermon, too, belongs here (*Judges 3:3; 1 Chron. 5:23*). The more fully the heathenish character of the heathen worship on high places disclosed itself, the more distinctly was this worship forbidden in the Law, and indeed not only in *Deut.*, but even in *Lev.* and *Numb.*; and from the terms in which this prohibition was couched, which are no longer applicable to natural heights, it appears that also artificial heights were now erected, which still existed in the following period. It is commanded that they should destroy and utterly remove them (*Lev. 26:30; Numb. 33:52; Deut. 12:2; Ezek. 6:3*); that they should *tear them down* (*2 Kings 23:8*); that they should *burn them up* (*2 Kings 23:15*). So, also, mention is made of fashioning, building, and erecting the high places (*1 Kings 11:7; 14:23; 2 Kings 17:9, 29; 21:3; 23:15; Jer. 7:31; 19:5; Ezek. 16:24, 25; 2 Chron. 22:11*); and in fact they were set up on mountains, in fields, valleys, cities, streets, and on roofs (*Jer. 7:31; 17:3; 19:4; 32:35; Ezek. 16:23, sqq.; 2 Kings 7:9; 17:8, 29*). These expressions are as little suitable to natural heights as they are to holy places set apart, which Otto Thenius avers the high places to mean. We should sooner, with Ewald, think of conical stones, monuments of stone, images of Asherah, objects similar to which are often mentioned both among the heathen and among the Hebrews. The LXX. translate *הַמָּקוֹם* in the Pentateuch uniformly by *στήλη*. But such stones as they used also for altars, are distinguished from the high places (*2 Kings 22:15; with which comp. Gen. 35:15*), or again the high places and altars are opposed to columns and stones (*Numb. 33:52; Deut. 12:3; Ezek. 16:16-39; 2 Kings 23:15*), if the high places are not designated exactly as tents. If now the artificial heights are mentioned as *houses of the high places*, *בְּתֵי הַמָּקוֹם* (*1 Kings 13:32; 14:23; 2 Kings 17:29; 21:3; 23:8, 13, 19; Ezek. 16:16*), there lies in this expression itself a distinction between houses and heights; they are explicitly opposed to each other (*1 Kings 3:32; 2 Kings 17:29*), whenever the shortened form *height* is used instead of *house of the height* (*Ezek. 16:16*). The artificial heights are the houses of the heights, to which latter all the expressions cited above, as used of the former, are applicable, and which are likewise distinguished from the monuments of stone, and so forth (*1 Kings 14:23; 2 Kings 21:3; 23:13, 14*). They are also called dwelling-places (*הַמְּקוֹמוֹת*, *Deut. 12:2*) instead of houses. All these forms of expression bring us to the idea of a temple. And, indeed, artificial

heights for temples among many tribes of America and Asia at this day consist of truncated pyramids, as did also the temple of Baal in Babylon. But nothing of this kind is spoken of in Palestine; no ruins of such objects have been found there; and the language above quoted concerning artificial heights, for the most part, does not apply to pyramids, while, on the other hand, it all very well applies to tents, nomadic coverings, and portable temples. And with this view, the two passages, Ezek. 16 : 16; 2 Kings 23 : 7, agree, according to which, the high places were decked with cloths of various colours, and again they wove tents for Asherah. These are the *Tents of the Daughters, Succoth-Benoth*, (2 Kings 17 : 30) in the lascivious sanctuary of Mylitta (*Herod.*, 1, 199; *Strabo*, XVI., 1), with which the *Σάσια* or *Feast of Booths* among the inhabitants of Asia Minor may be compared. Such a nomadic tent existed in America; among the Italians (according to *Servius*); the Egyptians (*Descript.*, I., pl. 11, fig. 4); the pagan Slavonians; the Mongolians; and especially in Asia Minor, whence the Carthaginians received it (*Diod.*, XX., 65). That even in the time of Moses it had come from Asia Minor into use among the idolatrous Israelites, is testified by Amos (Amos 5 : 25; with which comp. Acts 7 : 43).

The believing Israelites, however, in their wanderings likewise needed such a tent, as a military, political, and religious centre. They set it up in the Tabernacle, *הֵיכָל*, also called a house or abode of God (Exod. 23 : 19; 25 : 8, 9; Josh. 6 : 24; 24 : 26). This Tabernacle was to be an exclusive place of central worship (Lev. 17 : 1-9; Deut. 12 : 13, sqq.); and that in actual life they seriously treated this requirement, is manifest from the account in Josh. 22 : 10, sqq. The Tabernacle was, of course, not always in the same place. In the desert it was a wandering temple. It was afterward commonly at Shiloh, perhaps also once at Shechem (Josh. 24 : 1, 26). When, therefore, the people assembled before Jehovah in other places, as in Bethel, and in the two Mizpahs, we must suppose that the Tabernacle, or at least the Ark of the Covenant, was sometimes brought to such place from Shiloh. That the Tabernacle, down to the time of David, often changed its place, plainly appears from 2 Sam. 7 : 6. It was in Gilgal, under Samuel; in Saul's time, in Nob; under David, and in the early part of Solomon's reign, in Gibeon, from which place it was removed to Jerusalem. Notwithstanding all the rigor of the letter of the Law, there were yet, beside the central sanctuary, other places of worship, which were presupposed even in the Book of the Law, Exod. 2 : 20, 21, sqq. That in this passage allusion is not made to a different place of setting up the Tabernacle, is evident from the circumstance that mention is here made of altars of stone, whereas the altars of the Tabernacle consisted of wood or metal. So in fact Moses gave direction that an altar of unhewn stone should be erected on Mt. Ebal, and this direction Joshua obeyed. During the times of the Judges we find private and family altars in various places (Judges 2 : 5; 6 : 11, 24; 1 Sam.

24 : 18; 1 Chron. 21 : 26, 36). Thus then the worship of Jehovah on sacred heights was expressly said to exist as well in the times of the Judges (Judges 13 : 19), as in that of Samuel, who, together with the people, resorted to such a height (1 Sam. 9 : 12, with which comp. 7 : 17). Saul also prepared an offering on Mt. Carmel (1 Sam. 15 : 12); in the time of David the Mt. of Olives was used for such purpose (2 Sam. 15 : 30, 32); and Solomon himself, and the people, made offerings on high places before the erection of the temple (1 Kings 3 : 2, sqq.).

During the *Third Period*, from Solomon to Hezekiah and Josiah, the high places existed along with the temple. This structure, with all its magnificence, must have made the demand for unity still more emphatic than the Tabernacle, which now no longer answered its original end. Like the Tabernacle, the temple was to be a throne of God, not simply a high place for sacrifice, though built on a height. The more the temple required centralization, the more distinctly did all tendencies to political and religious disunion separate themselves from it. The temple was scarcely finished when ten tribes under Jeroboam fell away from its service and from Judah, and built, on the heights at Dan and Bethel, temples and houses of the heights, in which priests ministered who were not Levites (1 Kings 12 : 27; 2 Kings 17 : 32, 33). In these places the form of a golden calf or bull was worshipped as Jehovah at that period (1 Kings 12 : 28-33), and even down to later times (2 Kings 10 : 29; 17 : 16, 32; Hosea 8 : 56; 13 : 2). There were some instances even of heathen worship on high places, under Solomon to some extent (1 Kings 11 : 7); then in Israel under Ahab (1 Kings 16 : 19; 18 : 19; 2 Kings 10); and under Hosea (2 Kings 17 : 9, sqq., 29, sqq., 23 : 15). Nor did Judah remain free from this heathen service. As early as the time of Rehoboam they built many high places, set up columns and images of Asherah on every high hill and under every green tree, and there were then Sodomites in the land (1 Kings 14 : 23). The same thing took place under his successor Abijam (1 Kings 15 : 3), under Joram (2 Kings 8 : 18, 27), under Ahaz (2 Kings 16 : 4, 32; 10 : 21), and finally under Manasseh (2 Kings 21 : 3). Relapses also occurred in the period following. But while in both kingdoms, the opposition of the believing kings, prophets, priests, and Levites, was open and strenuous against the heathen heights, as against heathen worship in general, such was not the case with the monotheistic high places. The pious kings retained the high places of Jehovah, and were censured by no contemporary prophet. They had the example of Samuel before them, and even the zealous Elijah had made an offering on Carmel (1 Kings 18 : 17, sqq.). The assertion of *K. Ad. Menzel* (*Staats-und Religionsgeschichte der Königreiche Israel und Juda*, § 240), that the priesthood had already insisted on abolishing the high places, is, as well as much else in that work, utterly without foundation. The historical books, the Kings and the Chronicles, which were not written till a later period, first give utterance to their censure of the high places, which is repeated by the prophets (Isa. 65 : 7;

Hosea 4: 13). Thus in Kings it is said of Asa, that he put away all idols, but did not remove the high places, and yet his heart was given to Jehovah as long as he lived (1 Kings 15: 12, 14). The same is declared of his son Jehoshaphat (1 Kings 22: 44); of Jehoash (2 Kings 12: 3); of his son Amaziah (2 Kings 14: 3, 4); of Uzziah (Azariah) (2 Kings 15: 3, 4); and of his son Jotham (2 Kings 15: 35). There seems to be a contradiction of this in 2 Chron., in which book these kings are said to have abolished the high places. The case stands thus: in respect of Jotham, 2 Chron. 27: 2, quite agrees with 2 Kings, when it declares: *And still the people did evil*: of Jehoash, Amaziah, and Uzziah, the Chronicles make no mention, but of Asa and Jehoshaphat they state two different things: that namely the high places were abolished by them (14: 3-5), and then again that they were not abolished (15: 17; 20: 33). Recent critics, as *de Wette*, in his *Beiträge*, and *Gramberg*, in his *Religionsgeschichte*, press this contradiction against the statements of the Books of Kings, as if the Chronicles had ascribed to their own time the views of the earlier period, and had asserted that the faithful kings had already abolished the high places, which in fact they had not done. The Chronicles, these critics assume, made this representation with a view to vindicate the antiquity of the Law concerning the unity of divine worship; but when again the Chronicles, in agreement with the Books of Kings, make these two sovereigns, Asa and Jehoshaphat, still retain the high places, the Chronicles, in careless thoughtlessness and entire forgetfulness of their chief dogmatic aim, must have copied this from the Books of Kings. In opposition to such views, the general credibility and historical character of the Chronicles have more recently been vindicated by the result of the investigations of Dahler, Drey, Herbst, Hirscher, and especially of Movers and Keil, with whom, in general, judicious critics, such as Bertheau, Otto Thenius, Ewald, and Stähelin, concur. Such being the case, we are justified in the attempt to explain an apparent contradiction between the two historical statements. We cannot, however, follow the older commentators in referring the one passage to an attempt to abolish the high places, and the other to the ineffectual result, the very language employed forbidding this.

On the other hand, a simple examination of those passages in the Chronicles which seem to involve the contradiction, shows that they refer to the heathen heights; while the other passages that represent the heights as still existing, refer to the heights on which Jehovah was worshipped (comp. Movers, p. 257). It is said of Asa, in 2 Chron. 14: 2, sqq.: "And Asa did what was good and right in the eyes of the Lord his God: for he took away the altars of the strange gods, and the high places, and brake down the images, and cut down the Asherah; and commanded Judah to seek the Lord God of their fathers, and to do the law and the commandment. And he removed from all the cities of Judah the high places and images to the sun." The same in substance is declared of Jehoshaphat in ch. 17: 6. Here, by the context, the high places are clearly

enough designated as heathen, and indeed in exactly the same manner in which in the Law, the Prophets, and the historical books, the heathen heights are always mentioned. The places in the Law and the historical books are adduced above; for those in the Prophets, comp. Hosea 8: 8; Amos 7: 9; Micah 1: 5; Jer 7: 31; 17: 3; see also 2: 19, 9; 32: 35; 48: 35; Ezek. 7: 3, 4; 6: 6; 16: 16, sqq.; 20: 28, sqq.; Ps. 78: 58. In general, Ewald and Stähelin concur in this view, but they suppose that the later writers had gradually come to signify by the term height simply an idolatrous height, so that with these later writers also the monotheistic heights, and even those on which the Tabernacle stood, were idolatrous. But from the passages quoted in support of the latter supposition (1 Kings 3: 2, 4; 1 Chron. 16: 39; 21: 29; 2 Chron. 1: 3), it is evident that the Tabernacle was often erected on a height. That a two-fold, relative mode of expression was used in the Chronicles as well as elsewhere, is manifest from this apparent contradiction itself. In respect to the matter in question, there exists, between the Chronicles and the Books of the Kings, the point of agreement, that both hold all high places to be contrary to law. We learn, therefore, from the history of the worship on high places, that even from the time of Moses the Law prescribed centralization of worship. Effect was given to this law in actual life at first by the erection of the Tabernacle, afterward by that of the temple. This law was required by the necessities as well of the people in their wanderings as of the subjects of the kingdom. If, however, the law was not carried out with perfect consistency either by prophets or by pious kings, it was owing, in the first place, to the force of custom, which in religious matters is very strong; then to the circumstance that worship on high places is, in and by itself, natural, appealing as it does to the religious sentiment in general, and not simply to that of the heathen; finally, in the third place, that the Old Dispensation, neither in its beginning nor in its completion, required the temple, except only in one stage of the development of the people, when as yet they were not truly centralized. If, therefore, the worship on high places was practised without the adoration of false gods and the veneration of images, the latter being always considered as heterodox and sinful, and was so practised as not to violate fundamentally the leading principle of the Hebrews, such worship was tolerated even during this Third Period, according to the statement of the earlier records and those of the Chronicles themselves.

The *Fourth Period*, from the time of Hezekiah and Josiah, first wrought in the matter itself, and in the view entertained of it, such a change that thenceforth service in the temple, to the exclusion of the high places, was predominant in Judah. The greater part indeed of what is rehearsed of the reformation accomplished by these two sovereigns, relates to the abolishment of idolatry, but even the monotheistic heights were now done away, and are therefore no longer mentioned. That Hezekiah abolished the illegal monotheistic worship, we see from his destruction of the brazen serpent (2 Kings 18: 4.)

which Moses made, and to which, even at this period, offerings of incense were made. Again in v. 22 it is expressly stated that Hezekiah took away the high places and altars of Jehovah, and commanded the people to worship only at the altar in Jerusalem, with which statement Isa. 36 : 7 coincides. Josiah afterward followed in the footsteps of Hezekiah, and therefore the reformation he effected is to be regarded in the same light as that of his predecessors (2 Kings 23 : 4-14; 2 Chron. 34 : 35). Of him also it is related that he destroyed the houses of the heights at Bethel and elsewhere. This refers to the worship of the figure of a bull as Jehovah, which Jeroboam had instituted, and with which the elements of heathen worship were mixed, as had been done even in Jerusalem (2 Kings 23 : 15, 19; Zeph. 1 : 4-6).

Comp. on heathen worship on high places and mountains, the well-known Histories of Religion, by VOSS (Idol.), CREUZER and MONE, KLEMM, WUTTKE, SCHWENK, J. GRIMM, W. MÜLLER; FR. HERMANN'S Gottesdienstl. Altherthümer der Griechen; PAULY, ZACHARIÄ, *De more veterum in locis editis colendi Deos*, 1754; REISKE, *ad Max. Tyr.* VIII. 8; *Journal des Savants*, 1842, p. 217. On the same in America: Geschichte der amerikan. Urreligionen, von J. G. M. In Western Asia, especially in Palestine: MOYER'S Geschichte der Phönizier; GESENIUS, zu Gramberg, im Thesaurus und zu Jes., 13 : 13; DE WETTE'S Beiträge; GRAMBERG'S Israelitische Religionsgeschichte; WINER'S Lexicon; MOYER'S und KEIL'S Untersuchung über die Chronik; STÄHELIN, über die Leviten; EWALD'S Geschichte Israels, III., 1, 110, 182; Alterthüm. 235; EISENLOHR, das Volk Israel, I., 114; and the Commentare zu alttest. Büchern von BERTHEAU, OTTO THENIUS, and others.

J. G. MÜLLER.—C. Short.

High-priest.—The complete designation is found in Lev. 21 : 10: "The high-priest among his brethren, upon whose head the anointing oil was poured;" hence, more briefly, **הַכֹּהֵן**

הַכֹּהֵן הַגָּדוֹל, Lev. 4 : 3, 5, 16; or **הַכֹּהֵן הַגָּדוֹל**

Exod. 35 : 28. In the middle books of the Pentateuch, however, instead of the name of the office, that of its first incumbent is mostly used; in Deuteronomy (esp. 17 : 12), and the subsequent books of the Old Test., the high-priest

is called simply **הַכֹּהֵן**; and still later, **כֹּהֵן**

שֶׁרָאָה, 2 Kings 25 : 18; Esra 7 : 5; 2 Chron.

19 : 11; comp. 24 : 6. In the modern Hebrew

of the Mishna, &c., the common name is **כֹּהֵן**

גָּדוֹל, to distinguish them from the ordinary

priests. In the LXX. the general name is ὁ ἱερεὺς ὁ μέγας; Lev. 4 : 3, ἀρχιερεὺς, and thus generally in the New Test., in Philo, and Josephus. In the plural, the latter name, according to the most generally-received opinions, designates the chiefs of the twenty-four priestly classes; according to some, the members of the sanhedrim, who were of priestly descent. According to WICHELHAUS (Versuch eines ausf. Comm. z. Leid.-Gesch.), the name designated, besides the actual high-priests, only those who

had either formerly held the office of high-priest or were members of those families to whom the office was confined. The high-priest is the special representative of the theocratic people before Jehovah: in him is concentrated what is the special calling of the priesthood—the mediocrity between God and the people, through which access to God is given to the latter. If in the blood of sacrifices, God accepts the life of a clean animal, by which the uncleanness and sin of the people are covered before him (according to the leading sense of **כִּפֹּר**); he, in the high-priest,

on the other hand, chooses and sanctifies a man to be surety for the people, in order, as is said in Exod. 28 : 38, to "bear the iniquity of the holy things, which the children of Israel shall hallow in all their holy gifts, that they may be accepted before the Lord." Hence, that the sacrifice might have a reconciling and sanctifying effect, it was necessary that in the high-priest a personally reconciling mediocrity should appear before God¹; in which, of course, the old covenant shows its inadequacy to establish a true reconciliation in the fact that the very high-priest, through whose mediation the defects cleaving to the sacrifices were neutralized, needed, on account of his own sins and infirmities, an atonement and purification through the blood of sacrifices. As representative of the people, the high-priest bears the names of the twelve tribes upon his shoulder and his heart (Exod. 28 : 12, 29). Since the mission of the entire nation is united in his person (*aequiparatur universo Israeli*, says *Aben Esra*, to Lev. 4 : 13), the same sacrifice is required for him as for the entire nation (see *Art. Sacrifice*). According to Lev. 4 : 3, if the high-priest transgresses, there attaches to the people an interruption of the entire theocratic order: if, on the other hand, God acknowledges a high-priest as well-pleasing to him, it is a virtual declaration that he graciously accepts the entire people.—This character of the high-priest, in virtue of which he is specially "the saint of the Lord" (see Ps. 106 : 16), must show itself in his entire life, which is to make the impression of the highest purity and of an entire surrender unto God. To this refer the directions which concern 1, the person and order of life of the high-priest; 2, his official ordination and dress. 1. Here we have to describe only what is peculiar to the high-priest, as given in Lev. 21 : 10-15. According to this he is above all to be separated from all defiling contact with the dead—even with the dead bodies of his parents—that his priestly labors in the sanctuary might not be interrupted. In this surrender of the

¹ Comp. CALVIN'S just interpretation of the passage: "Oblationum sanctarum iniquitas tollenda et purganda fuit per sacerdotem. Frigidum est illud commentum, si quid erroris admissum esset in ceremoniis, remedium fuisse sacerdotis precibus. Longius enim recipere non oportet: ideo oblationem iniquitatem deleri a sacerdote quia nulla oblatio, quatenus est hominis, omni citio cordi. Dictum hoc asperum est et fere repudiosum, sanctitates ipsas esse immundas, ut venia indigeant; sed tenendum est, nihil esse tam purum, quod non aliquid labis a nobis contrahat.—Nihil Dei cultu praestantius: et tamen nihil offerre potuit populus, etiam a lege praescriptum, nisi intercedente venia, quam non nisi per sacerdotem obtinuit."

most sacred ties of nature in favor of the divine calling is symbolized the priestly disposition required in Deut. 33 : 9. Every token of mourning, even, is forbidden him. The words "uncover not your heads" (v. 6), have reference perhaps to the uncovering of the head in order to cast dust and ashes upon it (see *Hävernick* on Ezek. 24 : 17). The prohibition of rending the garments was not applied to mourning on account of public calamities (see 1 Macc. 11 : 71; Jos. *B. Jud.*, II., 15 : 4). *Mishna Horajoth*, 3 : 5, allows it in every case of mourning, only that the high-priest rend it from the hem, not from above.—As regards sexual relations, besides the prohibitions of the ordinary priests, the high-priest was also forbidden to marry a widow: he was to take a virgin "of his own people." Later tradition strained the qualification of virginity so far, as to exclude a virgin beyond her flowers (see *Mishna Jebum*, 6 : 4). The words, "of his own people," designed nothing more, perhaps, than to exclude a foreigner. That, according to Philo, *de monarch.*, II., 11, the high-priest could marry only the daughter of a priest, is a mere exaggeration. Of course, the high-priest had also to be born from a lawful marriage of the above kind; in later times, special weight was attached to the point that the mother had never been a captive in war (Jos. *Arch.*, XIII., 10 : 5).—As regards the age in which the high-priest could enter upon his office, there is no law given: Jewish tradition requires him to be 30 years of age, although Herod once appointed a youth of 17 years to the office (Jos. *Arch.*, XV., 1). As regards moral qualifications, the crime of idolatry, murder, incest, &c., excluded from the office.—2. The *official consecration* of the high-priest, the ceremonies of which occupied seven days, consisted of, 1, washing; 2, putting on the vestments; 3, anointing; 4, sacrifices, with which, again, special ceremonies were connected (Exod. 29; Lev. 8. See also Art. *Sacrifices* and *Priest*). What is peculiar here to the high-priest belongs to the putting on of the vestments and the anointing. As regards the former, see Exod. 29 : 5–9, Numb. 20 : 26–28, according to which latter passage, the transfer of the high-priest's office from Aaron to Eleazar was performed by the transfer of the high-priest's vestments. Without this holy vestment the high-priest is a mere private person; he is threatened with death if he appears before Jehovah without it (Exod. 28 : 35). A description of the official dress of the high-priest is given in Exod. 28 and 39, with which Sir., 45 : 9–16, Jos. *Arch.*, III., 7 : 4, and his *B. Jud.*, V., 5 : 7, must be compared. The most important monographs on this subject are: BRAUN, *de vest. sacerdot. Hebr.*, 1680; CARPZOV, *de pontif. Hebr. vest. sacro*, in UGOLINO's *Thes.*, vol. XII.; ABRAHAM BEN DAVID, *dissert. de vest. sacerdot. Hebr.*, in UGOLINO, vol. XIII. Among recent writers, especially BÄHR, *Symb.*, II., p. 97. In so far as the dress of the high-priest was the same as that of the ordinary priests, see Art. *Garments, holy, among the Hebrews*. Over this ordinary dress the high-priest wore a robe of woven work, blue, and of cotton, which, from the description, must be regarded as a closed garment, having a hole at the top, with a binding of woven work, and holes (not

sleeves) for the arms. To the hem, pomegranates and golden bells in alternation were attached, the purpose of which is stated in Exod. 28 : 35. Their tinkling signalized to the people in the outer court that the high-priest was engaged in his offices in the sanctuary, so that they could follow him with their thoughts and prayers. Over the robe was the ephod, to which the breast-plate was fastened by chains and bands (see articles *Ephod*, and *Urim* and *Thummim*). The head-dress was a mitre, which differed from the bonnet of the ordinary priest, although Josephus and the Rabbins often call the bonnet a mitre. According to Jos., the mitre of the high-priest consisted of the bonnet of the ordinary priest, with another of purple-blue wound over it. In front of it was a plate of gold, קָדֵשׁ (LXX., *κεφαλαιον*, see Lexicons), called in Exod. 29 : 6, קִדְדָן , diadem; it bore the inscription, "*Holiness to the Lord.*" In Sir., 45 : 12, and in Josephus, it is called *κεφαλαιον χρυσεον*, perhaps from its later shape. For the offices on the day of atonement, another dress of white linen was prescribed (see resp. Art.). In the age of the Herods and of the Roman supremacy, the official dress of the high-priest was kept in the tower of Antonia, and handed over to the high-priest seven days before the three annual festivals and the day of atonement, and returned the day after the festival (Jos. *Arch.*, 18, 4, 3; 20, 1, 1).—Various symbolical interpretations have been given to this dress. Philo, *de monarch.*, II., 5, refers it to cosmical relations. Among moderns, Bähr interprets the ordinary garment of the high-priest to represent the priestly, the robe the legal, and the Ephod and Choshen the kingly office. There is no doubt that in the splendid dress of the high-priest a certain royal dignity was to become apparent: but it is still certain that the Old Test. knows nothing of a kingship as attached to the high-priest. The union of the two offices was looked for only in the Messiah. A kind of anticipation of this union we find rather in the person of the king, since David and Solomon attached a certain priestly character to the kingship (see Art. *Kings of the Israelites*). Not until the age of the Asmoneans, is the high-priest at the same time a prince. The calling of the priesthood is constantly represented as twofold (see Deut. 33 : 10); 1, to be mediators between the people and God; 2, to teach the people the laws of Jehovah, as the messenger of Jehovah to the people (Mal. 2 : 7). To the latter office belongs the judicial function of the high-priest, and the Urim and Thummim (see Sir., 45 : 16–17; Joseph. *c. Ap.* II., 23; Philo, *M.*, p. 321). Hence the dress of the high-priest can have a symbolical meaning only in these two respects, which appears also evident in its chief parts, the Ephod and Breastplate. That the robe has no peculiar meaning, appears from Exod. 28 : 31. We cannot here discuss the second import of the H.-P.'s dress (see Art. *Urim* and *Thummim*). The first, that of an atoning mediatorship, appears especially in the fact that the high-priest, clothed with the ephod, bore the names of the twelve tribes upon the heart and shoulders. Although in Exod. 28 : 9, the heart

may perhaps denote the seat of wisdom, which judges and decides; yet it must not be forgotten that it is also the seat of the memory (see Jer. 44 : 21, *לִבְיָדָה*; also Isa. 46 : 8). The representative of the nation, who had to represent it before God that he might remember it in mercy (Numb. 10 : 9), had, of course, to bear the people in his mind. But this does not yet exhaust the idea (see besides the above, Cant. 8 : 6; 2 Cor. 7 : 3; Phil. 1 : 7). The heart designating also the centre of personal life, this bearing upon the heart symbolizes also a personal commingling with the life of others; in virtue of which, as *Philo, spec. leg.*, II., 321, well expresses it, the high-priest is *τοῦ συνπαρὸς Ἰσραὺς σὺνγυμνὸς καὶ ἀνταρὸς ποιεῖν*, and therefore stands in the most lively sympathy with those for whom he intercedes.—That the ephod is essentially a garment for the *shoulders*, does not make it a symbol of royal authority; this designates only that an office rests upon him, which certainly is related to that mentioned in Isa. 22 : 22, since to it alone it belonged to open access unto God. Nor do the onyx stones (Exod. 28 : 12), upon which the names of the tribes were engraved, designate by any means the high-priest as ruler of the people; but merely that he as mediator bears the people before God, or that the people rest as a burden upon him (Numb. 11 : 11).—The putting on of the dress was followed by the *anointing*. From Exod. 29 : 29, it has been concluded that this was administered on each of the seven days of the consecration, but that a single one was valid. The peculiarity of the anointing of the high-priest was that the oil was poured upon the head (Exod. 29 : 7; Lev. 8 : 12; 21 : 10; Ps. 133 : 2), after which, according to tradition, the sign of the Greek X was made upon his forehead. From this anointing—the symbol of the communication of the divine spirit—the high-priest was called the *anointed priest*. *Hengstenberg*, on Ps. 133, supposes, though altogether without foundation, it “very doubtful” that the high-priests after Aaron were anointed: but according to Jewish tradition, the anointing of the high-priest continued to the age of Josiah, when the holy oil was hidden and thus lost (see *KRUMBHOLZ, sacerdot. hebr. in Ugol. thes.*, XII., p. LXXXVII.), and the succeeding high-priests consecrated by merely putting on them the official dress. This may perhaps explain the difference made between the high-priests in *Mishna Maccoth*, 2, 6.—As regards the *offices* of the high-priest, all those of the ordinary priests could also be performed by him. According to *Jos. B. J.*, V., 5, 7, his functions were limited to the Sabbaths, new moons, and festivals; but in *Mishna Tamid*, 7, 3, it is taken for granted that he could at pleasure take part in the sacrificial service. In fact, the priesthood was a unit, of which the high-priest was the special bearer; and the ordinary priests, in their functions, were only his deputies. In *Sir.*, 45, 14, 16, the sacrificial service is called the service of *Aaron*. Concerning the special functions of the high-priest on the day of atonement, and the consulting of the holy oracle, see the resp. articles. Of course, the high-priest had the chief supervision of the temple-service and treasury;

for the latter, see 2 Kings 22 : 4; 2 Macc. 3 : 2. Concerning their part in the administration of justice, see *Justice, &c., among the Hebr.* In later times he was generally, though not necessarily, president of the Sanhedrim (see *Art. Sanhedrim*).—The office of high-priest was in older times retained by its incumbents no doubt until their death (*Jos. Arch.*, XX., 10, 1); nor can it be proven that at any time an annual change was customary. The succession was originally perhaps determined by the law of inheritance: so that, if no legal impediment prevented, the oldest son, and if he had already died, the oldest son of the same, succeeded. The entire number of high-priests from Aaron to Phanassa, who was elevated at the beginning of the Jewish wars by the insurgents, was (*Jos. Arch.*, XX., 10) 83, viz., from Aaron to Solomon, 13; during the existence of Solomon's temple, 18; the second temple, 52. The lists of the high-priests in *Josephus*, in *Seder olam*, and in the *Chronica paschale*, show many deviations; see a comparison of them by *LIGHTFOOT, minist. templi cap. IV., opp. ed.* II., vol. I., p. 682. The names of the high-priests, as well as they can be determined, are as follows: 1, *Aaron*; 2, *Eleazer*; 3, *Phinehas*. The names of the high-priests until Eli are wanting in the earlier books of the Old Test.; according to tradition (*Jos. Arch.*, V., 11, 5), the office remained in the family of Eleazer to near the end of the age of the Judges. According to *Josephus* (*ut supr.*, see also the genealogies in 1 Chron. 5 : 29, &c.; 6 : 35, &c.; Ezra 7 : 1, &c.), the 4th high-priest was *Abiezer*; 5, *Bukki*; 6, *Ussi*; 7, *Eli*, with whom the succession passed over to the family of Ithamar. In this way, however, the number of 13 high-priests cannot be made out; wherefore some supply, from the genealogies of Chronicles, 7, *Seraja*; 8, *Merejoth*; 9, *Eli*; and, during his lifetime, 10, *Phinehas*; 11, *Ahitob*; 12, *Achia*; 13, *Abiathar*. The latter being deposed by Solomon, the office again passed over to the family of Eleazer in the person of *Zadock*. In this second line, commencing with *Zadock*, follow, 2, *Ahimaaz*; 3, *Azariah*; 4, *Johanan*; 5, *Azuriah*; 6, *Amariah*. After this, everything is uncertain. *Lightfoot* gives, 7, *Ahitub*; 8, *Zadock*. In 2 Chron. 26 : 17, we find another, *Azariah*; 2 Kings 16 : 11, a *Uriah*; 2 Chron. 31 : 10, an *Azariah*. With *Shallum*, the father of *Hilkiah*, the succession of high-priests can again be determined. According to *Josephus*, *Hilkiah* was succeeded by *Seraiah*, who was slain by *Nebuchadnezzar* in *Riblah* (2 Kings 25 : 18), so that the office passed over to his son *Jehozadak*, who went into captivity (1 Chron. 6 : 15). With *Joshua*, the son of the latter, commences after the captivity the third series (see, concerning this series, in *Herzfeld's Gesch. d. Volkes Isr. von Volland. d. 2ten Temp.*, I Bd. 1855, p. 368, &c.). In the canonical books of the Old Test., the last list of high-priests is given in Neh. 12 : 10, 11. During the Syrian period the regular succession ceased, and from 160–153 B. C., the office was entirely interrupted. In 153, *Jonathan*, the son of *Mattathias*, begins the series of *Asmonean* high-priests from the class of *Jojarib*; which, according to 1 Macc. 2 : 54, was descended from *Phinehas*, and hence be-

anged to the line of Eleazer. Herod was very arbitrary in the appointment of high-priests, and his example was followed by Archelaus and the Romans (*Jos. Arch.*, XX., 10, 5). From Herod the Great to the destruction of Jerusalem, Josephus enumerates twenty-eight high-priests (see *Wieseler*, chronol. Synopse d. Evang., p. 88).

ÖZHLER.—*Reinecke*.

Higden, Ralph, an old English historian and Benedictine monk of St. Werberg, in the dukedom of Chester, died 1363 (according to some, 1377), being nearly 100 years of age. His history, *Polychronicon Lib. VII., ex anglico in latinum conversi a Joh. Trevisa et editi cura, G. Caxton*, 1482, sq., extends from Creation to 1357 after Christ; the best edition in 1642, fol. Caxton added one book—the eighth—and Dr. Gale, in his *Quindecim scriptores histor. Britann. etc.*: Oxon, 1691, published the section treating of the ancient Britons and Saxons. The work, though but a compilation—seventh book excepted—evinces good taste, and is often quoted by English historians.—(See *Rees*, *Cyclop. Britann.*)

S.—*Ermentrout*.

Hilarion, Saint, and founder of monasticism in Palestine, was born in Tabathe, near Gaza, towards the close of 3d cent. (288?) When a mere boy, he studied in Alexandria, and received baptism. Inflamed with the desire of imitating St. Anthony, whom he had visited, he returned home, being now but 15, distributed his estate among his brothers and the poor, and retired to the sickly wilderness by the sea-shore of Majuma, near Gaza. The tenderness of his body was afflicted with the most ascetic practices. He ate only after the sun had gone down, and, it is said, lived on the juice of herbs from the 64th to the 84th year of his age.—He prayed without ceasing, knew by heart the greater part of Scripture, and had written out the Gospels. The length of Anthony induced him—now 65 years old—to visit his place of abode in Egypt. Penetrating the deserts, he reached Epidauros, in Dalmatia. His miraculous prayers, rigorous life, and disinterestedness, brought upon him much veneration that, to escape it, he sought a new home. The possessed, however, whom he healed, found him out. He had power, also, over serpents and earthquakes; the sorceries of love yielded to his influence. At the earnest prayer of a Christian of Majuma, who wished him to bless his horses, he attended a race, excusing himself on the ground that the interests of religion were involved. Though the horses of the Pagan antagonist had been strengthened by the magic of the principal god of the city, those of the Christian seemed to fly over the course, and many of the spectators submitted to baptism. Died in 371 or 372, 84 years of age. The Church celebrates his anniversary Oct. 21st.

REUCHLIN.—*Ermentrout*.

Hilary, Saint, one of the most prominent Bishops of Gaul, and an earnest defender of the Gallican Church, was born about 403. Elected against his wishes Bishop of Arles, 429, he quit the monastic life to assume his new duties. In connection with the clergy of his diocese, he practised the rules of a strict asceticism. To redeem captive Gauls from the hands of the Germans, he cheerfully gave up the costly orna-

ments of his church. He was a terror to evil-doers, as the Governor of Arles experienced to his cost, whom he publicly reprimanded in church for his unjust judgments. In his official capacity he came into collision with Leo I., on account of the deposition of Bishop Chelidonius (444), but had to succumb to the veneration in which the Pope was held. Died in 449. He was celebrated for his fiery eloquence, his erudition, and literary zeal. Of his writings there remain only, 1) *vita S. Honorati Arelatensis episcopi*, together with a letter to Eucherius, Bishop of Lyon (reprinted by Surius, ad 16 Jan.), in the *Bollandist Collect.*, Tom. II., fol. 11, in the *Max. bibl. PP.*, T. VIII., fol., 1228, and in the edit. by Salinas; 2) a *metrum in Genesin*, written about 429, and reaching from Creation to the Deluge (reprinted in the works of Hilary of Poitiers). There is also ascribed to him a poem, *de providentia*, generally counted in among the poems of Prosper. See *Bähr*, christlich-römische Literatur, I. Abtheil., p. 34; 2. Abth., p. 338.

KLING.—*Ermentrout*.

Hilary, of Poitiers (Pictavium), born, as is most probable, towards the close of 3d cent., in that diocese of Gaul whose metropolis was Burdigala (Bordeaux), shone a star of the first magnitude in the dark sky of the Church of 4th cent. As a representative of the Western Church, he was no unworthy successor of Tertullian, Cyprian, and Irenæus. It would not be an easy task to find his equal in point of subtilty of spirit, depth of thought, acuteness of mind, and thoroughness of theological culture. A devoted student of the Scriptures, his was not a traditional orthodoxy; and, though he moved in the element of the Church, he yielded not himself to mere party. Nor did the tenderness of his disposition keep him from defending the assailed rights of truth and the Church. Of his early life little is known. His parents were heathen, and it was only in manhood that he, together with his wife and daughter Apra, joined the Church. In the year 350 we find him Bishop of his native place.—The sky of the ecclesiastical world was now deeply overcast. Arianism began to spread extensively over the Occident. His resolute opposition to its doctrines brought upon him the imperial censure of Cæsar Julianus and Constantius, who banished him to Phrygia, which swarmed with Arians. His activity kept pace with his persecutions. In 358 he addressed to the Gallican bishops his treatise on the faith of the Orientals, and, during the time between 359 and 361, composed 12 books on the *Trinity* (*ll. XII. de trin.*). At the Synod of Ariminum (Rimini), he effected a union between the Gallic bishops and the Homousians in opposition to the Arians. His urgent desire, however, for a public discussion was not gratified. A second letter (360) to Constantius, caused his banishment from Constantinople, and withdrawal to Gaul. Later, he directed his energies against the errors that swept over Italy. His opposition to Bishop Auxentius, of Milan, the influential advocate of Arianism at the imperial court, brought about his banishment from the city. As an exegete, he copied Origen, and paid more attention to the development of theology from Scripture than

to its historico-grammatical sense. Of his two commentaries, that on Matthew and that on Psalms, the latter is the more important. Of this, Jerome said: *in quo opere imitatus Originem nonnulla etiam de suo addidit*.—To define his position in brief, it may be said that, whilst on the one hand he made it a point to determine the relation between Church and State, he, on the other, energetically resisted errors that tended to subvert the foundations of religion. He was, in all respects, a worthy contemporary of Athanasius. To do him full justice, however, it is necessary to take some notice of his *theology* as contained in the 12 books on the Trinity, which, as Möhler has shown in his *Athanasius* II. 165, are characterized by exegetical tact and thoroughness, by comprehensiveness of plan, and fullness of detail.—By faith Hilary apprehended the infinite grandeur of God, as made known in the Old Test., and the Incarnation, as made known in the New. Looking upon the pretension of a finite being to perfect wisdom as a vain conceit, he held that the knowledge of God could only be had through God, and that what He revealed must be believed. He disdained to measure the Divine by the limited rule of the human. Thus armed, he drew his pen against the *rationalism* of the Arian heresy. Nor did he forget to insist on the unity of the Church, whose inward strength heresies served to develop, while they deepened and enlarged the scientific understanding of her doctrines.—In considering his views, we pass by those points which had not yet engaged the attention of theologians, and confine our remarks to such as were under discussion, viz., the Trinity, and the relations that obtained between Father and Son.—As regards the *Son*, the main thing was the determination of His *essential oneness* and *equality* with the Father. Generation being the communication of being, the Father, who begets, would not be Father, did he not recognize His essence in the Son. The Son, likewise, knows Himself in the Father in whom He reaches the full understanding of Himself. (Comp. *Dorner*, *die Lehre v. d. Person Christi*, I., 900). This oneness, however, does not destroy, in either case, the *distinction*—a distinction which by no means involves a *division* of the Divine Being. The Son—the Father's image—is another person, but not distinct in essence from Him. Nor can that which *was* in the beginning, and with God and God, be a mere *word* or *sound*, but must be a *being*; hence the Word, by which everything was created, must be the *eternal* Son. Thus reasoned Hilary. We subjoin a few specimens of his exegesis. The words: My Father, My Son, The only-begotten, denote the Sonship and Divinity of the Lord (Romans 5 : 10; compare 8 : 14, 15). That He possessed the *power* of God, shows the equality of being (John 5 : 18), which also grows out of the equality of *life* (John 5 : 26). His doing all the Father does (verse 19), proves their oneness; and, as by generation He has in Himself all that is in the Father, His work is the work of the Father (John 10). Both are one God, because both have in them one Divine essence (10 : 30). See also 14 : 9; comp. v. 10. A mere oneness of *will* is disproved by 14 : 9; 10 : 30. Nor can the analogy in 17 : 20 be ad-

duced in proof of it, as the unity of Christians is a result of regeneration, of which the *oneness* of Father and Son is the type. The glorifying of the Father through the Son is a counterpart to the prayer of Christ for His glorification, John 17 : 1; so that the Arians cannot make use of this passage in support of their system.—In the department of Christology, Hilary felt bound to maintain the distinctive properties of the Divine and human in Christ and the unity of His Person, against Ebionitism, Sabellianism, Patripassianism, and other kindred errors which in one way or another did violence to these relations. He carefully distinguished between the Divine and human in the production of the incarnation. His fundamental thought was, that He himself was the *causal* principle of both His soul and body. The heavenly essence of the soul not being tainted with earthy matter, he denied the transmission of it from Adam, and affirmed its creation by the Logos. The Son or Spirit of God is also the Creator of the *body*. Nor was Mary simply the foster-mother of a child, the germ of which had been put in her from without. For, the Holy Ghost (the Logos) assumed the earthy material of the body of Mary whom He had sanctified. Thus it was our Saviour received His body from the Virgin; by His own power, not by human conception.—Touching the unity of Person, Hilary taught that, though the Son in assuming nature emptied Himself (*evacuatio*) of His glory, that is to say, concealed or veiled its splendor, in order that the finite nature of man might gradually be attuned to it (*temperat*), and glorified by it, He did not cease to be the Son of God. As He, by this *evacuatio*, rendered Himself susceptible, as it were, to a union with human nature, so was the soul of man, in virtue of its heavenly character, capable of elevation to such a union. And as the Holy Ghost, by His cleansing influence over the body of Mary, disposed or qualified the earthy matter for conjunction with Christ, His body, though like ours in substance, was endowed with different properties—properties, however, which glorified saints shall also be made to possess. He also held that subjection to the ills and sufferings of mortal life was not a *necessity of His nature*, but an act of His will. Regarding His whole earthly existence as an act of the will, he could refer this also to His Divinity, and thus secured the unity of His Person.—Though his firm belief in a real incarnation, and the actual death of our Lord, kept him free from Doceticism proper, yet, by abridging the growth of Christ's manhood through the too rapid glorification of it by His Divinity, by allowing it, at too early a date, an unlimited knowledge, and by not recognizing a free human will in Him, he would seem to have been somewhat tinged by this peculiar heresy. He makes mention of *three births* as having found place in Christ. The first was the *eternal*, out of or from the Father; the second occurred in the Incarnation; and the third, beginning with the resurrection, ended in His complete glorification by which human nature is transformed into the eternal substance. In Him, inasmuch as one flesh is rescued from all weakness and corruption, *humanity as a whole is complete*. Christ is in the Father by Divine birth, we in Him by

His bodily birth, He in us by the Sacraments. In virtue of His assumption of flesh out of Mary, the body of the whole race is sanctified with Him. In us exists the germ of all He did; in Him we died and rose again; in Him humanity sitteth at the right hand of God the Father; in Him the nations behold their own resurrection and glorification.—H.'s doctrine of *the work of redemption* corresponds thus to that of the person of Christ.—His view of the final causality of the incarnation is worthy of special notice. Its *possibility* he finds in the fact that the Son, who created the soul an image of Himself, is the primitive type of it, and so stands from the start, ere time was, in intimate relationship to it; and its absolute *necessity* in the fact that the idea of humanity is complete only in the glorified God-man. His writings are a seed-bed of rich, fruitful ideas, the power of which is felt even in our day, and the thinkers of our time need not be ashamed to learn wisdom from his lips. — He died, most probably, in 368.

Literature: *Walchii, bibliotheca patrist.*; *Schöemann, biblioth. hist. lit. patrum latinorum*; *Neander, Church Hist.*; *Möhler, Athanasius II.*, 33; *Dorner, Entwickl.-gesch. v. Pers. Christi.*, 1037, in which are answered all the objections advanced by *Gieseler* (*Ecol. Hist.*), and *Dr. Baur* (*die christl. Lehre v. d. Dreieinigkeit*), 681. KLING.—*Krmentrout*.

Hilary, Deacon of the Romish Church, about 380. According to Jerome, he composed a treatise—lost, however—in vindication of the Luciferian schism (comp. Art. *Lucifer v. Cagliari*), and against the validity of heretical baptism. Ascribed to him is the Commentary on 13 Epistles of Paul, known by the name *Ambrosiaster* (comp. Art. *Ambrosiast.*), and the *questiones veteris et novi Testamenti*, to be found in Augustine's works, Benedictine edition, in Appendix, f. III. Comp. *Richard Simon, histoire critique des principaux commentateurs du N. T.*, p. 132.

S. — *Ermentrout*.

Hilarus, Bishop of Rome 461–468, successor of Leo I., a Sardinian by birth, and legate of Leo at the Robber-Synod of Ephesus, 449; obtained for himself a claim upon the papal chair by his rigid adherence to the Metropolitan system, opposition to annual Provincial Synods, and mercenary pastors, and by his erection and decoration of oratories.

S. — *Ermentrout*.

Hillel, Rabbi, called "the aged," by way of distinction, one of the most celebrated doctors of Jewish Law, lived from 110 B. C., to 10 A. D. Little is known of his private life, the tales usually assumed for its various incidents being assumed. He was born in Babylon, of David's family. His parents were poor, and he was compelled, even after he went to Jerusalem, to labor for his livelihood. His brother *Hezekiah*, also very learned, presided over a school in Babylon; another brother, *Schabbana*, became wealthy in Jerusalem, and despised Hillel. In his 40th year H. went to Jerusalem to learn the law under Shamai and Abtalion, laboring as a porter by day to support his family and attend lectures at night. One winter's day he failed to earn enough to pay for admission to the lecture, and took a seat on the

window outside where he could hear the speaker; his attention became so absorbed that he became unconscious through the severe cold, and was found there in the morning half dead, and great exertions were necessary to restore him. This perseverance secured him, thereafter, a free admission. Such was his zeal in study, that he not only became learned in the law, but acquired a knowledge of languages and other sciences, so that the Talmud (*Tract. Juchasin*, p. 55) says of him, hyperbolically, that he understood all languages, as well as the speech of valleys, hills, and mountains, of trees and plants, and even of demons. In 30 B. C., he became president of the Sanhedrim (see Art.). During the greater part of his term Schammai (*Jos. Antt.*, XIV., 9, 4) was associated with him. It seems strange that *Jos.* does not name Hillel, but it is probable that Pollion (*Antt.*, XV., 1, 1; 10, 4) is Hillel. Hillel and Schammai differed so much in disposition (H. being mild, and considerate of circumstances; S. severe, and rigid in literal adherence to the law) that it was natural for them to disagree in their expositions of the law, but they never became antagonistic. Their disciples, however, carried their zeal to physical violence. The Bath-Kol (see Art.) decided the contest in favor of the Hillelians; hence later rabbins mostly adhere to H., whilst the Caraites follow S. In his official capacity H. was moderate, paid regard to circumstances, and zealously promoted temporal reforms (*Bartolocci*, II., 791, &c.). Thus he introduced the *perusbol*, an agreement on the part of a debtor to yield his claim to release in the sabbatical year (*Deut.* 15 : 1, &c., *Talm. tract. Schebiith*, c. 10; *Rabe, Mishna*, I., 142. *Buxtorf, Lex. Talm. col.*, 1806, sq.). In all these things H. did not seek to evade the law, but to put such constructions upon it as its true spirit justified in the circumstances; and it is not at all probable that Jesus had these reforms of H. in view, in *Matt.* 5 : 17, though he may have meant to condemn extreme applications of these, by H.'s disciples.—(See *Bartolocci, Biblioth. Rabbin.*, II., 783–96. *Wolf, Biblioth. Hebr.*, II., 824–28. *Geiger, Commentat. de Hillel et Schammai in Ugolini Thes. Antiqq. sacrr.*, Vol. XXI., Col. MCLXXXI–MCCXII. *Ottónis, Hist. doct. Misnicorum*, in *Ugolini, l. c.* Col. MCXXXIII., sq. *Ottónis, Lex. Rabbin.*, 276. *Jost, Gesch. d. Isr.*, &c., I., 157. *Erach and Gruber, sect.* II., Bd. 8, p. 450, &c. *Fürst, Literaturgesch. d. Juden in Asien*, I., 11. *Biesenthal, Hillel d. Aeltere*, in the *Blätter für Israel's Gegenwart*, &c., III., 65, &c. *Literaturbl. d. Orients*, 1848, No. 43, 44, 46; 1849, No. 10, 15, 21, 27, 34, 35, 37, 38).

A descendent of H. in the 10th generation (upon *Gamaliel*, see Art.) was *Rabbi Hillel*, surnamed "the Prince" (i. e., pres. of the Sanh.), in the 4th century. He is supposed to be the *Ḥallāḡ*, named by *Epiph. adv. Hær.*, II., 127, edition Paris, as converted to Christianity shortly before his death. The Jews say the Sanhedrim, and the laying on of hands, in consecration of the doctors of the law, ceased after his death. He rendered service to Jewish chronology (see *Era*). — (See *Bartolocci, l. c.*, II., 797–802. *Wolf, l. c.*, II., 829). **ARNOLD.***

Himerius, B. of Tarragona, Spain, known by a letter addressed to him by Siricius, B. of Rome (385–398), in which S. arrogates supreme eccl. authority, and seeks by flattery to gain H.'s consent to his pretensions (see *Siricius*. *HARD.*, *Concil.*, T. I., 848. J. A. CRAMER, in *Bossuet*, IV., 597). S.*

Hincmar, Archbishop of Rheims, an ecclesiastical statesman, who vindicated the rights of the national Church, and his See, with wisdom and skill, sometimes passionately and arrogantly, was born c. 809. He was reared and educated by Hilduin, the learned Abbot of St. Denys, and followed him in his exile to Saxony. Subsequently H. returned, became canon of St. Denys, and gained the favor of Lewis the Pious, who employed him to restore discipline in the monastery. In 845 H. became Archb., and distinguished himself by completing the cathedral of Rheims, by his participation in the predestinarian controversy (see *Gottschalk*) of that period, and by his maintenance of the rights of his Prince against papal assumptions. Hincmar adopted semipelagian views, and succeeded in having his opinions confirmed by the Synod of Chiersy, 853 (*Mansi, Concilior. nova et ampliss. Coll.*, XIV., 920). He was thus brought into a violent contest with Remigius, Archbishop of Lyons, whom the Synod of Valencia sustained by adopting the doctrines of a double predestination. Soon after this H. and R. were reconciled, and H. wrote the lost *Libb.*, III., *De prædest. Dei et libero arbitrio*, and then his, still extant, *Posterior de prædest. Dei et libero arbitrio diss.*, in *Hincm. Opp. ed. Sirmond.*: Paris, 1645, T. I.). — H.'s energy in resisting papal assumptions appears in his letter to Hadrian II. (see Art.). His life was one of agitation. Even his latter years were disturbed by the invasions of the Normans, which compelled his retirement to the forest regions beyond the Marne. He died 882 in Epernay, whither he had transferred his See. — (See W. F. Gess, *Merkwürdigk. aus d. Leben, &c., Hincmars: Gött.*, 1806). NEUDECKER.*

Hincmar of Laon, the nephew, by his mother, of Hincmar of Rheims, by whom he was reared and educated, and through whom he became B. of Laon in 858. For a time they stood in friendly relations; but the nephew having caught the restless and arrogant spirit of his uncle, soon rose up against his authority as he had against Rome's. He had, without his uncle's consent, accepted an abbey from Charles the Bald, which lay out of his province, and often visited it, thus disregarding his metropolitan, and violating Church order. This caused a breach between himself and his uncle, which was widened by his constant opposition to the Archb., by harboring clergymen whom H. of R. had excommunicated, and other exasperating measures. To frequent citations to appear before Synods he paid no attention, and he even threatened Charles the Bald, who would not tolerate his violent seizure of another benefice, that he would join Lothaire. Thereupon Charles deprived him of his abbey and the revenue of his See. H. retaliated by placing his diocese under an interdict, (869) which, however, the Archbishop immediately annulled.

Being now cited to appear before a provincial Synod, he appealed to Pope Hadrian II. (see Art.). He was imprisoned, but liberated again after an earnest reproof. Soon he became involved in fresh disputes with the Archb., and declining to appear before a provincial Synod, appealed again to the Pope. But in spite of this appeal, his uncle and the King preferred charges against him for insubordination, and other offences, and the Synod of Douziacum deposed him (see *Mansi, l.c.*, XVI., 569). Charles had him imprisoned. When Pope John VIII. was in France, 878, he allowed H. to go untrammelled. He died in 882. — (See *Schäfer, Kirchengesch.*, XXII., 176, &c.). NEUDECKER.*

Hippolytus.—In order to ascertain the facts in the life of Hippolytus, we must set aside the legendary and confused accounts of a later age, and confine ourselves to the oldest sources, which belong to the 4th and 5th cent. (see an estimate in the traditions in *Döllinger's Hipp. and Callistus*: Ratisb., 1853. *Eusebius* (Ch. II. 6, 20, 22) is the first to mention him; he calls him Bishop, but is ignorant of his See. From works which he attributes to him, he places him in the age of Alex. Severus. Several works excepted, *Jerome* (*Cat. vir. illustr.*, 61) knows nothing more of him. The Roman Church honored him as martyr, and commemorated his burial on August 13th. *Prudentius* (about 400) narrates in his *Hymnós, περί εὐσεβίου*, the circumstances of his martyrdom. He was brought before the tribunal at Portus, near Rome. Having belonged to the Novatian party, he repents in view of death his part in the schism, and exhorts his adherents to return to the Cath. Church. Hereupon he is condemned, with bitter allusion to the mythical Hippolytus, to be dragged to death by horses.—*Prudentius* had seen the subterranean chapel in which the corpse of the saint was buried. It was beautifully decorated, and furnished with a painting of his death. There existed, therefore, a tradition of this kind; but strong doubts may be entertained whether it did not originate in the well-known myth (*Döllinger*, 58). But that a saint, who, according to the poet, was one of the most honored at Rome, was by a mere empty fiction converted into a schismatic, is not to be imagined: here, then, there must be a historical fact. Tradition, in order to account for his canonization by the Rom. Church, may have added his conversion before his death.—We should obtain the most reliable information concerning the life and position of Hippolytus, if a work belonged to him, the first book of which was formerly already known by the name of *φιλοσοφούμενα*; and of which seven others, from the 4th to the 10th, were discovered in 1842 in Greece, and in 1851 published with the other by E. Miller, under the title *Ὀριγένους φιλοσοφούμενα ἢ κατὰ παλαιῶν μοσείων ἔλεγχος*, at Oxford. Style, method and thought, indicate that Origen was not the author. *Baur* (*Theol. Jahrb.*, 1853) has attributed them to the presbyter Caius (see Art.). But this supposition is based upon the remark of Photius, that Caius had written a work, *περί τῆς τοῦ παντός οὐσίας*, which the author of the *ἔλεγχος*, B. 10, calls his own. But Photius asserts the authorship of Caius, not from the book itself,

t merely from a marginal note of a copyist. 1 that we know of Caius from Eusebius (Ch. 2, 25; 3, 28) is against the supposition. He had written a work against the Montanists; the other author dismisses them with the remark, that it was not worth the pains to describe them. Irenæus had very peculiar opinions of Cerinthus, and would not, setting these aside, have merely copied the account of Irenæus, as was done by the other; one of these opinions was, that Cerinthus was the author of the Apocalypse, which the other ascribed to John.—On the other hand, there are weighty reasons which lead to the conclusion that Hippolytus was the author of the work. In 1551 a statue was dug up in the locality of the chapel of H., which represents him as sitting upon a *θρόνος*, upon the back of which was a catalogue of his works, in which is found the book *περί τοῦ πατρὸς*. But if this work belongs to H., it necessarily follows that the *εὐχὴ* also belongs to him. This is further proven from the contents of the *εὐχὴ* taken in connection with the remark of Prudentius, that H. belonged to the Novatian party: for the book shows that the author was at variance with the ruling party at Rome on account of Novatian principles. Photius himself indirectly confirms this supposition. He describes (*Cod.*, 121) a small work of H., which seems to have briefly treated of the same heresies, which are treated of more at large in the *εὐχὴ*. But in the preface to the same the author says that he had written a polemical work of similar design but more compendious. These reasons, to which others might be added (see *Jacobi's* papers in the *deutsch. Zeitschr. für christl. Wissensch. u. christl. Leb.*, 1851, No. 25; 1853, No. 24), have led most investigators of the subject to conclude in favor of H. (DUNKER, in *d. Gött. gel. Anzeig.*, 1851; BUNSEN, *Hipp. and his age*, 4 vols.: Lond., 1852; GIESELER, *Stud. u. Krit.*, 1853; RITSCHL, *theol. Jahrb. v. Baur u. Zeller*, 1854; DÖLLINGER, *l. c.*).—From these premises his life would seem to be somewhat as follows. He was born in the second half of the 2d century, probably in the West: he had listened, as he remarks in the shorter polemical work (*Phot. Cod.*, 121), to Irenæus, and hence had probably visited him at Lyons. At the beginning of the 3d cent. we find him at Rome as presbyter, and highly honored for his learning and activity. He participated with much earnestness in the moral and doctrinal affairs of the Church; and, as one of the most prolific authors of the West, helped to direct its movements. The violent paschover controversies under Victor were previous to the age of his maturity, but he afterwards asserted the custom contended for by Victor. With the successors of the latter, Zephyrinus and Callistus, he differed on important points of discipline and doctrine. With many, at that time, very rigid principles were entertained, not without the influence of Montanism, with regard to the treatment of the *lapsi*; and since the persecutions of Sept. Severus and Caracalla had led many to deny their faith, the question at Rome also had become an urgent one. The principles subsequently represented by Novatian and his party, that the Church should be pure, and exclude those guilty of mortal sins,

became current. H. approved of them, whilst Callistus then already followed the milder course afterwards adopted by Rome. Another point of dispute was the marriage of the clergy, in which H. was less liberal than Callistus. But the special point of difference between them was a doctrinal one. Zephyrinus and Callistus favored the patripassian doctrine; to which, whilst the doctrine of the Trinity was yet undefined, many, especially in the West, were inclined. According to H., Callistus regarded the divine in Christ as God the Father. Hippolytus, on the contrary, defended the subordination theory of the Trinity, which was at the time the most prevalent one. If he charged his opponents with the Noëtian heresy, they called him and his party ditheists, since they worshipped a second God in the hypostatical and subordinated *logos*. Amid these conflicts H. was also furnished with weapons by the earlier life of Callistus; for although he may have given too strong a coloring to his representations, yet it cannot be supposed that his charges against Callistus were wholly unfounded.—Before the open rupture Hippolytus was evidently one of the most influential members of the Rom. clergy. In the *εὐχὴ*, written after the separation, he describes himself as a successor of the apostles, participant in the *ἀρχιεπισκοπή* and doctrine, and a watchman of the Church; which seems to indicate that he was bishop. But where was his See? The tradition which is followed by Prudentius, says at Portus, near Rome: for he evidently means to say, that after Rome had been satiated with blood, the judges went to Portus in order there to continue the persecution. Nothing justifies the hypothesis that Roman Christians, and Hippolytus among them, were dragged to Portus to be condemned there. Nor is the objection of weight, that Portus was an insignificant place, and was not until the 4th cent. erected into a bishopric: for from our scanty accounts nothing certain can be said concerning the size of Portus. And besides, in that age there were many rural bishops located in small towns. And even if it could be proven that no Roman Bishop lived there before the 4th cent., it would still be not improbable that a schismatic party might have formed a Church there under a Bishop: for that Novatianism was spreading in the vicinity of Rome, is evident from the epistles of Cornelius and Cyprian. We might then conclude Hippolytus to have been Bishop of Portus, which would solve more than one difficulty, if the *εὐχὴ*, the authentic testimony, were not unfavorable to this. For according to it, Hippolytus evidently stood at Rome itself, at the head of a party opposed by Callistus; and it would be unaccountable in him to leave his party to itself and retire to such a narrow field as Portus. Nor does he give the least intimation of this. The most natural conclusion then is, that at the time when he wrote the book he was yet at Rome. To solve the difficulties by making him, as is done by Bunsen, presbyter at Rome and Bishop of Portus, would conflict with the ecclesiastical custom of the 3d century.—If according to this he was Bishop at Rome, it is certainly remarkable that a movement so closely allied to the

Novatian controversy should find no mention in existing courses; and that neither Jerome nor Prudentius should have known aught of his episcopate at Rome. But the testimony of the *ἡγζος* cannot be invalidated by this circumstance. — Of the later years of the life of H. we derive an incident from an old catalogue of Rom. Bishops, which says: *Pontianus, ann. V., m. II., d. VII., Fuit temporibus Alexandria, a cons. Pompejani et Peligniani (231). Eo tempore Pontianus episcopus et Yppolitus presbyter exiles sunt deportati in Sardinia in insula nociva Severo et Quintino cons. (235). In eadem insula discinctus, IV., kl. Octobr. et loco ejus ordinatus est Antheros, XI., kl. Dec. cons. ss. (235).* If the Hippolytus here mentioned was the same with our Hippolytus, we learn from it that he was banished to Sardinia, but nothing more. The reading *discinctus est* seems to be corrupt, since it gives no meaning: it was most probably *defunctus est*. But if the author had been acquainted with the death of Hippolytus, he would most likely have mentioned it also. Like others, Hippolytus also may have returned from Sardinia, which would agree very well with the account of Prudentius concerning his death, if this account were only more probable. — With Irenæus, his teacher, Hippolytus shares a practical character, the general method and degree of cultivation, and many specific ideas. He is calm, unimpassioned, simple; of much erudition, well versed in the works of the philosophers; and although without a speculative talent, yet not without acuteness in the comparison of philosophical and heretical ideas. His opposition to philosophy is almost as severe as that of Tertullian, although in the development of his system he uses many definitions; which leads us to suppose that he would have criticised it more mildly, if the enemies of the Church had not made use of it. The leading ideas of his system are the following. The absolute God, conditioned by nothing external to himself, who is existence in its strictest sense, conceived within himself the Logos; who, included within him, was the sum of the ideas actualized by the creation; distinct from the reason of the Father, but not ignorant of it, and taking up within himself the will of the Father. He came forth from the Father to a separate existence, and as the first-born became the agent of the creation, forming on the command of the Father everything according to the divine ideas. The elements of existence are fire and spirit, water and earth. The angels and stars he formed of fire and spirit: man, as the lord of the world, he composed of all the elements. Since man was compounded and not simple, he was subject to dissolution, i. e., death. God could, if he had so willed, have made him divine and immortal, like his Son: but man was by obedience to make himself worthy of an immortal and divine existence. God gave him a free will, without which he would have been a servant, not a lord. But in this, also, lay his capability to do evil; for God is good and created man good, and the evil would not have been, if man by his own act had not produced it. The law was given to him as a bridle and spur, and his training, by means of it, was directed through

all ages by the Logos. Moses and other righteous and godly men gave an honorable and righteous law, and prophesied of the future. Through them the Logos, by the command of God, desired to bring man back to obedience, not by force enslaving him, but by a free abedience. But in the last times the Father sent the Logos himself, in order that he might not speak by a dark prophetic word, but by a visible manifestation. He received a body from the virgin; a common human nature, but in received originality. He passed through every age of humanity that he might be a law for every age, hold up to all his humanity as the aim of their labors, and show that God created nothing evil. If his humanity had not been the same as our own, he would in vain have required us to follow him. For this reason he endured fatigue, hunger, thirst, and sleep, did not resist suffering, yielded unto death, brought immortality to light, and in everything gave an example in his own humanity, that we might not despair in sufferings, but expect the same for ourselves. Through his doctrine and the ordinance, to wash man of sin in baptism, Christ by his divine power renews our old man according to his image. We must, however, know ourselves by knowing God our creator; for whoever knows himself and worships God, is known of him. Whoever follows the love of Christ, attains unto immortality for body and soul, the kingdom of heaven, communion with God, the heritage of Christ, and freedom from passions and sufferings. He is made a god unto the honor of God; but heathens and heretics are cast into the fiery lake, whither the light and the voice of the Logos never penetrates; and where the avenging angel of the abyss ever threatens them. — Of the works of Hippolytus the *ἡγζος* is to us the most important. Its design is to combat heresy, especially that of Gnosticism. Like Irenæus and Tertullian, only more extensively and in detail, Hippolytus shows the organic connection between the heathen philosophies and Gnosticism. He thinks that the pride of the Gnostics can be humbled only when it is shown to them that the pretentious revelations of their mysteries are to be found, and even with greater truth, in heathenism. With him no other refutation of heresy is needed than to trace it thus to its source. He therefore uses but few arguments from the received orthodoxy, but is content with the portrayal of heathen and heretical theories, and concludes with a brief sketch of his own system. This setting aside of his own reflections makes his portrayal of heresies all the more valuable. It consists, also, mostly of excerpts from Gnostic literature, which he could gather at Rome better than at most other places. No little of what belongs to this department we learn only from him, and thus obtain a desirable complement to the other reports. The first four books treat of heathenism. The first, named, by himself perhaps, *φιλοσοφούμενα*, gives a sketch of the philosophies. Those of the Greeks are classified as the physical, ethical, and dialectical. These are followed by the Indian and Druid doctrines, and by an extract from the theogony of Hesiod. The second and third books are lost. The fourth describes the Chal-

se wisdom, viz., astrology, the art of taking the horoscope, the meaning and influence of the constellations, especially of the signs of the zodiac upon those born under them, the art of magic and its means, etc., and thus gives us a deep view of the morals of the age. After this are given some statements from pagan metaphysics, especially of the Egyptians; extracts from the astronomical poem of Aratus, and finally the Pythagorean doctrine of numbers, with a reference to the influence which they had upon the heretics. In the fifth book he turns directly to the heretics. He begins with the Gnostics, who take up the entire book. Here we become thoroughly acquainted with the various kinds of them; such as the Naassenes, Cerinthians, Sethians, Justin the Gnostic, etc. In the sixth book follows the sect of Simonians; after which, in order to pass over to the Valentinian doctrines, he describes those of Pythagoras as their chief source. Very important for a proper development of this school is his remark that it was divided into an Italian and Oriental branch, and that the latter was more docetic in the doctrine of the person of Christ than the former. The seventh book commences with the system of Basilides, of which he gives an entirely new account (see Art. *Basilides*. Also *G. Uhlhorn*, *das Basilid. Syst.*: Götting., 1855). Among the other Gnostic systems described in this book, the account of the Marcionite system alone gives us new information. Among the Gnostics enumerated in the 8th book, he gives information of a party previously unknown to us, which are related to the Valentinians, and called by him docetics. He also treats in it of Monimos the Arab, Hermogenes, the Quartodecimans, and Montanists. In the ninth book he describes the heresy which had affected him most, and which he therefore controverts with an overrated importance and passionateness, viz., the Patripassians. He compares their doctrine with that of Heraclitus, concerning whom he furnishes us with several new and important fragments. Concerning the Patripassian doctrine and its derivation from Noëtus, he was among the ancients already the chief source. But more important than this is his account of events in the Rom. Church, which throws an unlooked-for light upon the condition of the Rom. Church, and the development of its doctrine. What he says concerning the connection of the Elkesaites with Rome is also worthy of consideration, on account of their relation to other Ebionite phenomena. He concludes with a description of the Jews. In the tenth book he furnishes for the sake of convenience a summary of the 1st and 5th to the ninth book, and concludes with a confession of his faith. Since this abbreviated form was more convenient, and the interest in the ancient heresies became diminished, this latter book was the more frequently consulted. This helped also to render the entire work less known.—The period in which the whole work was written, seems to have been about 234.—Under the name of a homily against Noëtus a fragment was published by *L. Holstenius*, which has been regarded as a part of the work against heresies. It is evident, however, that it is no part of the

ἀντιπρὸς, though it may be by the same author. Eusebius (Ch. II., 5, 28) furnishes from the work of an unmentioned author against the Artemonites a fragment, which has been attributed to Hippolytus, though apparently without convincing reasons. So, also, the work *κατὰ Εὐρωτος καὶ Ἡλίου* seems to belong to a later theology.—Jerome mentions a work on anti-Christ, which is perhaps the same as that published by Guidius in 1661. Another fragment, mentioned in the codex, *περὶ τοῦ πατρὸς πρὸς Πλάτωνα*, was very probably the conclusion of the book *περὶ τῆς τοῦ πατρὸς οὐσίας*. The statue also bears the title of a work, *προτρεπτικὸς πρὸς Σεβήριον*, probably the same with the letter *πρὸς βασιλῖδα τινά*, mentioned by Theodoret. The seat of the statue bears, moreover, the paschal cyclis of sixteen years calculated by Hippolytus in the 1st year of Al. Severus, and the titles of a number of doctrinal, historical, exegetical, and homiletical works, which have perished. The work named *περὶ χαρισμάτων ἀποστολικῆς παράδοσις* was evidently not written by him in its present form. Jerome also mentions a number of commentaries to Old Test. books, and one on the Apocalypse.—(See BUNSEN, *Hippolytus*, &c.; CAVE, *Script. eccles.*, I., 48. Ed. of *J. A. Fabricius*, Hamb., 1718, 2 tom. fol. For his life and writings, C. G. HANELL, *de Hippolyto*: Götting., 1838. E. F. KIMMEL, *de Hippol. vit. et script.*: Jena, 1839; SEINECKE, *üb. Leb. u. Schrift. des H. in Illgens Zeitschr. für hist. Theol.*, 1842, 3d number. ASSEMANNI, *Biblioth. Oriental.*, III., I. Also the works already mentioned).

JACOBI. — *Reinecke*.

Hiram, originally the name of a Phœnician deity (*Mover's Phœniz.*, I., 505). The Phœn. form is *Hirom* (cf. 1 Kings 5: 1, 2, 7; 7: 40), the Hebrew *Hiram* or *Huram* (2 Chron. 2: 3), the Greek *Εἰρώμος* (Jos. c. *Ap.* 1, 17, &c.), *Εἰρώμος* (ANTT. 8, 2, 6), *Χιράμ* (LXX.), *Σιρώμος* (*Herod.* 7, 98; SYKELL, p. 343), and even *Σούρων* (*Eupolem.* in EUSEB. *præp. ev.* 9, 34). In the Bible we meet it as the name of a king of Tyre, a friend of David and Solomon. Josephus (*l. c.*) reports that he succeeded his father, Abibaal, and reached the age of 53 years; having reigned from 1023–990 (1033–999, Ewald; or 980–947, *Mover's l. c.*). Under him Tyre reached its highest prosperity. He engaged in magnificent architectural projects, both for the defence of the country and embellishment of temples. He built new temples for Heracles-Melcart and Astarte, and adorned that of Zeus-Baalshamim with such splendor that Herod. (2, 44) speaks of it with admiration, and which later Phœn. traditions partly refer to Solomon's gratitude for Hiram's assistance in the erection of the temple at Jerusalem (*Eupolem. et Theophil. ap. Euseb. l. c.*). He also endeavored to give increased stability to his kingdom, re-subdued the Chittim (Cyprians), and managed to secure the political superiority which Tyre had recently acquired. David's successful wars had promoted Phœnicia's prosperity by securing to it an extensive trade. Sustaining amicable relations with Israel, which remained undisturbed through Solomon's reign, there was a free commercial intercourse between the nations (2 Sam.

5:11; 1 Chron. 14:1. The seeming chronological difficulty in Samuel's account is relieved by remembering that he groups classes of events with less regard to time. (1 Kings 5:15, 21). In Solomon's fourth year (Hiram's 11th, 1 Kings 6:1; Jos. Antt. 8, 3, 1) he began the building of the temple, and entered into a contract with H. for materials and workmen (1 Kings 5:15, &c.; 2 Chron. 2:1, &c.). H. sent him a skilful artificer, who did the ornamental work for the edifice. His name was likewise Hiram, the son of a Tyrian brass founder, who had married an Isr. widow of the tribe of Dan (1 Kings 7:13, &c.; 2 Chron. 2:12, &c.; 4:16. See *Bertheau* on these texts, p. 253, &c.) For these services Sol. paid H. a fixed amount of staple products (2 Chron. 2:9; 1 Kings 5:25). H. also loaned S. money, for which 20 cities of Galilee were ceded to him (1 Kings 9:10, &c.). During this period they united in commercial enterprises (see *Ophir*). Phoen. tradition further reports (Jos. c. Ap. 1, 17) a correspondence between S. and H., in which S. proposed riddles which Hiram could not solve, and so had to pay a large sum of money as a forfeit. At length a Phoen. sage outwitted S., and won back the money which H. had lost. Solomon is said to have married a daughter of Hiram; but this must have been in his later years (*Chaetius et Menand. ap. Tatian. or c. Græc.* § 37; *Clem. Al. Strom.* I., § 114; 1 Kings 11:1, 5). H. was succeeded by his son, Baalazar. His sepulchre is still pointed out at Tyre (ROBINSON, Pal.).—Toward the close of the Chald.-Babyl. empire, there reigned in Tyre a Hiram II., 551–532 B. C., Jos. c. Ap. 1, 21), not mentioned in the Bible.—(See EWALD, *Gesch. Isr.* iii., 1, pp. 28, 83. MOYER'S, ii., 1, p. 326, &c., 466, &c.). RÜTSCHI.*

Hita (*Juan Ruiz de*), a Spanish priest and poet, who composed his poems during a threatened imprisonment by the Archbishop of Toledo, in consequence of slanderous accusations. From his poems, we learn that he was born at Guadalajara or Alcalá de Henares (c. 1300–1310). Clarus ascribes eminent talent to him, for his age, and Wolf places his poems on a parallel with Don Quixote. He designed his poems to be a mirror of the arts and perils of carnal love, combined wit with earnestness, and abounded in allegories.—(See L. CLARUS, *Span. Literatur im Mittelalter*, Mainz 1846, I., 398–427.)

TH. PHESEL.*

Hittites, a Canaanite nation, dwelling in that country in Abraham's time (Gen. 10:15; 15:20), and holding the district around Hebron, where Abraham bought ground from them (Gen. 23:3–15). In Isaac's time they were still in the S. of Palestine. After Israel's return from Egypt, they occupied the hill-country with the Amorites, as far as Bethel (Numb. 13:30; Judges 1:26). The Israelites subdued them, but did not exterminate them (Judges 3:5; 1 Kings 10:29); they even had petty kings, but tributary to Solomon (2 Kings 7:6; 1 Kings 9:20). They seem to have taken advantage of the disturbances under Saul, already, to re-establish a small kingdom, near Syria, which subsequently strove to become independent (2 Kings 7:6). There they maintained themselves until after the exile. At times they

and the Amorites are named for Canaanites in general (Josh. 1:4; Ezek. 16:3, 45).

VAININGER.*

Hivites, a Canaanite nation, first named in Jacob's time, when they held Sichem in central Palestine (Gen. 10:17; 34:2). When the Israelites took Canaan, the people of Gibeon were called Hivites (Josh. 9:7; 11:19). Another portion of them dwelt on the north side of Hermon (Josh. 11:3) and around Lebanon (Judges 3:3). As no Hivite king is mentioned, it has been inferred that they had a republican-aristocratic form of government (cf. Josh. 9:12. EWALD, *Isr. Gesch.*, I., 283, 286). Those abiding in the south came under Hebrew dominion and embraced the Jewish religion (2 Sam. 21:1, 4; Josh. 9:21, 27), and even became absorbed in that nation. Those in the north maintained themselves in cities near Tyre, at the time of the kings.

VAININGER.*

Hobah, a Syrian town north of Damascus, whither Abraham pursued Chedorlaomer and his confederates (Gen. 14:15). During the earlier Christian period there was still a village of that name north of Damascus, inhabited by Ebionites, who observed Jewish customs.

VAININGER.*

Holland, historical and statistical.—Under the Spanish-Hapsburg dynasty, 17 Netherland provinces were united. Of these only eight belonged to Holland proper; viz.: Holland, Zeeland, Utrecht, Guelders, Zutphen, Groningen, Friesland, and Up. Yssel: the others were *Belgic*. During the entire 15th cent., which produced such distinguished Reformers before the Reformation in the Netherlands, these countries were approaching towards a Reformation. The influence exerted by *Geert Groote* (born 1340), of the *Fratres Communis Vitæ*, the Beghards and Lollards, of men like *John v. Wesel* is well known. On a soil so well prepared, and amid a people so generally educated,¹ the Reformation was naturally received with great favor. The commercial connections of the people, and the foreign merchants settled among them, as also the hired soldiery, were of no little importance for the spread of the Reformation (see *Strada, de bello Belg.*, T. 1, 76.) The Flemish nobles, who studied in great numbers at Geneva, brought Calvinism into the country, which was soon deeply penetrated with reformatory ideas. Charles V. did not remain inactive. In March, 1520, he published the first of his barbarous edicts, which were followed by many others. The last of them appeared in 1550 (see GACHARD, *Corresp. de Phil.* II., *Brux.*, 1848, T. I., p. 105–6). As their first victims, *Henry Voes* and *John Esch* were burnt at Brussels, July 2, 1523. Soon, of course, anabaptist tendencies mingled with the religious movement, which at first also had a tint of Lutheranism. Later, however, the Protestantism of the country bore a decidedly Calvinistic character.² The influence of the English exiles during

¹ See *Cornejo, Sumario de las guerras civ. de Flandra*. Fr. transl., pp. 8, 10. Guicciardini, who lived more than 40 years in the Netherlands, says that there was scarcely a peasant who could not read.

² *Calvinismus omnium pene corda occupavit*. Viglius v. Zuichem to J. Hopper. See *Kpp. ad Hopp.* ep. 34.

the reign of Mary Tudor, as also of the Reformed churches of France, must be regarded by no means slight. — Notwithstanding his error, Charles V. had to confess at the end of his life that his efforts to check the growth of heresy in the Netherlands had been in vain. Calvinists and Reformed are from this time the common names of the Protestants in the country. In the southern provinces Calvinism met with its earliest favor and spread. Its headquarters at first were Flanders, Hennegau, Artois, and the provinces bordering on France. From hence it spread, under the influence of distinguished Calvinist theologians and statesmen, to Holland, Zeeland, and other countries, through the auspices of the Calvinist preacher *Marnix v. St. Aldegonde*, a Calvinist Flemish noble, the celebrated "Compromise" was effected. A Walloon preacher, *Guido de Bres*, in company with several others, composed the "*confessio Belgica*" the basis of the French "*confession de foi*" (see art. *Belg. Conf.*). In the prefatory apology, the number of Netherland Reformed is already estimated at 100,000. This confession was received in 1561, and sent to Philip II. On the basis of it, the first Netherland Synod was assembled at Teu: it was adopted formally as the Netherland confession by the *Antwerp Synod* in 1566. The Church of the Netherlands thus entered the ranks of the other Protestant churches. The congregations constituted themselves thoroughly on Calvinist principles, with pastors, elders, and deacons, under the supervision of presbyteries, and of provincial synods; which latter were also constituted in the South, in Tournay and Armantiers. Characteristic of the spirit of these churches is resolution 2d of the Synod of Tournay (1563), which says: "*Qu'on vive le conseil de ceux de Genève.*" The most comprehensive church constitution of this age contained in the articles of the Synod of Antwerp of May 1, 1564 (see *Hist. and Royaards*, Nederl. Arch. voor Kerk. Gesch., 1849, IX., 141). — When the Calvinists had become the predominant party in the Netherlands, they stood opposed to their enemies in complete organization. In many large cities they had a senate and a kind of lower house, composing the consistory, which latter was subject to that of *Antwerp*, the chief fortress of the Reformation. They formed in their totality an independent Reformed republic. Unwavering in their principles, they made not the least concession towards Lutheranism; on which account, however, they lost the sympathy and aid of the German Lutheran princes, who in 1567 interceded with Margaret, though vainly, for the few Lutherans. — The government and Roman clergy made the most strenuous efforts to suppress the growing heresy. Extreme severity was not spared, and in 1567 the restoration of the old order was entrusted to the Duke of *Alba* and his executioners. Discoveries in the archives of Madrid and Simancas will hereafter permit no faithful historian to conceal or defend the odious measures of the duke or his sublime master. The excesses of the anabaptist iconoclasts injured, it is true, the Reformation considerably; but the latter had as little connection with

these fanatics as with the executed nobles, *Egmont* and *Honore*. — The correspondence and documents published by *Gachard* and *Groen v. Prinsterer* dispel many a poetic nimbus which has obscured the circumstances of that age. *Egmont* stood in political connections with *Orange*; the latter was the head of the Calvinist party, for which the former had not the least sympathy. After William's removal, he passed with his troops, in excessive loyalty to the king, through the country, abolishing the consistories everywhere, and restoring the Roman worship. Having thus lost the confidence of his former political friends, he at last gained only his execution. After the victorious regent had fearfully decimated the Reformed through her remorseless dragoons (see *Prescott's Philip II.*, pp. 138–9), *Philip* adopted extreme measures for the suppression of the disturbances and heresies. Fearful is the formal edict of Feb. 16, 1568, by which the Spanish inquisition declared all the Netherlands, with few exceptions, as heretics, apostates, or abettors of heresy, and therefore guilty of high treason. The king thus devoted thousands of his subjects to the axe, and could allow himself to represent as pardoned all those whom he suffered to live. After he had uttered the words "*heresy and insurrection*," *Alba* regarded himself at liberty to employ the most revolting proscriptions, degradations, confiscations, punishments, and tortures (*Groen v. Prinsterer*, *Arch. de la maison d'Orange*, T. III., p. ix.). Even the dead were not spared. How deeply the feelings of the people revolted against such measures, appears, among other things, from the popular songs of the times, such as the *Gentsch Vaderonze* (Ghent Lord's Prayer), the song of the pastor of *Lierre*, called *Arent Dirckz Vos*; an inscription for a statue to *Alba*, preserved in MS. in the *Bibliothèque de Bourgogne*, etc. Under this heavy cross the fresh life of the Reformed congregations in the South was prostrated, though we still find traces of it. Dec. 27, 1572, there was a meeting of the Classis of Brabant, the resolutions of which are of interest in showing that the congregations were distinguished as French and Flemish: the two, however, formed a common Classis. Nevertheless the heavy blows of *Alba* succeeded in scattering a large portion of the Netherland Reformed, and in driving them out of the country. They again reunited and organized in Germany and East-Friesland, along the Rhine and in the Palatinate, and held the important synods of *Wesel* (1568) and *Emden* (1572). We cannot here prosecute further the fluctuations of the struggle between the liberties of the Netherlands and the political and religious yoke of Spain. The northern provinces, under the sublime guidance of *Orange*, with their admirable hosts of naval *Gueux*, their undaunted and self-sacrificing devotion to their faith, their heroic cities,—such as *Haarlem* and *Leyden*,—came out of the struggle as victors; their reward was ecclesiastical and political greatness: whilst the southern provinces, through the machinations of the Catholic nobility and the enmity of the Walloons to the Dutch, were again reduced beneath the yoke of absolutism. From 1578, especially since the

Utrecht Union of 1579, by which Holland, Zeeland, Guelders, Zutphen, Utrecht, the territory of Gröningen and city, Friesland, Up. Yssel, and Drenthe declared their independence of Spain, the exiles gradually returned to their homes. Holland and Zeeland had already held their first Synod of Dort (1574), by which the Articles of Emden were repeated and completed, the clergy obligated unto obedience to their Classes, and the elders and deacons called upon to subscribe the confession of faith and the constitution. — Meantime, this strictly Reformed Church, which, in spite of oppression, had arisen and organized itself independent of the State, was soon to experience that even on the part of the Protestants its liberties would not be respected. The first Synod of Dort already produced conflicts with the government. During the 7th decade, it was designed to establish a kind of government *consistorium* over the Church. In 1575, the Prince of Orange, as governor of Holland and Zeeland, was even required, in opposition to the formerly adopted constitution of the Netherland Church, to recognize no consistories except those appointed or sanctioned by the town councils or states. The free Reformed churches, become suspicious during their persecution of state power, were not disposed to surrender the autonomy of the Church. Differences could not fail to take place, especially since Erastianism had numerous advocates among lukewarm members, the magistracy, and jurists. — Thus it happened that the provincial states really arrogated to themselves the government of the Church. In 1576 there appeared, under the authority of the *Prince of Orange*, a church constitution in 40 articles, in which, indeed, the office of *pastor*, *elders*, and *deacons* were recognized as according to Scripture, and church-discipline by the pastors and elders admitted; but in which, also, the most important points of the independent presbyterial constitution were wanting. The secular government, with the advice of the clergy, was to exercise authority over the Church. The right of a Christian government to issue enactments for the Church was thoroughly and acutely canvassed; and it was hinted that it was dangerous that *two kinds of government should exist in one and the same community!* The magistrate was to appoint the clergy; the elders to be nominated by the government. The local order of worship was to be determined by the magistrate, with the advice of the clergyman; only in the lower grades of discipline the congregation is allowed to act with freedom; the final decision rests with the magistrate. Synodical autonomy is set aside almost entirely. Such a constitution could only exasperate in the highest degree the strict Reformed members of the Netherland Church, who desired ecclesiastical freedom. — An effort was therefore made at the second Synod of Dort (first national Synod of the Netherlands) to achieve the Calvinistic presbyterial and synodical constitution, with complete ecclesiastical autonomy. A national Synod was to be held triennially. These resolutions were, of course, opposed by the secular authorities. When the next triennial national Synod was to be held, the States General were

requested to send deputies in order to settle existing disputes, and to effect a constitution for the Church of the country. The proposition was declined; whereupon the Synod at Middleburg, 1581, arranged matters so as to divide the Church of the country into provincial synods and the provinces into classes. The right of the government to appoint pastors, elders, and deacons was denied. In 1581, the *Prince of Orange* appointed a committee to revise this resolution, which elaborated a scheme that however, it could not carry out, since William died in 1584, by the hand of an assassin. It seemed, then, as if no general constitution for the entire Church of the Netherlands could be formed. Hence another course was adopted — that of a provincial organization of the Church. Its congregational organization remained predominantly presbyterial, though modified according to provincial circumstances. — The *National Synod of Dort* (see art.), at the beginning of the 17th cent., formed an important factor in the history of the Reformed Church, both as regards doctrine and polity. It is known that the doctrine of grace was the subject of the controversy, and of the deepest interest. Not to repeat what has already been given in the articles *Arminius* and *Gomar*, we mention only that the former parties here again enter into conflict, although under other names. Politically, they were divided into the state party and provincial party, or political Gueux and Genevan Gueux. The latter asserted that the existing religious controversy could be settled by a national synod alone: the former, with men like *Uitenbogaart* and *Hugo Grotius*, wished the government to settle it. A thorough exposition of this opinion is given by the former in his tract (publ. 1610): "*Trakt. van het ambt en cener hooge christelyke overkeid in kerkelyke zaken.*" But the authorities in favor of this opinion were by no means a majority; and in whatever towns the state-churchmen became too prominent, the Reformed began, in 1616, to separate from the Remonstrants. In consequence of these increasing separations, the call for a General Synod became constantly more urgent. The strict Reformed and free-church party became at last so powerful, that even the States-General thought it advisable to favor a General Synod. Pastors and elders were now elected by the provincial synods, and all the foreign Reformed churches were invited by the States-General to send deputies. — The Ref. Church of Holland, at the beginning of the 17th cent., occupied without doubt the most prominent position among her sisters. Whilst the leading men of the other Reformed churches had died, the theologians of Holland exceeded all others in learning and acuteness. *Breiting*, the *artistes* of Zurich, says: "At the Synod of Dort there are so many men distinguished for talent, learning, and piety, so much knowledge of the fathers, the Scriptures, and even of our Helvetic Confession and literature, that I cannot imagine whence they know all this." In Holland, therefore, the important and penetrating question was brought to such a profound and sharp discussion and decision. As in the questions of predestination and polity, so also, in a

bird respect, there were opposite parties. The strict churchmen adhered closely to the symbolical books as a Scriptural norm, especially to the *Belgic Confession* and the *Heidelberg Catechism*: they were therefore deeply outraged, when others desired to change many things in these books, which had been hallowed by the blood of thousands of martyrs. The state-church party and Arminians complained of compulsion in symbols, in which latter they saw only human authority. Thus the questions concerning *election*, *polity*, and the *authority of symbols* were interwoven. As regards the first point, it is known that the *Synod of Dort* rejected Arminianism most decidedly. On account of the great importance of the articles of Dort, they must be described more closely. The *first* article treats of the Divine predestination, which is, "the eternal and immutable purpose of God, by which, before the foundation of the world, he has chosen, according to his own good will, and of mere grace, from the entire race fallen in sin through its own guilt, a certain number, not better than the others, to salvation in Christ, whom he has also predestinated from eternity to be the mediator and head of all the elect, and to be the foundation of salvation,"¹ and has thus given the same to him to be saved, and effectually to call and draw them to communion with him through the word and his spirit, to incline them with true faith, to justify, sanctify, powerfully to defend, and finally to glorify them: all this to the glory of his grace." — The basis of election is not an already existing faith, or any other good quality; but it is in order unto faith. The *rejectio errorum* consists of nine points. — The *second* article treats of the death of Christ and redemption: articles *three* and *four* of human depravity and conversion. We reject the error that original sin does not in itself condemn; that Adam never possessed the spiritual gift of righteousness, and hence never lost it; that the will has never become depraved, but only darkened and impeded, and can choose freely as soon as the impediment is removed: that man is not dead in sin, and deprived of all power to do good: that he can thus use that common grace which remained to him even after the fall, as to attain in this way unto saving grace: that in conversion no new qualities and gifts are infused by God into the will: that faith is no infused gift, but only an act of man: that grace is merely a moral suasion: that in it God did not employ his omnipotence, and that man could resist and defeat God's design to convert: that grace and free will are partial and co-operating causes of conversion. The *fifth* article treats of the "perseverance of the saints." Whom God, according to his eternal counsel, has called and converted, him he delivers from the dominion of sin, though not wholly from the flesh. Hence there are daily sins of infirmity, which cleave even to the best works of the saints, but incite them to humility and sanctification. Left to their own power, they could not stand and persevere in grace: God, however, defends them powerfully unto the end. Although this power

is greater than the strength of the rebellious flesh, and can never be set aside by it, yet the converted are not always so guided by God, that they cannot through their own fault turn away in particular acts from the force of grace; hence they must watch and pray, and if they forget this, they may be drawn by Satan, God permitting it, into grievous sins, as was David and Peter. These grievous sins offend God deeply, interrupt the exercise of faith, and at times take from us temporarily the consciousness of grace, until after sincere repentance the face of God again shines upon us. For God, according to his immutable purpose of grace, never takes the Holy Spirit from us entirely, nor suffers us so to fall from grace, that we could commit the mortal sin against the Holy Ghost, and plunge into eternal damnation. He maintains in us the germ of regeneration, renews us without fail to true repentance and faith, to the renewed consciousness of grace and zeal in sanctification. All this is due merely to the grace of God, not to ourselves. The elect can be sure of this protection and perseverance in the faith in the ratio of the measure of their faith; not indeed by a special revelation, but by believing the promises of God in his word, by zeal in good works. — These are the celebrated *five articles of the Synod of Dort*, which undoubtedly correctly and faithfully represent the existing opposites which here came into collision, and at the same time exposes the rottenness of the Arminian system, with all its destructive consequences. With the same determination with which it defined the doctrine, the Netherland Reformed Church also carried it out within its bounds. Discipline was enforced without respect of person against those who would not adopt the orthodox doctrine as defined. The Synod thus assisted not only in the development of the Reformed peculiarity, but also in giving a specific character to the Netherland Church. Even yet, in spite of many events and fluctuations, the Dort spirit is to be felt in Holland, just as the Dort articles are still a symbol of the Netherland Reformed Church.

After the departure of the foreign deputies the Synod held 27 sessions, which had reference to the church affairs of the Netherlands, especially the obligation to adopt the confession. May 13–14, 1619, the question of church polity was settled. The *constitution of the Synod of the Hague* of 1586 was taken as a basis, and confirmed in all essential points. Here again the States-General opposed a *general* constitution, and refused their sanction to the one legally adopted by the Synod. Only Utrecht and Guelders adopted it, though with some modifications. After the Dort National Synod only provincial synods were held. Accordingly each province formed its own constitution at pleasure, so that from 1619–1775 there are really seven church constitutions in the Netherlands. There was, however, an organic link in the deputies which the provincial synods sent to each other. *Zee-land excepted*, the synodical organization was generally prevalent; in the congregations the presbyterial organization was general, for only in a few of them either the *deacons* or *elders* were wanting. The latter were elected by the

¹ Notice, the foundation of *salvation*, not of *election*.
VOL. II.—37

congregations, generally, for two years. *At the head of the congregation stood the Church council*, which met every week, and had a local magistrate as one of its members. The *Classical assemblies* consisted of the *preachers* and *one elder* from each of the congregations. The Classis sent a committee of two or three preachers annually to visit the congregations. The *provincial Synod* consisted of deputies from the *classes*. But it can be held only with the consent of the States-General, from which it must receive two commissaries as members. For every two preachers there is one elder. — If we look at the *religious life* of this period, we find the Dort spirit everywhere carried out in doctrine and morals. Besides the high-schools at Leyden, Franeker, and Gröningen, academies and Athenæa, with theological chairs, were founded. Thus arose the *academies* of *Utrecht* and *Harderwyk*, and the *Amenæa* of *Deventer* and *Amsterdam*. The labors of these schools were mostly directed to the biblical and accurate *portrayal, development, and defence* of the established doctrine of the Reformed Church. The *doctors* of theology regarded themselves as strictly bound to the exclusive service of the Church and her orthodox doctrine. We would, however, do these men great injustice if we, on this account, lessened or even denied their immense service to theological science. Even *exegesis*, though somewhat too much in the service of dogmatics, became for the age very flourishing. This is proven by the labors of *Rivetus*, *Louis de Dieu*, *Drusius*, *Amesius*, *Schottanus*, and *Gomarus*. They were also distinguished philologists. The Dutch translation of the Scriptures (of 1637), which is still an ornament of the Dutch Reformed Church, and even now occupies a most honorable position among all the translations of the Scriptures, is also a proof of the earnest and profound study of the Scriptures, their language and antiquities, as they flourished at the time in the Netherlands. The Synod of Dort has also the merit of setting on foot this excellent work. We may here also mention *Grotius*, however little the Reformed Church can be satisfied with his doctrinal tendency. Especially brilliant is the series of doctrinal theologians which the Dutch Church possessed at this time. Here we must again mention Gomarus and Rivetus. The labors of *Maresius*, *Makosius*, *Amevius*, and *Alting* give them a very honorable position among the first theologians of the Ref. Church, and the evangelical church in general. But the most distinguished of the Dutch theologians of the 16th century was *Voetius*, born in 1589, professor at Utrecht, and the most powerful defender of the orthodox doctrine (see Art.). *Cocceius* (see Art.) introduced a method opposite to the scholastic one. This method, which certainly seemed to ignore the *established* orthodoxy, and especially its very important *form*, the novelty of the matter, as also the connection of the school of Cocceius with the hated and, on account of its *natural* theology and other general principles, certainly very suspicious, Cartesian philosophy, excited the profoundest suspicions of the scholastic-orthodox theologians. Tedious controversies arose: but since both parties stood

upon the foundation of the same Church and faith, they could not fail in the end to recognize each other as members of the same Church, and not only tolerate, but also esteem each other (see Arts. *Cart. philos.* and *Cocceius*). About 1736 the controversy became extinct. Through it, rich and various energies were applied to the service of the Church, which ended in a blessing to the Reformed communion. Theological science owes to Cocceius not only a series of excellent works, especially in exegesis and biblical theology, but also such men as *H. Witsius*, *Bermann*, *Van Till*, and *Vitringa*. With his disciples he accomplished an extensive awakening of religious life, the effects of which were felt far beyond the limits of Holland. In his footsteps followed *Jodocus v. Lodenstein* (1620–71), whose entire efforts were directed to the awakening of the Church to a new life by a true conversion and sanctification. *Jean de la Badié*, of course, advanced to a decided separation (see Art. *Labadie*, *Lodenstein*).—Various minor controversies arose during the times of the Voetian and Coccejan struggles. It would lead us too far, however, to enter upon these.—About the middle of the 18th cent. we notice not only the disappearance of the old parties, but also an increasing indifference with regard to the specific Reformed doctrine. A revolution was in progress which subsequently not only lost sight of the central doctrines, but even partially denied them. In Holland the same thing took place, as everywhere else at that time. What *Klema* (1775) taught concerning the intimate connection between the so-called free morality of man and the supernatural gifts of the grace of God, *Le Sage ten Broek* (1784) concerning the atoning efficacy of the suffering Christ, and *Hammeisfeld* concerning the purpose of Christ, justly deserves the name of “*new light*” given to it by the old orthodox Reformed Dutch. The exegetic-linguistic labors of *Venemas* († 1787) and *Albertis* († 1762), however, are deserving of praise. But a more and more decided opposition arose in the midst of the congregation, the more that unbelief was spreading, and Voltaire and Rousseau on the one side, and German rationalism on the other, were exerting a pernicious influence. The Reformed Dutch gave, during these days of apostasy, the brightest and most practical proofs of their attachment to the doctrine of the Church. During this time many noble institutions were established in defence of Christian truth, which even now are rich in blessing. We may mention here the institution of *P. Stolp*, at *Leyden* (1735), the *Teyler Society*, at *Harlem* (1778), the *Hague Society*, the object of all which was to publish distinguished works in defence of the fundamental truths of the Reformed faith, and of Christianity in general, against their successive enemies.—About the end of the century we find rationalism proper represented in Holland. *Van Hemer* advanced the Kantian principles concerning the “*authority of reason in matters of faith*.” *Regenbogen* is a rationalist of the *Bretschneider* kind. In exegesis, the tendencies of *Bosveld* made themselves felt. *Van der Palm*, *Th. Pureau*, and *Van der Villigen*, followed the same rationalistic course. In short, the “*new light*” sought

o penetrate everywhere, and during the first quarter of the 19th cent. attained to a truly dangerous influence.—Meantime the old constitution of the Dutch Church had perished beneath the fearful throes of the age. With the republic of the United Netherlands the work of the Synod of Dort crumbled. In consequence of the founding of the Batavian Republic the Church was separated from the State, and the position of the Reformed Church became very difficult, although it maintained itself in all its former essential features. When the kingdom of Holland was established under *Louis Bonaparte*, a new organization of the Church was attempted. A National Synod was to form its head. But this project was not executed, since the Netherlands were incorporated in 1810 with the French empire. The introduction of the organic articles was now thought of (1812), but no result was attained. When, in 1814, the Netherland government was restored, the constitution of the Church was again earnestly thought of. Everything had perished except the *Classes*. The State, favored by circumstances, at once assumed the government of the Church. Nevertheless, in 1816, a "General Government of the Reformed Church" was established, in which the congregations, Classes, provincial and national Synods, regained a large portion of their former rights. In fact, the Church of the country had for the first time found a united head in a National Synod, although considerable influence was still left to the government in the appointment of members of the ecclesiastical assemblies and boards. The constituent Synod of 1816 completed the work by an order for church supervision and discipline. A general synodical committee was appointed, which had to execute the resolutions of the Synod: this became, after 1827, a permanent committee of the General Synod to attend to current business, and consisted of seven members chosen by the king from fourteen persons proposed by the Synod. It possesses, however, no legislative authority, and can make no changes in the Church constitution. But although the Church was thus outwardly re-organized, its inward condition was still very deplorable. Unbelief had made sad havoc in the Dutch Church. As soon as the pernicious influence of the French had been broken, the rationalism of Paulus and Bretschneider gained ground among the Dutch theologians. The orthodox faith was also frequently preached in a dry and lifeless manner. The thoroughly-rationalized Mennonite community also exercised a pernicious influence upon the Dutch Church. A change made in the obligation subscribed by the preachers opened a wide door to license in preaching. All this, as also the existing latitudinarianism with regard to the Remonstrants who had advanced far towards Socinianism; the laxity of Church discipline; the rapid "*Evangelical Songs*" attached to the Psalms, publications such as the "*Beiträge*" of Donker Curtius; public offence, such as that given by *P. W. Brouwer* in his defence of Arianism and Sabellianism, soon stirred up an ecclesiastical opposition. Add to this the interference of the State in religious affairs sanctioned by the constitution of 1816, an interference so

odious to the strict Reformed Dutch.—In March, 1816, the Classis of Amsterdam sent an address to the King, in which it complained that the new constitution of the Church was introduced, not by the Church, but by the King; that the influence of the Ministry of religious affairs was unjust and injurious; and that the power of the Synod was too great. The articles of Dort were repeatedly urged, and the necessity that they should be adhered to by the theologians. In the 2d decade the opposition had already become strong, and was increasing every year.—The head of this movement was the gifted Dutch author and poet, *William Bilderdyk*. He zealously urged the restoration of the old Dutch Church and her constitution. To him were joined his two pupils, *Da Costa*, the gifted poet, and *Capadose*, the physician, both converts from Judaism to the Reformed Church; *Groen v. Prinsterer* and *Dyrk Molenaar*, minister at the Hague. All these labored in the restoration of the old system. A work of the latter, "An address to my Reformed Brethren," in which he comes to the conclusion that the "Ref. Church is the Reformed Church no longer," was widely circulated, and produced an immense sensation.—The restoration was in full progress, when the Belgian insurrection gave it a check. But this was of short duration, for in 1832–33 the opposition became bolder and more active than ever. The motto now became: "Let us leave Babel, and build a new Church." In many places the people with enthusiasm joined the movement, and followed the orthodox preachers even to a secession from the Dutch Church. The chiefs of the movement were *H. de Cock*, *H. P. Scholte*, a pupil of Bilderdyk; *A. Brummelkamp*, *J. van Reek*, and *H. T. Gezelle*.—It may be granted that De Cock and Scholte sometimes went too far in the manner of their opposition; but it cannot be denied that the state of the Church fully justified them. The government interfered with the military measures of compulsion and various annoyances. In 1834 the subjects of this persecution separated from the Church, and a considerable number of their members followed them. But a royal edict of June 5, 1836, ended these vexations, and opened the way to religious liberty.—From this time we find scattered throughout all Holland a *Ref. Church of the Netherlands* separated from the establishment. It has simply placed itself again, both in organization and doctrine, upon the ancient basis of the Dutch Church, and exercises an earnest discipline. It cannot be denied that in these seceding congregations there is much life, a decidedly Reformed spirit, and an astonishing liberality. Although thousands of these seceders have emigrated to America, their number is nevertheless still increasing. Their churches are much frequented by the awakened and active members of the establishment.—*Da Costa*, *Groen van Prinsterer*, *de Clercq*, and *Capadose*, with many others, although they shared the opinions of the seceders, remained nevertheless in the establishment, since they rejected the principle of secession, and maintained that the Church must be restored within the Church. The flourishing Society of Christian Friends, 1845–48, also ren-

dered distinguished services by means of periodical and other literature, and by practical enterprises of Christian charity. They also appealed to the congregations and the Synod to reinstate the Reformed Confession to its ancient rights, and to apply Church discipline in doctrine and life, especially against the pastors. To their efforts especially it is due that the Synod of 1841 restrained laxness in matters of doctrine by an unequivocal explanation of the obligation to be subscribed upon entering the pastoral office. But this did not yet content them. The opposition was continued, and gained in activity, when two rationalist pastors were called to parishes at Amsterdam and the Hague. In consequence of these circumstances the Synod of 1854 felt itself compelled to give to the obligation of ministerial candidates a shape more positive and more favorable to the Reformed Confession. But even by this the wishes of the faithful church members cannot be completely satisfied; for though progress has been made in this highly important matter, the question of the symbols has not yet been brought to a satisfactory solution. The struggle of parties is, therefore, actively continued. The tendencies and doctrines of the so-called "Gröningen school," and other neologies are especially opposed by the decided adherents of the Ref. Church and doctrine. The leaders of this school are, Professors Hofstede, de Groot and Pareau. Their principles are given in their leading features in the *Encyclop. Theol. Christ. in schol. usum breviter delin.* a Hofst. de Groot et Pareau, ed. 3, 1851; also the "*Compend. dogmat. et apologet.*" by the same authors, edit. III., 1848.—The theological and scientific importance of these works has been much overrated. They are imbued with Socinianism and Rationalism, sometimes tinged with the system of Schleiermacher, and wanting in doctrinal definiteness and scientific precision. All the essential doctrines of Christianity are either altered or entirely ignored. Christ is to be the centre of this system; and yet this Gröningen Christ is after all nothing more than a human individual, only somewhat more divine than other men. He is the *educator* of his race, sent to deliver man from the guardianship of the Old Test. law, and to lead him to his majority. Even the superhuman in this Christ cannot, from the premises of the system, be sincerely meant. The admitted pre-existence of Christ is utterly untenable in the form here given. From the premises the redemption of Christ must necessarily in the Gröningen system have a meaning and intention entirely different from that given in the Scriptures and the doctrine of the Church. He is no mediator and surety, who atones for our sins and secures for us pardon and righteousness. The theory of redemption here offered is a mere rationalistic evasion. The Holy Spirit is a mere divine power or life, which God imparts to man. From this it is evident that the Gröningen school has given up the common faith of Christendom in the Holy Trinity and the fact of redemption; as also the doctrine of grace as held by the Prot. Church of the 16th cent., and particularly of the Ref.

Church. "*Reason and freedom take the place of faith; and everything is good and holy, which arises from these two forces*" (Chantepie de la Saussaye, pastor at Leyden, to the Evang. Alliance at Paris, 1855). Prof. Scholten at Leyden, whose chief work is his *Dogmatics of the Ref. Church according to their sources* (3d ed., 1855, 2 vols.), has much higher claims to the respect of scientific theologians. He manifests earnestness and depth, and an earnest desire to do justice to the *Ref. theory*, to comprehend it in its depths, and to portray, maintain, and advance it in its peculiarities. There are points in *Scholten's* system, also, which cannot be defended with the symbols of the Ref. Church: for which reason orthodox men are not satisfied with it, and even charge it with Pantheism. Among younger theologians, however, the Leyden school has many adherents; its aim is to do justice to both the Ref. orthodoxy and to the freedom of science, and to reconcile them.—The theological faculty at *Utrecht* is more historical and conservative. It numbers among its adherents the larger portion of the older clergy.—If we survey the sphere of the modern Dutch Church, we must come to the sad conviction that here also unbelief and neology have left many wounds. But nowhere in the Evang. Church can we find so much fidelity to evangelical doctrine, such soothing charity, churchly firmness, and knowledge of saving doctrine, especially among the people—who formed, after all, the main pillar of defence against unbelief—as in the Reformed Church of Holland. With great and self-sacrificing zeal various energies were here mustered to rebuild the broken walls of Zion. And although we cannot find in societies either a substitute for the Church or a dispensation to restore it, yet the rich life with which they enfold their labors in Holland gives us the hope that the nearest future of the Dutch Ref. Church will be richly blessed of Christ.—Among the Christian societies which arose at the beginning of the present struggles we may mention the *Bible Society* and the *Society for Heathen Missions*; each of them numbering some 8000 contributing members and an annual revenue of some 90,000 florins. The anniversaries enjoy the most lively sympathy of the people. The Bible Society distributes yearly some 30,000 Bibles and New Testaments. One of the noblest of their achievements is the Japanese version of the S. Scriptures. Deserving of all praise are also the "*Tract Society*," the "*Society for the Moral Improvement of Prisoners*," the "*Society for Public or General Beneficence*," a number of local societies for purposes of home missions, which are all related to the "*Netherlands Evangelical Society*." Throughout the country there are "*prayer-unions*" for the conversion of the Jews. There is also a "*Society in defence of the doctrine and rights of the Netherlands Ref. Church*," with auxiliaries in various towns. The immense efforts of Romanism in Holland gave rise to various societies to furnish material aid to the Reformed citizens and merchants, who were threatened with the financial manœuvres of the Jesuits; whilst the "*Society for the Spread of Truth and Piety among Catho-*

ics" contended with spiritual weapons. In most recent times we find an auxiliary of the Gustavus-Adolphus Society. Deacons, Institutes, Houses of Refuge, Sunday-schools, Young Men's Societies, Unions for reading the Bible, &c., fill up the list of charitable institutions.—The question of organization has been considerably advanced since the storms of 1848. The result thus far has been, that a Church council, consisting of the pastors, elders, and deacons, all elected by the members, stands at the head of each congregation. The entire Church of the country is divided into 43 classes with 10 provincial districts. The classes meet yearly at the end of June, and consist of pastors and elders, the number of the latter never exceeding that of the former. The Classis appoints the members of the Provincial Classis. A standing committee of the Classis exercises a general supervision, holds visitations, enforces discipline, decides controversies, and can suspend pastors, candidates, elders, and deacons. In the place of the former provincial Synod there is now in each province a Provincial Board, consisting of as many pastors as the number of Classes in the province, with another pastor as secretary, and an elder to every two pastors. This Board has supervision over the Classis and its board, issues ecclesiastical ordinances for the provinces, can depose pastors, elders, &c., and examine candidates for the ministerial office. The legislative body, however, is the General Synod, which meets annually at the Hague. It consists of 10 pastors from each provincial Synod, whilst the Walloon Church, the Church of the E. and W. Indies, and that of Limburg, send one pastor each. The Provincial Board also sends three elders, and the theological faculties of *Leyden*, *Utrecht*, and *Gröningen*, each one representative.—The Dutch Ref. Church numbers 1,800,000 members in 272 congregations, with 1511 pastors.—The 17 Walloon churches have 25 pastors, and form an integral part of the Ref. Church of Holland. In the ten provinces of the Netherlands there are 13 Classes.—The independent Ref. Church of the Netherlands numbers from 50–70,000 members in 220 congregations and 30 Classes. It possesses one theological school at Kampen.—The *Remonstrants* number only about 5000 members in 27 congregations, with 25 pastors.—*Lutheran congregations* are found in the Netherlands at an early date. At present they number 55,000 members in 47 congregations, with 58 pastors. The Synod is the supreme authority. They have a theol. seminary at Amsterdam with two Professors. Near the end of the last century a portion of the Lutherans rose in opposition to Rationalism, and formed the so-called restored Lutheran Church, which still exists with 8 congregations, 11 pastors, and 1,000 members.—Of *Mennonites* there are 10,000 in 123 congregations, with 124 pastors. They are a genuine Netherland phenomenon, which is older than the Reformation, and cannot, therefore, be identified with the Protestantism of the 16th century. Chantepie de la Saussaye remarks concerning them: "The ecclesiastical and doctrinal principles of Calvinism find little favor among them. They are more at-

tached to the mysticism of the middle ages, to the custom of free, religious unions. Their congregations, therefore, form no connected and organized Church. Formerly several Mennonite unions might be found in the same city. Since the beginning of the present century they have begun to enter upon a certain kind of connection with each other. They, therefore, possess no common creed, no Church organization, no bulwark against unbelief. They possess, however, a common seminary for the education of their clergy, and an executive board for some common external interests."

Besides the works already named, see *Die Nederl. Ref. Kirche. Charakterisirende Mittheil. üb. ihren dormal. Zustand*, von AUG. KÖHLER: Erlangen, 1856. The author has carefully investigated, in Holland itself, the condition of the Dutch Church, and is also conversant with modern Dutch theology.

SUDHOFF. — *Reinecke*.

Homerites, the Greek name for the *Hamjarites*, or the descendants of Hamjar, the son of Eber (the son of Saba or Sheba, Joktan's grandson. Cf. Gen. 10), to whom the true ancient South Arabians, in distinction from the Ishmaelites or mixed Arabians, trace their origin. These Homerites, whose dialect resembled the ancient Hebrew and Syrian more than the present Arabic, pressed from the interior to the west coast, and seized the country of the Sabæans and Catabani. There (the modern Yemen) they founded a kingdom which flourished over 500 years. Their kings were called Charibaël (prince of the sword), and their capital was Saphor (Dhafar, now in ruins). About 100 B. C., their kings embraced Judaism. Later, the commerce between a part of Arabia and the Roman Empire led Constantine to send to them Theophilus of Diu, with costly gifts, to procure the privilege of establishing among them a Christian church for the benefit of Roman merchants. The embassy was successful. The Hom. King himself was converted, and built three churches; one at Tharpar, then the chief city, another at the Roman port, Aden, the third at the Persian trading-place, Ormuz. But for the Jews, the whole nation would have become Christian. Early in the 6th cent., they again had a Jewish king, Dunnan, who caused Christian merchants to be murdered in retaliation for the sufferings of his brethren in the Roman empire. Elesbaan, King of Abyssinia, thereupon invaded the Hom. kingdom, dethroned Dunnan, and made Abraham, a Christian, his successor. But Abraham soon died, and Dunnan seized the throne, and became a still more bitter persecutor. About 4000 native Christians were burned or beheaded. Elesbaan again interfered (under Justinian), overthrew the old Hom. kingdom, established a Christian government, which thenceforth maintained itself until the Persians, and finally Mohammed, got possession of the country.—Although Theophilus was an Arian, the Hom. Church never embraced or adhered to Arianism, but under the Persian rule Monophysitism insinuated itself. Niebuhr heard of no Christians there, but of nearly 5000 Jewish families. In the 7th year after the Hegira, Mohammed sent a messenger to the

Homerite king, who, with his subjects, embraced Islamism. The name of the Homerites has almost become extinct. TH. PRESSL.*

Homilarium, a collection of sermons for the whole church year, selected from the works of different Church Fathers, and arranged as a model collection for ministers, as a Church book, indeed, to be read by such as are not able to preach. The thought of providing such a collection belongs to the early part of the mediæval period; a time that was so barren of homiletic productivity, that it depended entirely upon the rich treasures of the Fathers. The best known work of this sort, by which the older and less available were superseded, is the *homilarium* of Charlemagne. Its title (we refer to Cologne ed. of 1530) gives us Alcuin as the collector (*Homiliae seu maxis sermones sive conciones ad populum, præstantissimorum ecclesiae doctorum. Hieronymi, Augustini, Ambrosii, Gregorii, Origenis, Chrysostomi, Bedae, etc., in hunc ordinem digestae per Alcuinum levitam, idque injungente ei Carolo M. Rom. Imp. cui a sacretis fuit*). From other information, however—and, indeed, according to the instruction which accompanied this work—it was Paulus Diaconus, who was commissioned by Charles to prepare it, “because among the *horae*, promiscuously selected from the Fathers, he found in use a great many that were badly written and badly chosen.” As it is not to be supposed that Charles, in a work which he deemed so important that he saw and examined every sheet as it was prepared, would not have availed himself of the services of Alcuin, so the two statements may be reconciled by the admission that both these men participated in the service. Alcuin, perhaps, was entrusted with the revision of the plan; and Paulus Diaconus carried it out. Or the very plausible opinion of Lentz may be preferred (*Gesch. der Homil.*, 1, 215), that Alcuin, as he by the command of the Emperor, revised the *comes* (the *Pericopen-Ordnung*) of Jerome, by a change of the later publisher of the *Homilarium*, may have come to adopt the title of the last.—The work has obtained a further significance in addition to the immediate object contemplated, in this, that it has confirmed the pericopic arrangement founded and gradually established by Jerome, although since then, and even at the present time, differences of various kinds still present themselves.

PALMER. — Dr. Wolff.

Homiletics.—As this science will be duly discussed, as to its contents, in the article on Pulpit Eloquence, we shall here simply consider it in its formal aspect, the method of sermonizing, as it has been historically constructed. The term Homiletics, *ὁμιλία* (see Art. *Homily*), has only recently been adopted, as is the case, indeed, with other terms employed for particular departments of theological education, especially those that belong to practical theology. We meet with it first in the latter part of the 17th cent. and the beginning of the 18th. It was doubtless the case in the introduction of this term, as it was when it was adopted by Augustine and others, and again by Melancthon, and a succession of theorists who followed him, that pulpit oratory rested as yet upon the basis of classical rhetoric, and that it was only in the appli-

cation of its rules, with the necessary modifications, that Homiletics, properly considered, were brought to view; whilst on the other hand, those who attached greater importance to the specific Christian stand-point, regarded the sermon more particularly from the pastoral point of view. For this reason, the science had no name of its own: sometimes it was found in the service of rhetoric, at others in that of pastoral theology. Its appearance, with insignia of its own, marks the time when the practical Christian intervened, dissatisfied with a theory that had become *stark* and stiff, demanded a more exalted activity in the pursuit of academic culture in the various spheres of the spiritual office, the Spener-Frankian period. Since that time there has been such a diversity of views respecting the sermon as a whole, its objects and significance, that new names have been sought both for it and the theory of preaching. Thus Stier for Homiletics would substitute *Keryktic*, and Sickel, *Homilectic*. But these new names remain the undisturbed property of their inventors, for the reason that they cannot express the thing, the object, *ἡ οὐσία*, but only an aspect of it, the design and operation. But the name we give to a science should indicate objectively the thing itself as it presents itself under every variety of view.

The sermon now, as one of the essential organic activities of the Church, requires in the first place, as do all others, a systematic discussion, so that the rules applicable to it be arranged in proper order, with a view to practical observance; and in this respect, Homiletics furnishes directions for preaching. But this already, if we are not to be controlled merely by the authority of distinguished precedents,—the common practice,—or an undue regard for details, must carry us back to fundamental principles, which lie deeper than customs, and ground themselves in the idea of the Church and Cultus; and for which history is no longer a collection of authorities, but as a whole, is the realization already before us of the idea, whilst each particular act of preaching is a realization of the same idea, completing itself in the present, as though in parts it commenced it. Thus the science of Homiletics has a side upon which it is clearly practical, and will admit of rules and directions entering into particulars. It is seldom that any writer has contented himself with merely unfolding the idea without reference to practical results (as, for instance, *Marheineke's* “*Grundlegung der Homiletik*,” 1811). And this practical side is by no means conditioned exclusively by the idea, but equally so by its actualization in history. From this it does not follow that every elaboration of the science must, as one of its parts, include the whole history of preaching, which, on account of the large store of material at hand, would only be possible as a compend (see *Nitzsch*, *Pr. Theol.*, Th. II., 1, § 96. *Baur*, *Homiletik*, § 4, p. 20–68); besides, the academic lecture, unless it accompanies the lecture on the history of preaching in an independent way, cannot be dispensed with. But every treatise should at least clearly and distinctly show the connection of that which it demands of the preacher, with history and tradition in the cur-

inuous life of the Church ; and must also make appear that the Homiletic does not cherish the unscientific as well as arrogant imagination that he must begin anew, as if all history was made up of absurdities and errors, which he has surmounted, and that, for this reason, his self-subsistence is not that silly negativeness which seeks to exhibit itself under the mask of Christian freedom from all that is called human ordinances.

As, now, it is only possible to construct a theory after the practice has, to a certain extent, been ascertained and adjusted, so preaching, as a particular form of church life and activity, must have been defined and cultivated by skilful hands before a theory of it could be expected to appear. We indeed already, in the first centuries, meet with detached observations upon Christian elocution, and they all agree in this : that it does not need the ornaments of heathen declamation ; so Clem. Al. Strom. 1, 4, 2, 1 ; Orig. hom., 7, in Jos. ; Cypr. ep. 2, ad Don. ; even Lactantius, who had a good deal of rhetoric himself, calls it, *Inst.*, 3, 1, a divine order, *ut simplex et nuda veritas esset luculentior, quia talis ornata per se est* ; but, then, expressions of his kind have respect not so much to preaching in the congregation as to the missionary, catechetical, and apologetic exhibition of Christian truths in ordinary conversation and writing. At first, when the art of preaching had attained to its culminating point in the ancient Church, great attention was paid to the subject of art generally. It originated with two individuals, representing, as preachers, the highest grade of oratory—Chrysostom in the Greek, and Augustine in the Latin Church. The first, after showing by the example of Paul, in the 4th vol. of his work *de sacerdotio*, the necessity of eloquence for a minister, enters more fully into his subject in the 5th vol. ; but instead of a scientific theory, he merely furnishes, in a general way, practical directions ; and these, too, so as to show plainly, by his great regard for applause, instead of seeking to please God, that he man lived at a time when the sermon par took altogether too much of worldly eloquence, and, indeed, of the theatre. The subject is treated in a far more earnest spirit in Augustine's *doctrina christiana*. In this there is no method. After exhibiting the contents of the sermon, he shows that we should only exhibit that which we are able intelligibly to appropriate. But, then, the influence which Pagan rhetoric, in the hands of all those men who passed over from their schools into the Christian ministry, had upon the construction, is apparent also in Augustine. His theory betrays this connection far more than his practice. Although, in his "Confessions," he had said of this same rhetoric, *victoriosam loquacitatem victus cupiditate vendebam*, he still could not do without it in his theory of preaching. He recommends the study of it, especially to young men. He also clearly points out the distinction between *sapientia* and mere *eloquentia*, and gives the preference decidedly to the first. In this way, and still more in directing the attention to the best specimens of oratory contained in the sacred Scriptures, the elements of Pagan rhetoric are con-

fined to proper limits. At the same time, both factors are only brought together and associated in an outward way, whilst on the other hand, a development of Christian rhetoric from the Christian and churchly life principle is not yet secured.

As, during the earlier mediæval period, there was but little productiveness in church sermonizing, and they lived upon the rich treasures of the Fathers, so they availed themselves of whatever was regarded as homiletic oratory, especially in Augustine, and with him in the rules of ancient rhetoric, as little as they corresponded with the tone and spirit of the preaching of that age. To this belongs what Isidore of Sevilla says of rhetoric in his *Origines*, l. II., and still more, the spirited discussions of Rabanus Maurus, in the third book of his *Institutio Clericorum*, where not merely the 19 chap. *de rhetorica*, and ch. 28–39 (*quid debeat doctor catholicus in dicendo agere—quod facili locutione uti in vulgus debeat—de triplici genere locutionis, etc.*), but also the previous chapters on the laws of scriptural interpretation, are considered. The book of Gregory the Gr., *de cura pastorali*, is also usually mentioned in the history of Homiletics. It is entitled to this honor solely on account of a few—very few—general rules which it contains, whilst the whole, true to its title, partakes far more of the pastoral, although partly of a casuistic character. The Synod of Tours, in 813, might also have been mentioned in the history of Homiletics, so far as it assigned to preachers the principal themes, *quibus subjecti erudiantur*, namely : *de fide catholica, prout capere possint, de perpetua retributione bonorum et æterna damnatione malorum, de resurrectione quoque futura et ultimo judicio, et quibus operibus possit promereri beata vita, quibusve excludi*.

The second half of the mediæval period evinces greater homiletic productiveness. Still, it is evident that it was only within the range of one of the homiletic tendencies of the age—the scholastic—that there was a disposition to treat the sermon theoretically ; the other preachers,—such popular speakers as Berthold, such mystics as Tauler and Suso, such reformatory spirits as Wickliffe,—they were far too much taken up with practical interests, and lived so much in their works, that they had no time to spare in any other direction. Besides, even the scholastics gave themselves no trouble to transfer their systematizing skill to this particular sphere. In the wake of a few obscure theorists (*Alanus ab insulis* † 1203, with his *summa de arte prædicatoria*, &c.), there appeared, under the *firma* of Thomas Aquinas, a *tractatus solennis de arte et vero modo prædicandi* ; which, however, not just on account of its late appearance in the second half of the 15th cent., but that the sermons of Thomas Aquinas, as we meet with them in his works, have no reference scarcely to the rules ascribed to him, its authenticity is more than doubtful. The compiler himself says, both in the commencement and conclusion, that the writings of other holy teachers were made use of in the work. Very soon after, 1503, Sur-gant's *manuale curatorum* was published, in which the *modus prædicandi* occupies a separate

section; the more worthy of remark, as the author, who seems to belong, as to his personality, far more to the class of popular orators, commends the scholastic method of sermonizing as a necessary discipline and means of correcting the recklessness and confusion frequently met with. In Reuchlin's *liber congestorum de arte prædicandi*, which appeared only a year later, the classico-oratorical culture appeared again, after a long interval, in Homiletics, and that, too, in a way that, owing to Melanchthon, secured for it favor for a long time with the Homileticians in the evangelical Church, inasmuch as the classic rules were retained also for spiritual discourses; and on the other hand, by means of the *loci communes*, the ground-themes of all Christian preaching, there was secured to the matter of the sermon its proper right. For the rest, the ministers of that age gave less attention to such rules of art than to those which required less study. A work of this sort already was Bonaventura's *biblia pauperum*, a lexicon for preachers, furnishing historical material for such as were in need of it. The later works of this class show already by their titles, *dormi secure*, and other names, how convenient they meant to make it for preaching.

In the evangelical Church, with the regeneration of the sermon, reflection upon it,—the consciousness of what it then was, and was intended to accomplish, must be very clear. "Our office is now very different from what it was under the Pope; it is far more earnest and sincere, and accordingly costs us more labor," says Luther, at the close of the Preface to his smaller Catechism; and, for this reason, it was necessary for the fulfilment of its important duties that there should be suitable directions. Accordingly there is no want of scattered golden words for the sermon. They are collected in the *Pastorale Lutheri*, of Porta, 1586. Jerome Weller had already borrowed the greater part of his *modus et ratio concionandi*, 1562, from Luther. Also in later times there existed a number of such collections, referred to by Lentz in his history of Homiletics, and more recently in the works of E. Jonas, Luther's Pulpit Oratory, 1852. The zeal and earnestness of his successors are, however, shown more in the rich products of a particular form, than in actual improvement. They did as much avail themselves of Luther's choice words for the purpose of obtaining from them proper fruit and new seed, as of the connexion between rhetoric and pastoral teaching, which Melanchthon effected in his *elementa rhetorices*, in imitation of Reuchlin, and the still more brilliant and classical performance found in the *ecclesiastes* of Erasmus. That in this way the art of rhetoric for a time vacillated between the pagan Ciceronian rules, divisions, &c., and the Christian, devotional, pastoral standpoint, without being able to fix itself upon its proper ground and basis, has already been shown. It was, however, still worse that the externality of the whole theological tendency of the age directed itself to the sphere of preaching, and in fact extended its theory to really childish trifles and mere pedantry. It is really lamentable to think of the *methodus concordantialis*, *methodus parallelitica*, *prosopopœia*, and the dozen other names

by which they were called, a knowledge and familiar handling of which made out and wrote the homiletic *virtuosa*, and of the "Leipziger, Wittenberg, and Holmstädt fashion," after which the sermon was made and measured. It was the purpose of many of these methods, that much of the matter taken from the old rhetoric, under the name of *amplification*, could be made use of that the preacher would need no fountain of thought within himself, but in a purely mechanical way could avail himself of material with which to fill up the empty frame of his discourse. Generally, the Homiletics of that period consisted simply in this, that the old categories of *inventio*, *dispositio*, *elocutio*, *memoria*, *pronunciatio*, *actio*, and farther, *exordium*, *narratio*, *propositio*, *confirmatio*, *confutatio*, *peroratio*, and indeed the genus *didascalica*, *deliberativum*, *demonstrativum*, were applied to the sermon, and regulated its construction: although Hyperius already was opposed to the last division, and preferred a genus *didascalica elenctica*, *paedenticum*, *epanorthoticum*, and *paracleticum* (*consolatorium*), similar to the five-fold *usus* which obtained at a later period in Homiletics. Essentially Val. Lœscher, in his *breviarium oratoriae sacræ*, 1715, which was opposed to pietistic homiletics, had not yet given up this mode of treatment. The minute care with which the preparation of a sermon, and the different possible modes of providing material, were carried into the most trifling detail, must really excite surprise; and yet it produces no other impression than that the sermon was the complex of a number of particular operations, an artificially-constructed machine, and not a fresh stream flowing from a living spring.

As clearly as the Spener school comprehended this view, they were nevertheless chiefly concerned in protesting against the ruling abuses, and practically to introduce another method. The theory developed itself with them at first in academical lectures. The most important work produced by them was Rambach's *præcepta homiletica* in 1736, which, however, as to the form and statement, partakes already of the influence of the Wolfian method. The Spener standpoint is most prominent in the *prolegomena*, where, alongside of the *habilitas naturalis*, a *habilitas supernaturalis* (§ 15, &c.), an *unctio sp. s.* is required, according to which, *homines impii atque irregenerati non possunt habiles judicari ad munus oratoris sacri recte obeundum*. The arrangement is simpler and much more superficial than that of the earlier divines. The intermediate link between the Spener and the rationalistic schools was Mosheim (*Anweisung, erbaulich zu predigen*," first published 10 years after his death, 1765). The distinction between enlightening the understanding by ideas and arguments, and the moving of the will and emotions, shows already that the wind was coming from another quarter. These formal indications of the business of the sermon, if even the expressions were not Spenerish, would still admit the thought of their being filled with Spenerish contents. But we are already upon the road, which led farther and farther astray from the positive doctrines of the Christian Church. And in the succeeding rationalistic period, there are in fact

two principal thoughts to be distinguished: 1) the philanthropic Eudæmonism, which proposes to make man happy, to free him from prejudices, and to secure to him health, prosperity, &c. With this intention, Spalding's "Nutzbarkeit des Predigtamtes," 1772, Steinbart's *Anweisung zur Amtsberedtsamkeit christlicher Lehrer, unter einem aufgeklärten und gesitteten Volke*, 1779, were written. 2) In distinction from this we have the transfer of the Kantian *morality* to the sermon, which we see carried out to an extreme in Schubert's "Versuch einer Kritik der Homiletik," 1797, and in which it is asserted that a sermon ought to be properly a religious discourse, but that it need not absolutely be Christian in its character. An abatement of the strictness of the Kantian principle in reference to the people, Ammon (in his "Ideen zur Verbesserung der herrschenden Predigt-Methode," 1795,) was willing to concede. This party, aside from their opposition to false Eudæmonism, had right only in their thorough aversion to persuasion instead of conviction. On the side of the orthodox theologians, during his whole period, there was no attempt to produce any thoroughly-scientific work. The publications of Bengel and Oetinger, and the treatise of Palmer concerning Oetinger, and of Ph. D. Burk in his *Sammlungen zur Pastoral-Theol.*, contain nevertheless much that is appropriate.

The Reinhard period, as on the one side, it returns again to positive Christianity, although rationalistically apprehended and expressed, so, on the other hand, it reverts again to the classic models of antiquity. The most important work of this tendency is Schott's "Theory of Rhetoric" (1815-1828), the exemplification of which is to be met with particularly in the sphere of the Reinhard sermonizing. Thoremin, in his "Beredtsamkeit eine Tugend" (1814-1838), more cordially still seeks to exhibit the relation of the orator, especially the classic models, to the Christian sermon; but the earnestness with which he strives to trace the source of eloquence to the "life of faith," does not suffice to conceal the mistake, that this source of Christian eloquence is essentially the same with that from which the worldly flows, and that the efficacy of the first is conditioned by the same power with that of the last. We must have entirely lost sight of the peculiarity and self-subsistence of the sermon, and especially its Church character as to form and contents, in order to believe that the idea of eloquence advanced by Thoremin is really the same with that which lies at the ground of the Christian evangelical discourse.

And now if we deduct for these, the stragglers of the rationalistic and Reinhard periods (such as Alt, *Anleitung zur kirchl. Beredsamkeit*, 1840; or Ziegler, the *fundamentum dividendi*, 1851; and others), we have, as the principal feature of the sermon at the present time, on the one hand, as distinguished from classic elegance, the application of Christian freedom to the individual life, the right of personality in the sermon, and on the other, as the connecting bond, the insisting upon its churchly character; the first since the time of Harms, the second since that of Schleiermacher. Within these outlines, that personal diversity of apprehension stamps

itself in strong delineation; still, as the writer of this article has shown in his "Evangel. Homiletik," this two-fold, although in fact single effort, leads nevertheless to the acknowledgment of the same fundamental arrangement. (Comp. Ficker, *Grundlinien der evang. Homiletik*, 1847; Nitzsch, *Pract. Theol.*, 1848; G. Baur, *Grundzüge der Homiletik*, 1848, &c.). That which is peculiar in these works could not be adverted to without enlarging this article to a review. The order of Homiletics is, in some way, according to some, to connect itself with the antithesis of the *matter* and *form* of the sermon (so with Nitzsch: 1, the idea and object of the sermon; 2, choice of material; 3, plan; 4, execution; 5, language; 6, delivery;—with Schweitzer: 1, principles of Homiletics; 2, method; 3, form). Others, however, as Gaupp and Palmer, think that in the sermon there should be no separation of matter and form, and proceed rather from this, that in the sermon, the *word of God*, the *Church*, as the Church at large and as the *congregation*, and the *personality of the preacher*, should be the co-operating, and in the *Holy Ghost*, the comprehending factors, by means of which the plan and divisions in a variety of ways might be determined. In these two principal modes of constructing Homiletics is represented still in our day the difference between the classic rhetorical and the specific churchly fundamental view.—We must not omit specially to mention the author of the *Keryktik*, *Rudolph Stier*, inasmuch as with him the biblical element is decidedly prominent in the form of the sermon. His work, too, occupies precisely its proper place, as well for the inculcation of free individuality, as for that of the Church features of the time, which, particularly since Schleiermacher's day, could not, in all its controlling authority, be appreciated—that is, the duty of stricter conformity to the Scriptures. The admonition was not unheeded, as all the works just mentioned distinctly show.

As it respects the Romish Church, we must content ourselves with the remark, that in manuals and guides there has been no lack, within the last centuries. In earlier times, the plan seemed to be to provide for the preacher the necessary material collected from the sphere of morals (Abraham a. S. Clara, in his "Judas der Erzscheim," has accomplished something of the same sort, and in his *grammatica religiosa* has constructed a Homiletic in his own way). Performances of a more scientific character are met with for the first time in the last century. Graf has enumerated them in his work, "Zur praktischen Theologie," but without being satisfied with them. In modern times, Zurbel has appeared with a "Handbuch der kath. Homiletik," 1838; Lutz, with a "Handbuch der kath. Kanzelberedtsamkeit," 1851; to which we must add Hirscher's "Beiträge zur Homiletik und Katechetik," 1852.

Finally, among these works are to be mentioned the History of Homiletics, including the History of Sermons. With the exception of the unfinished labors of Eschenburg (*Versuch einer Geschichte der öffentl. Relig.-Vorträge*, &c., 1785), of PANIEL (*Pragmat. Gesch. der Christl. Beredsamkeit*, 1839-41), and of AMMON (*Gesch.*

der prakt. Th., 1 Bd., 1804), there exists but a single complete work, the *Gesch. der Homiletik* of LENTZ, 1839, which, however, furnishes simply notices and brief specimens of popular preachers, without mastering his materials from a higher standpoint. In this field there is still much to be done.

PALMER.—*Dr. Wolff.*

Homily, originally the name of the sermon itself, was afterwards used of only one kind of sermonizing, the exhortatory. As sermons could not then be discourses in an oratorical sense, but rather expositions of Scripture, they were called *homiliai*, with reference, if not to the form, yet to the familiar, fraternal style adopted. During the more brilliant period of Greek pulpit oratory, when the style of the homily was superseded, the name was retained; but in the West we soon find *homilia* or *tractatus* distinguished from *sermo* (Augustine). But even there the *sermo* was not synthetical, or the *homilia* analytical; for Augustine's *quingenta homiliae* might as well be called sermons as the *de sanctis*, &c. And yet we can see in these the antithesis which fixed the later use of *homilia*. One kind of discourses aimed merely at exposition, the other at commemorating the festival on which it was preached; or it had a distinct doctrinal aim (as *de amore dei et amore seculi*, &c.); so that although the terms seemed to be used promiscuously, one still feels that the *sermo* was less dependent on the *text* than on the *theme*. And this indicates the essential feature of the *homily*; it adheres to, and practically develops the text, in an analytic way. There is no necessary conflict between these two methods, but they must be treated as auxiliary to each other. (See PALMER's *Homilet.*, 3d ed., p. 451). It is noteworthy that as the Latin *postillae* of the middle ages were superseded by evangelical sermons, the term homily disappeared. ZINZENDORF was the first to revive its use, "34 *homiliae* über d. Wunden-Litanei" (1747). The most important homilies of recent times are those of MENKEN (über Elias; über d. Hebräerbr., &c.).—(See A. G. SCHMIDT, "die Homilie," &c.: Halle, 1827).

PALMER.*

Honorius, son of the Emperor Theodosius I., born A. D. 384, was appointed Emperor Nov. 20, 393, and succeeded his father, after his death, on Jan. 17, 395, under the guardianship of the Vandal Stilicho, as the first Western Roman Emperor, whilst his brother, Arcadius, inherited the kingdom of the East. Honorius, a weak and characterless ruler, submitted entirely, even after he had obtained his majority, to the control of Stilicho, to whose daughter, Maria, he had been married, and that the Western empire was not already convulsed under him, was not owing to the services he rendered as ruler. In addition to the invasions of Alaric into Italy in 403 and 408, the empire was visited by other barbaric invasion, as well as by rebellions in the provinces during the reign of Honorius. Soon after his ascension to the throne, he confirmed the laws of his father against heathen worship with new restrictions; but the weakness of his government, in connection with the manifold political agitations and the corruptibility of several governors, promoted the preservation of heathenism in many parts

of the empire, so that it was necessary continually to renew these laws. In 399 he published a law that all the heathen temples in the provinces should be destroyed, in order to remove all occasion to superstition. But as the heathens at this time believed a prophecy, that Christianity would only exist 365 years, the destruction of temples failed in its purpose. After the death of Stilicho, Honorius, under the influence of several nobles favorable to heathenism, enacted a law which conflicted with those heretofore existing. Between the years 409 and 410 a law appeared in the Western kingdom: "*ut libera voluntate quis cultum christianitatis exciperet*," by which the laws hitherto existing against those who practised a worship other than the Christian were abolished. This law, however, remained in force only for a short time, and the old ones were re-enacted. By an edict of 416 the heathen were excluded from civil and military honors—at least on paper, for according to Zonimus V., 46, Honorius was compelled to abolish this law by the heathen general, Genserid, whose services were indispensable, and who would remain in service only on this condition. He was equally weak and sickly with regard to doctrinal controversies within the Church. In 418 he published several edicts against Pelagius and Celestinus and their adherents. He also came into conflict with the Donatists. Already in 405 he enacted several laws against the entire Donatist party as being heretical, which were more severe than even the Council of Carthage desired. Later he appointed a conference, which was to be held at Carthage in 411 between the Catholic Bishops and the Donatists. As was natural, the imperial commissioner decided in favor of the Catholic Church. Severer laws followed, by which all Donatist priests were banished from the country, and the laymen of the party condemned to pay fines. As important as was the period of Honorius' reign for the Christian Church, so weak did he show himself to be in all his transactions. He remained his life long a child in understanding, and his death, which took place in Aug., 423, from dropsy, was no misfortune either to the State or Church.

TH. PRESSER. — *Reck.*

Honorius I., Pope from 625–638, born in Campagna di Roma, is especially distinguished by his participation in the monothelite controversies (see the Art.), which originated just at this time, and by the charge of heresy under which he fell. These controversies having spread and increased through the influence of the patriarch of Jerusalem, Sophronius, Sergius, the patriarch of Constantinople, who declared monothelitism to be orthodox doctrine, proposed a cessation of controversy. Pope Honorius approved of the proposition as well as of the dogmatic views of Sergius (see *Honorii Epist. I. ad Sergium*, in *Mansi, SS. conciliorum nova et ampliss. Collectio*, Tom. XI., p. 537; comp. p. 529; 579), still, the controversy not only increased in violence, and II. was even involved in it after his death. It was attempted, namely at Rome, to vindicate II. after his death on account of his monothelite views (see *Johannis IV., Epist. ad Constantium Imp.*; *Mar-*

mus in *Ep. ad Marinum*, and *Maximi Disp. um Pyrrho*, in *Mansi*, l. c., T. X., p. 682, sq.; 39, sq.); and although his position was then passed by with silence, still the VI. Oecumenical Council of Constantinople, 680, condemned him as a heretic (in *Mansi*, T. XI., p. 556). This judgment was repeated by several Popes, ex. gr. Leo II., who expressly anathematizes him as a heretic, because he attempted *apostolicam ecclesiam—profana prodicione immaculatam subvertere* (*Mansi*, T. X., p. 731). Roman Catholic authors of later times have attempted, after the example of Anastasius (about 870), to defend him against the charge of heresy. Baronius says that the acts of the Council of Constantinople, Ballarmine that even the letters of II., have been interpolated; others, on the other hand, as Garnier and Ballerini, affirm that II. was not condemned on account of heresy, but *propter negligentiam*. *Contra comp. Richer, Historia Concil. general.*, T. I., p. 296; *Du Pin, De antiqua eccles. disciplina*, p. 349. It is yet to be remarked that the festival of the elevation of the cross was introduced under II. (about 1228), and that he was also active in promoting conversions to Christianity.—II. was the anti-pope of Alexander II. from 1061–1064, having previously been Bishop of Parma, and was called, as such, Peter Cadolaus. Whilst Alexander was only raised to the papal chair by cardinals, and without the approbation of the Emperor, Henry IV., II. was chosen by the imperial party, at a council held at Basel. Hereupon the German bishops, under the influence of Anno, Archbishop of Cologne, at a synod at Augsburg, 1062, gave their adhesion to Alexander (comp. *Mansi*, T. XIX, p. 1001), and II., whom also the synod at Mantua, 1064, declared deposed, was now limited only to his former bishopric, although he maintained his claims to the lawful possession of the papal chair until his death, 1072. He is charged with simony and concubinage. On account of his deposition, he is not reckoned among the popes; therefore Lambert of Fagnano, who raised himself from a low position first to the bishopric of Velletri, then to the cardinalate of Ostia, and finally, through the influence of the powerful party of Robert Frangipani, to the papal chair, is called Pope Honorius II., whose reign extended from 1124 to 1130. He laid Duke Conrad of Franconia under the bann, because he permitted himself to be crowned anti-king of Lothaire III., and received therefor important new rights (see *J. D. Oleneschlager, Erläuterung l. gold. Bulle, Urkundenb.*, p. 19); on the other hand, he was compelled to permit Count Roger of Sicily to appropriate to himself the papaliefs of Sicily and Apulia. The order of Premonstrants, just instituted, was sanctioned by him, as also afterwards, at the Synod of Troyes, the order of Knight-templars.—III., born at Rome, was, previous to his election to the papal chair, Cardinal of St. John and St. Paul, was called Cencio Savelli, and ruled as pope from 1216–1227. In the violent contests of the hierarchy with the Hohenstaufen then existing, he manifested a yielding disposition, making no opposition when Frederick II. allowed his son Henry, who was King of Sicily, also to be

elected King of Germany (April 1220), even crowned him emperor (Nov. 1220), and allowed Frederick to restore the rights of his crown in Sicily. The peaceable relations between him and the emperor, however, appeared to be endangered, when Frederick attempted to bring somebody again under his sceptre. II. sent his chaplain, Alatrinus, to the Diet of Cremona, 1226, the league of Lombardy was renewed, and II. favored it; and Frederick, not pursuing his plans further, preserved thus the peaceable relations. These were soon threatened again with interruption. Frederick, who at his coronation at Aix la Ch. vowed to undertake a crusade, continually postponed the fulfilment of his vow. Finally, by an agreement at St. Germano, 1225, it was decided that Frederick should undertake the crusade in Aug. 1227, under penalty of the bann; H. however, died in March 1227. The mildness, yielding temper, and forbearance which he showed towards the Emperor Frederick, were wanting in his conduct towards Count Raymund VII. of Toulouse. The father of the latter, Raymund VI., lost his province to Count Simon of Montfort, from whom it was retaken by Raymund VII. Hereupon H. incited King Louis VIII. of France to conquer Toulouse with a crusade; but neither he nor Louis survived the end of this war. H. solemnly sanctioned the order of the Dominicans, 1216, and the order of the Franciscans, 1223. The Tertiarians came into existence under him (1223), and he first granted indulgences at the canonization of saints. The treatise, *Conjuraciones adversus principem tenebrarum*, Rome, 1629, is attributed to him.—IV., pope from April 2, 1285, to April 3, 1287, was called, before his election to the papal chair, Cardinal Jacob (Giacomo) Savelli. During his short reign he was occupied with the Sicilian quarrels which were then raging, and gained the credit of putting a limit to the robberies prevailing in the Roman province.

NEUDECKER.—Beck.

Honter, John (Honerus), a pillar of Protestantism in Siebenbürgen. He was born in Cronstadt, 1498, studied at Wittenberg under Luther, then went to Cracow, where he taught grammar, and from thence to Basel, where he attended Reuchlin's lectures. In 1533, he returned to his birth-place and established a book-printing office; later, 1547, also the first paper-mill. Hermannstadt had already, in 1529, driven out all priests and monks. Cronstadt soon followed this example, and Honter became now, by continual labors, and by circulating the writings of Luther, the chief cause that entire Berzenland accepted the Augsburg Confession in 1542. Because Luther's works were costly and rare, he translated them into Hungarian and published them himself. In 1544 he became town-rector of Cronstadt, and obtained an assistant, whom some call Matthias Calvin, others Klatz, and later a certain Valentine Wagner. He died at Cronstadt, Jan. 23, 1549. He was an eloquent orator, thorough mathematician, and able philosopher. He belongs to the first humanists and scholastics of his time. He employed his printing office mainly in printing school-books, and was in-

strumental in founding the *gymnasium academicum* in Cronstadt. Of his writings we mention, *de grammatica libri II.*, (1532, and often reprinted); *Rudimenta Cosmographica*, in verse; *Sententiæ ex omnibus operibus divi Augustini excerptæ*; *Sententiæ catholicæ Nili monachi græci*; *Formula reformationis ecclesiæ Coronensis et Barcensis totius provinciae*, published by Melanchthon, 1543, with a preface. *Agenda für die Seelsorger u. Kirchendiener in Siebenbürgen*. Comp. *Dav. Cavillingeri specimen Hungar. literatæ*, Francof., 1711; *Mailath*, *Gesch. d. österr. Kaiserstaats*, II., p. 234, sq.

DR. PRESSEL.—Beck.

Hoogstraten, Jacob van (Hoogstraten, Hogstraten, Hooch Straten), Dominican monk, prior of the convent of this order at Cologne, one of the most violent opponents and accusers of Reuchlin, and later of Luther, was born at Hoogstraten, in Brabant, 1454. He studied at the University of Cologne, which was then the chief seat of spiritual darkness; and having received the degree of A. M. in 1485, and having previously entered the Dominican order, he was chosen prior. He represented the order with such zeal against the illumination then spreading, especially against Erasmus, that he was appointed inquisitor at Louvain. He also became professor of theology at the University of Cologne, although his ignorance was great; and, in connection with Hermann of Busche, undertook to crush Reuchlin and the spiritual movement originated by him. Failing in this after many assaults, he attacked Luther and the Reformation, proposing that Luther be burned before he would disturb the Church (*Raumer*, *Geschichte Europa's*, p. 210; *Walch*, *Luther's Schr.*, XXI., Anh., p. 118). He died Jan. 21, 1527, at Cologne. Hermann of Nunnar characterizes him in a letter to Charles V. (in *v. d. Hardt*, *Ænigmat. prisca orbis* p. 574), thus: *Pestis est in Germania Jacobus Hochstraten, quam si restrinxeris, tota p̄ntia p̄llescit; homo præter ingentem suam audaciam insigniter impudens atque temerarius. Omnes interroga, si libet, per Germaniam doctos viros, omnes laesit, omnibus aequè invidus est.* His writings appeared at Cologne, 1526. Comp. *Meiner's Lebensbesch.* berühmter Männer I., p. 97, sq.; *Mayerhoff*, *Joh. Reuchlin und seine Zeit*, p. 158, sq.

NEUDECKER.—Beck.

Hooper, John, of Somersetshire, the originator of the Puritan movement in England, (see *Art. England, Reformation in*), studied for a time at Oxford, and early accepted the principles of the Reformation, notwithstanding the efforts of Gardiner to the contrary. His situation, on this account, became critical already under Henry VIII., especially so when the six Articles appeared, within which the King wished to limit the Reformation (see the *Art. Eng. Ref.*). He left England, went first to France, and then to Switzerland; where he became intimately acquainted with Bullinger (see the *Art.*), and applied himself zealously to the study of theology and the ancient languages, especially the Hebrew. At Zurich, by the advice of Bullinger, he married, and the latter baptized a child of his (*Hess*, *Leben d. Ant. Bull.* I., 216). He continued to correspond

with B. after his return to England. He returned to England when Edward ascended the throne (1549), and soon became distinguished through his attacks on Roman Catholic doctrines, and through his eloquence. Next to Latimer, he was the most popular preacher. He was also instrumental in causing Bucer to lose his position. The Earl of Warwick appointed him his chaplain, and had him elevated to the bishopric of Gloucester. Before his consecration he objected to putting on the episcopal robes, which were still very similar to those of Romish bishops. He also refused to take the prescribed canonical oath (which closed thus: "So help me God, *all saints*," &c.), and to acknowledge any other ecclesiastical authority but the holy Scriptures. Cranmer, together with Bucer and Peter Martyr, sought in vain to remove Hooper's scruples. He vindicated his opposition in a treatise, which he called his confession of faith, and by his preaching against ordination and episcopal robes caused a violent agitation among the people. Finally he was imprisoned, and after a time agreed to a compromise, according to which the clause "*all saints*" was omitted from the oath, and he consented to wear the episcopal robes only when he preached before the king and in his cathedral, and when he officiated on solemn occasions, and was consecrated in March, 1551; soon after which, by the union of the bishoprics of Gloucester and Worcester, his labors were greatly increased, but not his income. His labors as care, as preacher, pastor, and superintendent of schools, are highly extolled; not less great was his fearlessness in exercising church discipline.—He died as a martyr at the stake, 1555, one of the many sacrifices of the Roman Catholic reaction under Mary Tudor. Comp. *Bauer's Hist. of the Ref. of the Eng. Church*; *Weyl's Gesch. der akatholischen Kirchen und Sekten in Grossbritannien* II., 106–109, 264.

HERZOG.—Beck.

Hope is the third element of Christian life and character (1 Cor. 13 : 13; 1 Thess. 1 : 5 : 8; Col. 1 : 4; Gal. 5 : 5; Eph. 4 : 2–5; Heb. 10 : 22–24). As faith is the receptive, and the responsive act of the soul in regard to Divine grace, and as the Christian is conscious of having found, through these acts, eternal life in Christ, they produce hope, as a living assurance, and inward certainty, that all things are secured in Christ, not only for the individual believer, but for the Church and the world. Faith is the root, love the fruit, branches, and hope the crown of the Christian tree, rearing its head to the very heaven. Faith embraces the accomplished grace of God for man's salvation; love is the soul of our present Christian life; hope is persuaded that the future belongs to the Lord and his people. Thus in these three factors we see a reflection of the actuality of the kingdom of God.—Hope is joined to faith and love, because the spiritual life, though begun, is not yet perfected. It is the antithesis of seeing, having, and perfecting (Rom. 8 : 24, &c.; 1 John 3 : 2, &c.); it is, however, simply a desire and longing (Rom. 8 : 19, 22), nor yet the mere expectation of a future existence, but the real looking

nd prospect of the fulfilment, collectively, of all things promised to believers and the Church. Rom. 15 : 4, 13; Heb. 3 : 6; 6 : 11, 18). Hence hope is based upon the fact of Christ's resurrection, as the primal victory over the world, and glorification of the flesh, the reality of which manifests itself in our regeneration; hence the Holy Ghost, given unto believers, is the pledge and power of their hope (1 Pet. 1 : 3; Acts 23 : 6; 2 Cor. 5 : 5; Rom. 8 : 11; 15 : 13; Gal. 5 : 5). This is nothing else than the self-consciousness of the new spiritual life begotten in us by the glorified Redeemer, that it is the power by which the still existing antagonisms between flesh and spirit, the world and the kingdom of God, earth and heaven, will be overcome. Hence the full clear idea of hope first appears after the resurrection of Christ, and the outpouring of the Holy Ghost. In this form we do not find it in the Old Test., nor even in the Gospels (Heb. 7 : 19). — From this we see how essential an element of Christian life hope is, so essential that it may serve faith and love as a sign of the nature of Christianity (1 Pet. 3 : 15; Heb. 10 : 23). In it the glory of the Christian profession is concentrated (Eph. 1 : 18; 4 : 4); it is the proper aim of the Gospel (Tit. 1 : 2; Col. 1 : 5, 23); for the Christian's chief treasures are, in their perfection, the objects of hope (1 Thess. 5 : 8; Rom. 8 : 23; cf. Ezek. 1 : 14; 1 : 30; Gal. 5 : 5; 2 Tim. 4 : 8). Unbelievers are designated as persons without hope, because without God in the world (Eph. 2 : 12; 1 Thess. 1 : 13), for God is a God of hope (Rom. 15 : 13; 1 Pet. 1 : 21). The proper object of hope, however, is Christ, who is called *ἡ ἀντίδοσις*, not only because all our confidence rests on him, but especially because his second coming will fulfil the believer's hope of glorification (1 Tim. 1 : 1; Col. 1 : 27; Tit. 2 : 13). The fruit of hope is patience and steadfastness under present trials and tribulations; hence *ὑπομονή* is the constant associate of *ἀγάπη* (1 Thess. 1 : 3; Rom. 8 : 25), or faith and love in its stead (Tit. 2 : 2; 2 Tim. 1 : 10; 1 Tim. 6 : 11). And as hope produces patience in suffering, so it incites to endurance in action, because the Christian knows that his labor is not in vain (1 Cor. 15 : 58), and purity of life (1 John 3 : 3; Phil. 1 : 10). — In theology most attention is given to faith, less to love, and least to hope (prophecy); and after the 1st cent. the element of hope was kept far too much in the background. It will be the duty of modern theology to secure to it proper attention, both in theory and practice. — (NITZSCH, *System d. chr. Lehre*, §§ 209–214). AUBERLEN.*

Hophra (LXX. *Ουαφρα*, Vulg. *Ephree*, Jer. 44 : 30) is doubtless the same Egyptian King whom Manetho calls *Ουαφρα*, Herod. and Diod. *Ἀπριης*, the 8th of the Saitic dynasty. The writers just named speak of his successful wars against the Phœnicians and Cyprians. He reigned 25 years, and the nation flourished under him. Towards the close of his life, however, the Cyrenians rebelled against him, and were joined by his general *Amasis*, who overthrew him (c. 571 B. C.) and put him to death. Zedekiah, the last King of Judah, after his revolt from Nebuchadnezzar (Ezek. 17 : 15), formed a league with H., who actually sent out an army

to aid Z., and thus caused the Chaldeans to raise their siege of Jerusalem for a time (Jer. 37 : 3, &c.). Subsequently the siege was renewed without H. interfering. Hence Jeremiah's displeasure at many for looking to Egypt for aid, and his prophecy of H.'s downfall (Jer. 44 : 30; 46 : 26; Ezek. 29 : 3). VAHINGER.*

Hornbeck, John, born at Harlem, 1617, died at Leyden, 1666, distinguished himself as Prof. of Theology and as clergyman from 1644, in Utrecht, from 1654 in Leyden. His writings were highly prized, and are in part yet deserving to be read, as the *Examen bullæ papalis quæ Innocentius X. abrogare nititur pacem Germaniæ*: Ultraj., 1652; or the *Epistola ad Joh. Duræum, de Independentismo*: Ludg. Bat., 1659; and the *Commentarius de paradoxis Weigelianis*. An important question of the times is discussed in his treatise *de conversione Indorum*, which contains a biography of the author. His *Brevis institutio studii theologici*: Ultraj., 1658, shows us the mode of theological instruction then in vogue. Of his polemical writings, *De convincendis Judæis*, L. B. 1655, may be antiquated; but the *Summa controversiarum religionis, Trajecti ad Rhen.*, 1653, remains, with Spanheims, the most serviceable Reformed compendium of polemics, and contains especially an important section on the Brownists. His work, *Socinianismus confutatus*, 1 T.: Ultraj., 1650; 2 T.: Amst., 1662; 3 T., 1664, continues to be instructive as a learned and able representation and refutation of Socinianism. To this he added a *Compendium Socinianismi confutati*: Ludg. B., 1690. His *Miscellanea sacra* were published at Utrecht, 1677. Highly prized is his *Theologia practica cum irenica, sive de studio pacis et concordie*, 2 T.: Ultraj., 1663; Auctior, 1689; and Franef. et Lips., 1698, with supplements, *Vetera et nova, s. Exercit. th.* — Traj. ad Rh., 1672. Besides the biography already mentioned consult the Art. Hornbeck in Bayle's Dictionary.

ALEX. SCHWEITZER. — Beck.

Horites (חֹרִי, Sept. *Χορραῖος*, Vulg. *Horæus*), the name of the aborigines of Edom, Gen. 14 : 6, who inhabited Mount Seir, but who were conquered and partially exterminated by Esau and his descendants, Deut. 2 : 12, 22. Their name is derived from Hor (חֹר), hole, cavern, and represents them as troglodytes, which they also might have been in great part. Their independent existence was destroyed only gradually by the constant oppression and hatred of their conquerors, which were transmitted from one generation to another. This becomes tolerably evident from the book of Job, where 17 : 6; 24 : 5, sq.; 30 : 1, sq., allusion is made to the great contempt and to the ignominious fate, which befell the oppressed nations of the land of Uz. (Comp. Ewald, *Hiob in l. u. israel. Gesch.*, 1, 273, sq., and Vaihinger, *das Buch Hiob, metrisch übersetzt u. erläutert*, Stuttg. : Cotta, 1842, in these passages). But as Uz was a descendant of Seir (Gen. 36 : 28; 1 Chron. 1 : 42), as also a descendant of Nahor, the brother of Abraham (Gen. 22 : 21); it follows, that the descendants of Nahor, to whom Job might have belonged, mixed themselves with the descendants of Seir, that is, with the Horites, and

gradually destroyed their independence. The province of Uz, however, was situated near to Edom in the East, and was even taken possession of later by the Edomites (Lam. 4 : 21; comp. Jer. 25 : 20, and *Vaihinger's* Commentary, p. 55). But the Horites belonged, as *Knobel* shows in his register of nations, with the Rephaim and Anakim, with the Amorites and Amalekites, to the great race of the Sudim, who was the fourth son of Shem (Gen. 10 : 22). Consequently they were not Canaanites, descendants of Ham, but Shemites, and, as *Knobel* shows, cognate with the Hyksos, emigrated from Assyria to Egypt, and after 511 years returned to their country. This section of the Ludim, however, was greatly reduced, and became the prey of the Abrahamic tribes.—The name 'רְחִי (Sept.

Ῥαῖοί, Vulg. *Hori*), Gen. 36 : 22, is the name of a single man, and signifies a nobleman, a baron, as also Numb. 13 : 5; 1 Chron. 1 : 39).

VAIHINGER. — *Beck*.

Hormisdas, *Pope*, born at Frusino in Campagna, was chosen Bishop of Rome as successor of Symmachus, July 26, 514, and was soon after his election invited by the Eastern Emperor, Anastasius, to a general Council to be held at Heraclea, in order to bring to pass a reunion between the Oriental and Occidental Churches, and especially to examine impartially the decrees which had been published against those who believed in the two natures in Christ. H. consented to attend, provided that the decrees of Chalcedon were not disturbed, and the chiefs of Eutychianism, Dioscurus, Timotheus Aelurus, Peter Mongus, and Acacius were condemned. The Emperor was willing to accede to all these conditions except the condemnation of Acacius, Bishop of Constantinople. He insisted upon it, and the Council was not held. The Emperor made another attempt in 517, and failing again, he stopped all intercourse with Rome. After the death of Anastasius (518), his successor Justinus began negotiations again with H., but as the Patriarch of Alexandria, the Metropolitan of Thessalonica, and many other of the clergy refused to accept the articles which had been dictated by H., he repelled the overtures of the Emperor so roughly, that the latter abandoned the undertaking (comp. the correspondence between the Patriarch of Constantinople, the Emperor Justinus, and Hormisdas). He acted more mildly and prudently in the dogmatic controversy which arose concerning Faustus of Rhegium.—Nothing more than this is known concerning the labors of H. He is said to have discovered traces of the Manicheans at Rome, and to have driven them out and burned their writings. He died Aug. 6, 523. A number of his letters are yet in existence, to be found in the *Epistolis Romanorum Pontificum*.

DR. PRESSEL. — *Beck*.

Horney or **Hornejus**, *Conrad*, Lutheran theologian in Helmstädt, was born Nov. 25, 1590, at Braunschweig. He early made such rapid progress in writing prose and verse in Latin and Greek, that he became known to men like J. Gruter in Heidelberg, *et. al.* In 1608 he went to Helmstädt, where he became the favorite pupil of the elder Caselius (see Art.),

whose colleagues, the Aristotelian Cornelius Martini, Nich. Gran, *et. al.*, became more his teachers than the theologians of the University, and other distinguished pupils of Caselius and Martini, as George Calixtus, Barthold Neubam, *et. al.*, became then already his friends. After the death of Caselius in 1613, he remained eight years in the family of his teacher, Martini, was appointed Professor of Logic and Ethics in connection with Martini in 1619, and after the death of the latter (Dec. 17, 1621) became his successor. In 1628 he was transferred from the philosophical to the theological faculty, having his friend Calixtus as colleague, when he remained until his death.

Horney wrote several philosophical text-books which were much used at other Universities, as the *Compendium dialecticæ succinctum*, first published at Helmstädt, 1623, and in 1666 had run through twelve editions; the *disputationes ethicæ depromptæ ex ethica Arist. ad Nicom.*, first published in 1618, and seven editions to 1666; in addition to these many other philosophical treatises: *Compendium naturalis philosophiæ*, 1618; *disquisitiones metaphysicæ s. de prima philosophia*, 1622; *institt. logicæ*, 1623; *philosophia moralis*, 1624; *exercitationes et disputationes logicæ*, 1621; *processus disputandi*, &c. — He died Sept. 26, 1649. Among his papers were found a Commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews, and on the Cat. Epistles, which were published in 1654 and 1655; also a *compendium theologiæ, quo universa fidei chr. tam credendorum quam magendæ doctrina pertractatur*: Br., 1655, in 4to., and in the year of his death also a *compendium hist. eccl.* of the first three centuries. Many of his letters to Calixtus, Schwartzkopff, *et. al.*, are preserved in the libraries at Wolfenbüttel and Göttingen. The Latin and German funeral addresses by his friends and pupils are referred to and used in der Ersch- u. Gruber'schen Encyclopædie, sec. II., Bd. 11, in the Art. *Hornejus* by HENCKE. — *Beck*.

Hosea, the *Prophet*, holds a very peculiar position in the number of those great men, who were impelled by the Spirit of the Lord, to rebuke the violators of the covenant and to comfort the faithful. No other prophet beheld such an appalling abyss of sinfulness and idolatrous abominations, that tainted the people from the throne down to the lowest classes. The heart-sickening picture of depravity, which presents itself in Hosea, will not surprise us, if we bear in mind, that he lived, as appears from his book, in the kingdom of Israel at the period of its greatest degeneracy, in Ephraim joined to idolatry (4 : 17). For when he refers to Judah (4 : 15; 5 : 5; 5 : 12, 14) he does so only incidentally, while Israel is always prominent in his mind (6 : 4; 10 : 11). In chapter 7th he deals exclusively with the iniquity of Ephraim and the wickedness of Samaria; in chapter 8th he refers particularly to the calf-worship of Samaria, and its unauthorized appointments of kings. Though at the end of the chapter Judah also is rebuked, this is hardly more than a passing notice of the sister state. It cannot, indeed, be expected that a prophet, though belonging to the ten tribes, would in his exhortations leave Judah altogether out of view. The remem-

rance of their common ancestor Israel, and their common earlier history, did not allow such an exclusion. Jerusalem, however, is never mentioned, and only the North of Palestine, Samaria, and Bethel, Gilead, Gilgal and Sichem, are familiar localities. The land, therefore, which, according to 1 : 2, was rebellious against Jehovah, and where Hosea was commanded to take his wife, was undoubtedly the same in which he lived and prophesied, not one of which he merely took a view from Judah: it was Israel with its capital Samaria, whose ruler he calls "our king" (7 : 1, 5). Upon this point critics of the most diverse character (*Hävernick* and *Keil*, *Ewald* and *Hitzig*, &c.) agree, and the opinion of Jahn, that Hosea was a prophet in Judah may now be regarded as given up. *Maurer* (*Observ. in Hos.*, in *Maurer's* and *Rosenmüller's Commentat. theol.*, tom. II., p. 1, cap. 3) suggests that Hosea, like his predecessor Amos, might have removed from the southern to the northern kingdom, but his reasons are by no means conclusive. Ewald, on the contrary, connects the writing of the second half of the book with a presumed residence of the prophet in Judah, thus accounting for his greater forbearance with Judah in the beginning, when he observed its iniquity from a distance only, and his later severity after he had himself become an eye-witness of its wickedness.

Turning to the inquiry as to the time when the prophet of Ephraim saw "terrible things" in this kingdom, we find the beginning of his ministry referred to in the first words of the book: "The beginning of the Word of the Lord by Hosea" (1 : 2), which, in connection with 1 : 4, "for yet a little while, and I will avenge the blood of Jezreel upon the house of Jehu," etc., clearly prove that the prophet did not prophesy before that King, whom Elisha chose from the captains of Joram and anointed as master against his master, to smite in the son of Ahab the house of Ahab, that the whole house of Ahab might perish (2 Kings 9 : 7).

With respect to the question, how long before the fall of the house of Jehu the prophet arose, we find in the text no other clue than the words just quoted: "Yet a little while," etc., which, though couched in rather general terms, will justify us in assigning no earlier date to Hosea's ministry, than the time of King Jeroboam II., son of Joash, in conformity with the superscription of the first chapter. If we emphasize the expression "a little," the probability arises, that the prophet did not enter upon his office till towards the end of the King's reign, and this is the opinion of almost all interpreters. But it is even possible (as we need not be guided by the superscription, which is of doubtful authenticity) that Hosea spoke those prophetic words in the time of Jeroboam's son, Zachariah, with whom the house of Jehu actually ended (*Berthold*). To judge by the description of the country, as given in the beginning of the book, the people, though guilty of apostasy, appear to have lived on a fertile soil in thrifty comfort (2 : 10-13). Between the death of Jeroboam II. and the accession of his son, there was an interregnum of 10-11 years (*Simson*, Introduction to his *Comment.*, p. 14), a period of wild

distraction, of which we find a saddening picture in the second part of Hosea's book. Zachariah ascended at length his father's throne, but found his death six months after by the hands of the rebel Shallum, who, in his turn, after one month, was killed and succeeded by Menahem, a cruel oppressor of Israel for ten years. It is not unlikely that Hosea (10 : 6, 7) alludes to the disgrace and humiliation of Israel, which paid at one time for the aid rendered by Pul, the Assyrian King, to Menahem's faction (for both Assyria and Egypt had been appealed to, 7 : 11), and was heavily taxed another time, in order to avert a permanent occupation of the country by the same monarch (2 Kings 15 : 19-20). The more difficult question, how long Hosea continued to fill the prophetic office, would find a ready answer if *שִׁלְמָן*, in 10 : 14, as I think most likely, were an abbreviation of

שִׁלְמָנָאֶדָר. Ewald, taking a different view, supposes that Shalman was some predecessor of Pul, who had destroyed the celebrated Arbela on the Tigris, and treated its inhabitants with cruelty. If the former explanation is the correct one, as Gesenius, Keil, and others think, Hosea was still a cotemporary of King Hezekiah, and as such he is represented in the superscription. His prophetic activity would then have continued upwards of 60 years, which cannot be disproved by merely alleging improbability. For other attempts to determine the time of the prophet see *Simson*, p. 17, sqq. He was undoubtedly a younger cotemporary of Amos, on whom he seems to be dependent in some of his passages.—(Comp. 4 : 3 with Amos 8 : 8; 4 : 15 with Amos 5 : 5).

The soul of the prophet is profoundly agitated under the burden which God has laid upon it, to preach against the sinfulness of his nation, and to announce the punishment to which it was doomed. Hence the abruptness of his discourse, in which the sentences seem imperfectly connected, and the rapid succession of images that are merely sketched and not filled out. Jerome well observes of him, "*Commaticus est et quasi per sententias loquens*." But the dark and impetuous surge of his indignation is wonderfully tinted with the gladdening beams of reconciling love, which God in his mercy and long-suffering can bestow anew on those of his erring children who "seek the Lord their God, and David their King, and shall fear the Lord and his goodness in the latter days" (3 : 5). It is this very contrast, this impressive blending of God's retributive justice with his eternal love, which gives a peculiar sublimity to all the appeals of Hosea (11 : 3, 4; 5 : 14; 13 : 8; 14 : 6, 9). "Hosea," says Ewald, "has a rich and stirring imagination, his discourse is remarkable for a pithy fulness, and though he uses many forcible images, which evince his poetical boldness and originality, as well as the straightforwardness of his times, his language is tender and warm."

The book of Hosea, taken in its connection, consists of two parts, chapter 1-3 and ch. 4-14. The former contains the "beginning" (1 : 2) of the prophet's discourse, and treats of apostasy, punishment, repentance and mercy, in a sym-

cides, thieves, and robbers. The murder of Coligny gave his soul incredible refreshment (*incredibile animi recreationem*); he thanked God for the deed, and wished a Bartholomew's night for his own country: so he wrote to the Cardinal of Lorraine (see *d. d. Sublaci* 4. Septembris, 1572; *Epist.*, 178; *Opp.*, II., p. 339, 340). Coligny he called a man, *quo uno haud scio an unquam tellus produxerit pestilentiorum*. In politics he was an absolutist (comp. *Rescius, Vita Hosii*). Krasinski says of him: his learning could not, however, free his mind from the unchristian notions inculcated by the same Church, that voluntary self-torment is acceptable to the Father of all mercy; and being a rigid observer of those practices which are more in accordance with pagan rites than the mild precepts of Christianity, and which that Church recommends, he frequently lacerated his own body by severe flagellations, spilling his own blood with the same fervor as he would have spilled that of the opponents of the Pope (Reform. of Poland, p. 406).

The best edition of his works is that of Cologne, 1584, in two fol. We mention: 1) *De expresso verbo Dei*: Rom., 1559. 2) *Dialogus num calicem laicis et uxores sacerdotibus, &c.* 3) *Judicium et censura de judicio ministrorum Tigurinorum et Heidelbergensium, &c.* 4) *Confutatio Prolegomenon Brentii*. 5) *De loco et auctoritate Rom. Pontificis*. 6) *De sacerdotem conjugio*. 7) *De missa vulgari lingua celebranda*. 8) *Propugnatio Christ. Cath. Doctr.* Comp. Biog. by *Rescius* and *Dr. A. Eichhorn, Sixt, Paul Vergerius*, 1855, p. 425; Hist. Sketch of Rise, Progress, and Decline of Reformation in Poland, &c., by Count Valerian Krasinski, 2 vols.: London, 1830 and 1840.

K. SUDHOFF.—*Ermentrout*.

Hospinian, Rudolph, born in Altorf, canton Zürich, Nov. 7, 1547. On his return from the Reformed Universities of Marburg and Heidelberg, he entered the ministry, 1568. In 1576 he became principal of the Carolina school, the duties of which, in connection with those of his parish, he discharged for 19 years. His biographer, Heidegger, says of him: *Ferreum certe adamantinumque dixeris, qui tot labores exantillare et simul ingenium a situ et squalore vindicare posset*. To demolish the Papacy appears to have been one of his objects. On this point Heideg. remarks: "*Impetum concepit animo suo plane heroicum et laude nunquam intermoritura dignissimum fictitiæ illius vetustatis spectrum debellandi Gibeoniticæque artes et fraudes, monstratis genuinis errorum, qui paulatim detegendi, concellandique. Et magnæ quidem molis, immensusque laboris opus aggrediebatur, cum de cælesti doctrina et ceremoniis veræ primitivæ ecclesiæ, cum de inclinatione et depravatione ejusdem doctrinæ, deque ceremoniarum mutatione, autione et progressu iis seculis, quæ Christum et Apostolos primum deinde vere Constantinum Imperatorem imprimis autem Gregorium M. secutæ sunt*. His first work on these subjects, *De origine et progressu Rituum et Ceremoniarum Ecclesiasticarum*, appeared in 1585; two years later, his *De templis, hoc est de origine, progressu et abusu templorum, ac omnino rerum omnium ad templa pertinentium*; in 1588, his *De Monachis, seu de*

origine et progressu Monachatus ac Ordinum Monasticorum, Equitum militarium tam sacrorum quam secularium omnium; in 1592 and 1593, his *De festis Judæorum et ethnicorum, hoc est de origine, progressu, ceremoniis et ritibus festorum dierum Christianorum*; in 1598 and 1602, his *Historia sacramentaria*, with the title, *De origine et progressu controversiæ sacram., de cæna Domini inter lutheranos et orthodoxos, quos Zwinglianos et Calvinistas vocant, exortæ ab anno Christi Salv. 1517 usque ad annum, 1602*; in 1617, his *Concordia discors, seu de origine, progressu, formulæ concordiæ Bergensis*; in 1619, his *Historia Jesuitica*. These productions created a great sensation over all Europe, and placed Hosp. in the first rank of theologians. The Catholics pitted against him their most distinguished champions, such as Bellarmine and Gretscher, and the embittered Lutherans fought him with extravagant zeal. His reply to *Leonard Hutter*, who had in hand the review of his *Historia sacram.* and the *Concordia discors*, was never published. Of another treatise, which it appears shared the same fate, Heidegg. says: "*Neque tamen opus isthoc ad metam perduxit seu lædio victus et maledecentiis adversarii, qui nescio quibus agitaturs furius ubique insultare, quam cum ratione quadam disputare maluit, seu fastidium subiit docendi, funem molestæ adeo conventionis, qua non tantum animos veritatis facta copia sauciatis ægrosque, magis exulceratum iri, sed etiam capitales religionis hostes. Jesuitas cum primis, infausti certaminis illius futuros spectatores avidissimos delicias jucundo ejusmodi spectacula sibi futuros metuit*. *Hutter* can by no means be put on an equality with Hosp., who, for the sake of peace and of the various governments which desired a cessation of religious disputations, withheld many things which were to his own advantage. (See his letter to *Wolfgang Amling*, Aug. 22, 1607.) His countrymen now loaded him with fresh honors, but he did not live long to enjoy them. His devotion to science and the doctrine of his Church had undermined his constitution. He endured blindness for one year, and, in his 76th year, became idiotic. Death relieved him of his sufferings, March 11, 1626. The best edition of his works appeared at Geneva, 1681. 7 fol., to which is prefixed *Hospinianus rediens seu historia vitæ et obitus Rod. Hospin.*, by *J. H. Heideggeri*.

K. SUDHOFF.—*Ermentrout*.

Hospital (Michael de L'), born, 1506, at Aigueperse, in Auvergne, studied at Toulouse and Padua, and became Auditor of the Rota in Rome. On his return home, he was the recipient of various imperial honors, and was finally created Chancellor, 1560. A learned, ingenious, dignified, and honest statesman, he adorned his character with a morality such as is seldom found in men of his profession. Inspired with a national idea, and abhorring sectionalism, he sought to unite the ecclesiastical factions that divided his country, in a hearty, cordial support of its interests. The excited religionists of his day could not appreciate the sentiments he uttered on Dec. 13, 1560, when he said before an assembly of the States that, as Christianity had neither been founded nor spread by arms, exhor-

tions availed more than force, and advised them to drop names, such as Lutherans, Huguenots, Papists, and keep unchanged that of Christ. He seemed to think that good-for-nothing people were to be found in all religious societies, and that the devil had most to do with religious dissensions. And so, in April, 1561, he proposed a decree, granting toleration to all parties, and inviting back refugees. He was forced, however, to content himself with mitigating the severity of the laws on this subject. His remarks he made before the Conference at Meaux, Sept. 9, 1561, are worthy of being recorded. "It is first of all necessary," said he, "that you be united in spirit. To accomplish this, let no one think himself better than another, avoid all wire-drawn subtleties, and strive to know only the divine Word and Christ. Do not look upon the adherents of the new doctrines as enemies: instead of hating them, love them and seek to gain them, for they are baptized and, like ourselves, Christians. You are not to determine which religion is the better, but how to uphold the State, and secure the public peace," &c. He obtained for the nobility the privilege of worshipping in their own castles. His opposition, 1564, to the reception of all the Tridentine decrees, brought him into collision with the Cardinal of Lorraine. Pope Paul IV. demanded his dismissal, but the Chancellor retained his position. His denunciation of the shameful breach of the peace of Longjumeau, which his exertions had brought to pass, interrupted the amicable relations that had hitherto obtained between him and Catharine. Resigning the Chancellorship, Oct. 7, 1586, he retired to his country-seat at Vignay, near Etampes. He died May 13, 1573, 68 years old — a wise as well as an honest statesman. Of his writings we have: *Epistolæ seu sermones; harangue contenant la remonstration faite devant CHARLES IX., and poemata*. He was an accomplished Latinist. Many of his poems were classical, in the full sense of this term. Comp. *Vie d'Hopital*, Amsterdam, 1762; *F. Raumer*, *Gesch. Europa's*, Bd. II.; *Soldan*, *Gesch. des Prot. in Frankreich*, Bd. II.

DR. PRESSEL.—*Ermentrout*.

Hospitalist brothers — those lay-brothers, monks, and knights, who, while leading an ascetic life, nursed the poor and sick in hospitals. Each brotherhood had a Superior, and over all presided a General. Some of their societies were independent of Episcopal jurisdiction, being responsible only to the Pope. They first originated in Italy, in 9th cent., in the Order *U. L. Fr. della Scala*. They multiplied with extraordinary rapidity in the time of the Crusades, and, spreading over France, England, Spain, Portugal, Germany, Netherlands, Bohemia, Poland, reached even the West Indies. As spiritual knights, they were divided into knights, priests, and serving-brothers. To this class belong the Hosp. of St. Antony, founded by Gaston, 1095; of St. John (*Fratres hospital. S. Joannis*) in Jerusalem (1099); of the German knights (*Equites Teutonici hospital. s. Mariæ Virginis*); of the Holy Ghost, by Guido, 1178, of Burgos (1212), of John of God (*de Dieu*), of Bethlehemites (1655), &c.

NEUDECKER.—*Ermentrout*.

Hospitalist sisters, called also "daughters of God," were nuns and lay-sisters, who, besides discharging the duties just mentioned, also undertook the education of girls, particularly orphans, and the reformation of women who had forgotten to be virtuous. They are still to be found in France, Netherlands, and in Italy. Of them we mention the order of St. Gervasius (founded 1171), of St. Catharine in Paris (1222), of St. Martha in Burgundy, of the Holy Ghost, of Loches and St. Joseph, of Bethlehemites (17th century).

NEUDECKER.—*Ermentrout*.

Host (oblation), is the name given, in the Romish and (in part) Lutheran Churches, to the wafers of flour and water used by those Churches as the sacramental bread (*panes eucharist., orbiculares, ἄpros σπογγωσίδης, Epiphan.*). The composition and form of this bread occasioned violent controversies, first between the Eastern and Western Churches, then between Lutheran and Reformed theologians. Certain traces of unleavened bread at the communion are not found in the Latin Church prior to the 9th cent., when Rab. Maurus recommended it. But the Rom. Church contend for its use in the 2d cent., although under Innocent I. consecrated bread is called *fermentum*. Even in the 9th and following centuries, Photius, and other prominent opponents of the West, say nothing of a diversity upon this point (see *Azymites*). The Greeks had antiquity on their side. Indeed, originally the communion bread and wine were taken from the *προσφορæ, oblationes*, of the members, and the custom of preparing special bread for the sacrament was introduced with the development of the doctrine of transubstantiation, and the mystical view of the sacraments. The Rom. Church urged the insignificance of the distinction, and appealed to Luke 22:7, as favoring the use of unleavened bread. Later, it was argued that unmixed wheat flour was a symbol of the unspotted paschal lamb; hence, long after the lay *oblationes* had ceased, the wafers were called *oblata*, and, after the consecration, *hostiæ*. The Greeks replied that, as Christ had instituted the Supper on the evening before the passover, he used leavened bread, the unleavened having not been prepared until the following day. At the Synod of Florence, 1439, the matter was compromised by admitting the use of both kinds; but Constant. refused to sign the formula. At the Reformation no general change was made of the Romish custom. In Zurich and Geneva, as in Wittenberg, *oblata* were used. After some time, however, the Lutheran Church alone retained them, as *ἀδιαφόρον*. The Reformed Church (Zurich excepted) rejected wafers, as lacking the nutritive property of bread, and precluding the *εὐχαριστία*. In the united Church of Prussia, strips of bread, cut across, are used. The *oblata* of the Romanists and Lutherans usually have the impress of a cross or lamb.

GRÜNEISEN.*

Hubertine Annalist, or anonymous author of the *Chronicles of St. Hubert's Monastery in Arduenna*, living in the middle of the 11th cent. In his *Chron. St. Hub. Andaginensis*, he imitated the style of Sallust. L. C. BETHMANN and W. WATTENBACH issued a new edition of it in PERTZ

Script., VIII., 565–630, where the following opinion of the author is expressed: "*satis habeamus nosse, auctorem operis fuisse virum inter medias res versatum, acrem judicis, veritatis studiosum; hoc enim totum ejus dicendi genus, hoc simplex et sincera rerum narratio suadent.*"

P.*

Hubert's Order.—St. Hubert, the son of Bertrand, Duke of Guienne, early entered the service of Theodorick, the Frank. king, and became passionately fond of hunting. After his wife's death he entered the monastery of Stablov. A legend says that whilst hunting on a Good Friday in the forest of Ardenne, near a monastery, he met a deer with a brilliant crucifix between his horns, which led him to abandon the chase, and devote himself to the Church. After Lamprecht's martyrdom (708), he became B. of Mästricht and Liege, and built a cathedral in Liege in honor of Lamprecht. Many years after H.'s death (727), his body remained uncorrupted. He was canonized, and his body placed (827) in the monastery, which was thenceforth called St. Hubert's. It was the popular belief that St. Peter gave Hubert power to cast out devils, and cure the bite of mad dogs. Hubert became the patron of hunting, and his anniversary is observed on Nov. 3.—Several orders were founded in his honor, among them that in *Bavaria* bearing his name. NEUDECKER.*

Hübmaier, Balthasar (Hübmr), born at Friedberg, near Augsburg, c. 1480, was a zealous advocate and promoter of the Anabaptist (see Art.) agitation of his day. He possessed popular oratorical powers, and could easily sway the multitude by his earnest appeals. When he first changed his views, as a Romish priest, he embraced evangelical views, especially those then spreading in Switzerland. But before long his fanatical tendencies showed themselves, and he ranged himself under Münstzer's banner. The principal field of his efforts was Waldshut. In support of his views he wrote numerous works, especially upon the sacraments. At length he was arrested by the Austrian government as a seditionist, and condemned to the stake. He was burned at Vienna, March 10, 1528. His wife, who firmly clung to him, was drowned in the Danube three days later.—See Letters of Zwingli and Oecolamp. FÜSSLIN'S Beiträge zur Ref.-Gesch. II. FABRI, Ursach warum d. Wiedertäufer Patron * * * Hubmayer verbrannt sei, 1528. RAUPACH, Evang. Oesterr. II., 52. SCHELHORN, Acta hist. eccl.: Ulm, 1738. SCHREIBER'S Biographie im Taschenb. f. Gesch. in Süddeutschl., 1839, 1840 (not completed). Some of H.'s works are reprinted in the Unschuld. Nachr., 1746. SCHELHORN, Samml. f. Gesch., u. dessen Beitr. z. Erläut. d. schwäb. K.-gesch. STÄUDLIN, K.-hist. Archiv, 1826). CUNITZ.*

Hucbald (Hucbold, Hugbald, Hubald, Ubald), was probably born about 850, and was placed, as was customary, in youth, at a monastery. He enjoyed the tuition of his learned uncle Milo, in the *monasterium Elnonense* (St. Amandus), and during a long life became an ornament of that institution. Under Milo, H. made rapid progress in his studies, and excelled in music.

"*philosopher*," i. e., teacher of the liberal arts, and continued in the post for 60 years. He devoted his talents mainly to the advancement of music as a science. First he established the laws of harmony (*diaphonia*), then invented musical signs, and prepared books of instruction. The Abbot Gerbert of St. Blasius published (*Scriptores eccl. de musica*, T. I.) three works of Hucbald: *de harmonica institutione sive de musica; musica enchiridialis; and comment. brevis de tonis et psalmis modulandis*. The second had the widest circulation.—H. was also a great linguist and a poet. He wrote a Latin comic poem of 130 lines, each of which begins with a C (Charles the Bald). He likewise wrote some saints' lives, which are valuable as sources, especially *Vita S. Lebuini*. He died in 930, when the *Annales Elnonenses majores* remark: *obiit Hucbaldus philosophus*.—(See CASIM. OEDK. comm. de scr. eccl., II., 417, &c. MARTIN GERBERT, scr. eccl. de musica, St. Blas., 1784, sq. T. I., pref. n. VII.). ALBRECHT VOGEL.*

Hugo de Sancto Caro, so-called from his native place, a suburb of Vienne in Dauphiné; sometimes also called Hugo de St. Theodora. At Paris he studied theology and canon law, and in 1224 entered the celebrated Dominican monastery of St. James. On account of his erudition he was often consulted in difficult ecclesiastical matters. In 1236 the Chapter-General of his order entrusted to him the correction of the *Vulgate*, according to ancient manuscripts. Somewhat later he was one of the commissioners who examined and condemned the *Introductorius in Evangelium æternum*, composed by Gerhard the Franciscan, and developing the fanatical doctrines of Alb. Joachim of Flore. He was equally active in the controversy of William de St. Amour with the mendicant orders. In 1245 he was appointed by Innocent IV. as Cardinal of St. Sabina. He died in 1263 at Orvieto, but was buried at Lyons. His works are merely *collectanea*, which display, however, much diligence and reading. His correction of the *Vulgate* is said to have been made according to the Hebrew, Greek, and Latin manuscripts of the age of Charlemagne, of which, however, little is known. He seems also to have had but a limited knowledge of the original languages of the Scriptures. From his correction arose the formerly much used *Correctorium Biblicæ Saronicum*, as yet unpublished. We possess of him also: *Postilla in univ. Bibl., juxt. quadrupl. sensum*, short explanations of words, in order to unfold their literal, allegorical, mystical, and moral sense, in which often the queerest and most ridiculous notions occur. It has often been printed. *Speculum Ecclesiæ*: Lyons, 1554, designed for the instruction of priests in their office; *Sacrorum Bibl. Concordantiæ*, an alphabetical index of all the words of the *Vulgate*, with the places in which they occur. This work, which first made the division into chapters general, has been often printed. We possess of him in MS., *Sermones sup. Evang. et Epist.*, a commentary on the four books of sentences, and the *processus in libr. Evang. æterni*. Besides these there are found in French libraries a number of works bearing the name *Hugo cardinalis*, or *Hugo magister*;

it is difficult to decide from what Hugo they originate.—See concerning *H. de St. Cher*, and the manuscripts and editions of his works: QUÉTIF ET ECHARD, *Scriptores ordinis prædicatorum*, I., 194; and *Hist. littér. de la France*, XIX., 38, sq. C. SCHMIDT.—*Reinecke*.

Hugo de Flavigny, a son of Rainer by a daughter of Crotilda, sister of the Emp. Conrad the Salian, was born 1065, in or near Verdun, and educated in the monastery of St. Vitonius, at Verdun. A persecution against the Bishop here led him, with the other members, to Flavigny, then to Dijon, where the Abbot of St. Benignus, Jarenton, kindly received him. He accompanied the Abbot, 1095–6, to Italy, and in 1097 became Abbot of Flavigny, but lost the office in 1101. Thenceforth he seems to have joined the imperial party. In 1111 he became Abbot of St. Vannes, and still held it in 1115. He is author of: *Chron. Virdunense, a quibusdam dictum Flaviacense, hist. eccl. undecimi præsertim seculi thesaurus incomparabilis. Ex ipso auctoris authographo MS., quod servatur in Bibl. Collegii Claromontani Parisiensis Societati Jesu, nunc primum prodit. (In Ph. Labbei nov. Bibl. MSS. libro, T. I., 75).* It reaches from the birth of Christ to 1002, and from then to 1102. The latest edition, PERTZ, *Script.*, T. VIII., 280–504. P.*

Hugo de St. Victor ranks with Abelard and Bernard of Clairvaux (see Arts.) as a representative of the revived literature in the 12th cent. He was a speculative mystic, a man of deep religious experience, the John of his age. And in harmony with his Johannean nature, he was of so retired a habit, that but little is known of his external life. The place of his birth is in dispute. But he is generally called Saxon (not *Gallus*), descended, say some, from the Dukes of Blankenburg (HENRICI MEYERII, *jun. rerum german.*, T. III.: Helmst., 688, fol., 427, sq.), whilst other older accounts (*Hist. littér. de la France*, T. XII.) call him *lothariensis*, and *territorium Yprense*, his birth-place. Against the former opinion we have his own words (*Eruditio didascalica*, III.): *Ego a PUERO exulavi, et scio, quo maerore animus arcum aliquando PAUPERIS TUGURII fundum deserat, qua libertate postea marmoreos lares et tecta laqueata respiciat.*—Born c. 1097, Hugo was early placed in the monastery of Hamersleben, near Halberstadt, probably by the advice of his uncle Hugo, Archd. at Halberstadt (Neander's account is not supported by the authorities). From his youth H. was thoughtful and studious, diligently using such facilities as he could command. It was his love of study, more than the wars then disturbing the country, which led him, c. 1115, to accompany his uncle Hugo to Paris, then the centre of learning, where they both joined the monks regular of St. Augustine in the monastery of St. Victor, then under Abbot Gilduin; the school was under the prior Thomas, who had filled that post since the withdrawal of William of Champeaux. Hugo became the successor of Thomas, and remained in this secluded post until his death. Of his official labors we know but little, excepting that, though of a feeble body, he could inflame his pupils with love for the truth and for science, and earnestly

warned them against the brilliant but perilous attractions of his eloquent cotemporary Abelard. From his few extant letters, especially to Bernhard, we also gather that he took a lively interest in the affairs of the Church. When he found his end approaching he confessed his sins with tears, and desired to receive the Holy Supper. This done, he audibly commended his spirit into the hands of the Lord, and died 1141, one year earlier than Abelard. On his tombstone was truly inscribed: *Claruit ingenio, moribus, ore, stylo.*

A fuller view of Hugo's character and spirit is obtained from his writings, which he is said to have begun in early youth, and continued to his end. In these two periods may be discovered, the former that of a one-sided mysticism, the latter that of a harmonious development of conflicting views. To the latter belong the *eruditio didascalica* and *de sacramentis christ. fidei*; the *summa sententiarum* was only a prelude to *de sacr. chr. fidei*.—Hugo was not a creative reformatory spirit; his talent was to elucidate and develop existing systems. In the struggle between mysticism (Bernhard) and scholasticism (Abelard) H. was on Bernhard's side; but he aimed at harmonizing the two, so that in his writings, sometimes the one, then the other, becomes prominent. But his mysticism, like B.'s, always rests upon a practical religious basis. Hence he assails, at once, dialectics, which philosophize but teach nothing, and a mysticism which allegorizes without understanding the letter, and he recommends the study of empirical sciences, the Bible and the Church Fathers. This led him to write his *de erud. didasc.*, of which the first three books are a sort of practical encycl., the other three an introduction to the Holy Scriptures (the 7th book in the usual edition is an independent work).—Starting from *Wisdom* as the lowest basis of all knowledge, he divides knowledge into *intelligence*, *science*, and *logic*. *Intelligence*, or higher knowledge, he classifies as *theorics* or speculation, and *ethics*, or, as he terms it, *practica*. Science (also called *mechanics*) includes the knowledge of the arts and manufactures. Logic, including grammar, rhetoric, and dialectics, though last invented, must have the precedence in education. *Theorics* includes theology, mathematics, and physics; mathematics: arithmetic, music, geometry, and astronomy. At the close of this part of the work he complains of the usual neglect of these practical studies, and assumes as requisite qualifications for study, natural talents, practice, and moral discipline, especially the last.—In the other three books it is noteworthy how decidedly he distinguishes between the canonical and apocryphal books of the Bible, and indulges in other liberal remarks in adherence to Jerome. In exegesis he adopted, as was then usual, the threefold sense: the historical, allegorical, and tropological, though he admits that these senses are not to be found in all passages. Indeed he demands in theory, that the historical take precedence of the allegorical sense: "*si litera tollitur, scriptura quid est.*" He divides Bible students into three classes: the foolish and miserable, those who hope by its study to secure wealth and renown; the inconsiderate, those who

study God's Word and works only because they are wonderful; the praiseworthy, those who study that they may grow in heavenly grace and knowledge.—It was this work which gained for Hugo the title *magister* or *didascalus*. Of greater theological importance are the other two works named above.

Although in his *summa* we have but a sketch of the doctrines of the Church, he exhibits therein his own theological studies, so that from it, compared with his other writings, we obtain the best idea of his views and of the peculiarities of his system. In correspondence with Paul's trichotomy of body, soul, and spirit, Hugo distinguishes a threefold eye in man: a bodily eye for visible things, the eye of reason, by which man sees his own soul and its faculties, and the eye of contemplation, susceptible of divine impressions. But sin blinded the last, and obscured the second, leaving only the first clear. Now instead of contemplation we have faith, the merit of which is that it realizes without seeing. But reason has not been so obscured as to excuse man's ignorance of divine things. He acutely distinguishes between what is *ex ratione*, *secundum*, *supra*, and *contra r.*, and shows that only the second and third can be objects of faith. Faith is supported by reason, reason perfected by faith. The certainty of faith is superior to opinion, but not to knowledge; still a *scire quod ipsum sit* must precede faith; after faith comes *intelligere quid ipsum sit*. But the true value of faith consists in its enabling the heart to apprehend and love God (*fides, voluntaria quædam certitudo absentium supra opinionem et infra scientiam constituta*). Upon the basis of faith rises mystical contemplation, that foretaste of heaven. The means of attaining to this is *oratio et operatio*. He distinguishes *tres animæ rationalis visionis*, viz., *cogitatio*, *meditatio*, *contemplatio*. In the first, the spirit is only superficially aroused; *meditat.* seeks after the ground of things; *contempl.* actually apprehends them (*meditatio quærit, contemplatio possidet*).—In these views we find the groundwork of Hugo's numerous mystical writings, his *annotationes in Dionys. Areop. de cælesti hierarchia*, *de arca morali*, *de arca mystica*, *de vanitate mundi*, his beautiful monologue upon "the pledge of the soul."—His *de sacramentis fidei* is mainly occupied with the *opera restorationis*: the 1st book treating of redemption from the Creation to the incarnation of the Word; the 2d, from then until the Judgment. He regards man as the end of Creation, but God as the end of man. In the doctrine of the divine attributes he assumes, with Abelard, power, wisdom, and goodness as the primary attributes of God, but opposes Abelard's view that what God does is the limit of his omnipotence. He endeavors, like Anselm, to exhibit the doctrine of the Trinity by its analogy with the human spirit. Spirit, wisdom, and love, correspond with the three divine persons, with the difference that human wisdom and love are changeable affections, but not so the divine.—His reserve upon the doctrine of angels is notable.—In anthropology, Hugo follows Augustine (he was even called *alter Aug.*), striving to soften the severities of A.'s system. In order to har-

monize human freedom with divine omnipotence, he distinguishes between willing *per se*, and the fixing of the will upon something definite; the former is free, the latter bound by the moral government of God. Hence God is not *actor ruendi*, but merely *ordinator incedendi*.—He is the first to advance distinctly the idea of *gratia superaddita*. Grace is *creatrix* and *salvatrix*. The former involved the power not to sin; positively to do good required *gr. appositæ*. But after the fall, *gr. operans* had to be added to *gr. coöperans*. He supposes the essence of original sin to consist in ignorance and concupiscence.—Hugo was the first among the scholastics who gave definiteness to the doctrine of the sacraments. Augustine's definition of them as *sacra rei signum*, does not satisfy him. In his *summa* he calls a sacrament a *visibilis forma invisibilis gratiæ in eo collatæ*, and in *de sacr. f.* still more distinctly: a corporeal, actually perceptible element, which by virtue of the divine institution exhibits, and really contains, symbolically, invisible grace. He is, also, the first who distinctly names seven sacraments, though giving special prominence to baptism and the holy supper. He of course holds transubstantiation, calling the mode of the change *transitio*; but the main thing with him is communion with Christ, through the sacrament.—In regard to vows, he maintains that a vow to surrender ourselves wholly to God, can never be dispensed. Some of his expressions remind one of Reformation theses.—The ethical section of his work reveals Hugo's inner life, especially where he speaks of the excellency of Christian love. His prudence, however, is displayed in the decided manner in which he speaks against the so-called theory of disinterested love. This ignores the essential character of love, which cannot be conceived of apart from a longing after the object beloved (*non amares, si non desiderares*). He wrote a special treatise, *de laude caritatis*, in which, as the Benedictines appropriately say, love is describing love. Ardent love to Christ was, indeed, the ruling principle of Hugo's life, and his beautiful saying: *ubi caritas est, claritas est*, furnishes the best outline of his character.—Although he lived secluded, his ideas exerted great influence on succeeding periods. Richard de St. Victor and Peter Lombard, though inferior to Hugo in religious depth, were the most distinguished advocates of his views—the former in their mystical, the latter in their scholastic aspect.—There are five editions of Hugo's works: Paris, 1526; Venice, 1588; Mayence; Cologne, 1617; and Rouen, 1648. The *ed. princeps* is the best, but all are scarce. A new, carefully-sifted edition is needed. As worthy preparations for this, we name OUDIN, *Comm. de script. eccl.*; the Benedictine Hist. lit. de la France, T. XII.; and LIEBNER's excellent monograph on Hugo: Lpz., 1832.

SCHNEIDER.*

Humility (*ταπεινότης, humilitas* (*χαμηλός*) found on the earth), as the derivation of the word implies, is opposed to high-mindedness, and, therefore, in general that virtue which keeps man from thinking more of himself than he ought (Rom. 12: 3), and leads him to keep himself subject to his superiors. And as God is above all, humility shows itself as a sense of

entire dependence upon God, and is thus the root of all piety. In the strictest sense of the word, it is only in our relation to God that *humility* can be exercised; our relations to each other call only for *modesty*. And this is the more evident in view of the fact that, in the former case, humility results not merely from a sense of dependence, but from a consciousness of our moral defects in contrast with the holiness and justice of God, of our sinfulness and guilt.—Among the great spirits of ancient times, in the classical world, *Sophocles* approximated nearest to the true idea of humility. It runs as a thread of light through the piety of the Old Test., from Genesis (17 : 1) to Micah (6 : 8), and John the Baptist (Matt. 3 : 2).—Although Christ was without sin, humility shines forth in his life (Matt. 19 : 17; John 5 : 30), and he demands it as a condition of entrance into his kingdom (Matt. 5 : 3; 18 : 2). But if humility is necessary to prepare us for repentance and faith, it must also continue to animate the Christian; and, though sensible of personal impotence (1 Cor. 4 : 7; 2 Cor. 3 : 5), or even because of this consciousness, it must urge him to work out his salvation with fear and trembling (Phil. 2 : 12; 1 : 12). And if supreme love to God in Christ is the soul of the Christian life, it must, in more than one respect, maintain its true character, through *humility*, and, when needful, act as a corrective against mystic and quietistic errors. If it is grateful, reciprocal love, springing from humility, humility will continually accompany it in pure, prayerful reverence for God, in unqualified obedience to him, and confident trust in him, which will meekly bow to trials and sufferings, even as it will bear prosperity without self-complacent exultation—yea, will kiss the rod, assured that whoso thus humbleth himself shall be exalted; and yet it will do this without improper regard to such a reward (1 Pet. 5 : 6; Luke 17 : 10). Hence also it does not affect a self-imposed humility (Col. 2 : 23), such as is often met with in the Romish Church, and even in much of the extreme pietism of the Protestant Church, the obnoxious pride of which is poorly masked under its lowly garbs. But of true humility involuntarily shows itself in the language and entire life of the Christian, its caricature becomes hypocrisy (Luke 18 : 13, &c.). Its mask falls off in its conduct towards others. For the Scriptures, so far as their whole spirit is opposed to all simulation and flattery, require men to exercise towards each other a humility based in humility before God and animated by love. True humility, however, presupposes proper self-respect, which exhibits itself in patience, meekness, goodness, kindness, peaceableness, and a forgiving disposition (Matt. 5 : 5; 1 : 29; Rom. 12; Eph. 4 : 2; Phil. 2 : 3; Col. 3 : 12; 1 Pet. 5 : 5; James 4 : 5, &c.).—(See MOSHEIM'S *Sittenlehre*; REINHARD'S *Moral*; SCHLEIERMACHER, *Christl. Sitte*; MARHEINEKE'S *Moral*; HIRSCHER, III., 114; MORUS, *de hom. se submitte Deo*).

E. SCHWARZ.*

Humility, the Order of, founded, say some, under Henry II., others in 1134 under Lothaire, others under Fred. I. in 1158–63; all agree that it was established by nobles carried as captives from Lombardy to Germany, after their return,

in fulfilment of a vow. They adopted the Benedict. rule. Innocent III. confirmed the order, and it rapidly spread in Upper Italy. Later, many abuses crept into it. Borromeo attempted to reform it, but only excited a conspiracy against himself, for which Pius V., 1571, dissolved it. But the female order of the name still exists in Italy. Their rules bind them to severe penances, fastings, and prayers, especially during Lent.

NEUDECKER.*

Hunting (Gen. 10 : 9; 25 : 27, 28; 27 : 3; Jer. 16 : 16).—Whilst the earth was still thinly populated, and wild animals could multiply without hindrance, their destruction was thought a meritorious service. In heathen antiquity, the heroes of the chase are ranked among the greatest benefactors, and exalted to demigods; thus Nimrod of Babylon, and Hercules of Greece (called ἀλκιμαχός, αὐτῆρ). Opposed to this estimate is the judgment of the Bible, indicated by the name of Nimrod (= we will revolt), and the exclusion of Ishmael and Esau from the line of promise (Gen. 21 : 20; 25 : 27). Esau's grandson was called Kenaz = *venatus est* (so the Kenizzites, and several members of Caleb's family, Gen. 36 : 11, 15, 42; 15 : 19; Numb. 32 : 12; Josh. 14 : 6; 15 : 3; 1 Chron. 4 : 13, 15), with reference to hunting. The natural tendency of hunting is to produce restlessness and roughness of manners. The Lord did not wish his people, therefore, to become a nation of hunters. It is true a pastoral people (see *Shepherds*) had to protect themselves against wild beasts, especially the Israelites from their exposure to adjacent wildernesses (Judges 14 : 8; 1 Sam. 17 : 34, &c.; 2 Sam. 23 : 20; Jer. 49 : 19; 50 : 44; 12 : 8). During periods of their downfall, and of the depopulation of the country, wild beasts gained an ascendancy, as a divine punishment (Exod. 23 : 29; Deut. 7 : 22; 2 Kings 17 : 25; Jer. 5 : 6; Ezek. 14 : 15). To prevent the increase of wild animals, the Israelites were to take gradual possession of Canaan, as they became able to settle and cultivate it. As cultivation progressed, wild animals decreased. It is doubtful whether even game was spared, considering the injury done by deer, &c., to agriculture; only an exception was made in sabbatical years (Exod. 23 : 11; Lev. 25 : 7. Cf. Lev. 17 : 13). The blood of animals slain in the chase was to be fully shed, and covered with earth (Deut. 12 : 15; cf. 14 : 5). Roens and harts were not to be offered in sacrifice, but might be eaten. Venison was formerly, as still, a favorite dish (Gen. 27 : 3, &c.). The law also provided for the protection of birds, both clean, for eating, and unclean, for the destruction of worms (Deut. 22 : 6, &c.; 1 Sam. 26 : 20).—In destroying wild animals, the bow was used (Gen. 27 : 3; 21 : 20), a javelin (Ps. 57 : 4), or only the hands (1 Sam. 17 : 34). They were also taken in nets (Ps. 18 : 5; Job 19 : 6, 8; Isa. 51 : 20), gins and snares (Ps. 18 : 5; Job 18 : 10, spring-nets). Lions were taken in pitfalls and cisterns (2 Sam. 17 : 9; Isa. 24 : 17), in one covered with snow (2 Sam. 23 : 20; Ps. 57 : 6; 9 : 15; 119 : 85. Cf. SHAW, *Travels*, &c.; PLINY, 10, 54). At a post in a pit a lamb was fastened, that its cries might attract the lion, which, leaping down, could easily be secured. Thus taken alive, the lion, with a ring

thrust through its nose, was put in a cage, and carried off in triumph (Ezek. 19 : 4-9). Hunting, with its various arts and perils, is often employed in figurative descriptions (Job 18 : 7, &c.). There is reference to the use of dogs in the chase, in Ps. 22 : 16 (*cf.* Jos., *Antt.*, IV., 8, 9).—In the post-exile period, the Jews caught from the Persians (XEN. *Cyrop.*, I., 6, 19; VIII., 1, 3), Syrians, and Egyptians (WILKINSON, *Anc. Eg.*, III., 4), a passion for hunting as a noble exercise (Sirach 11 : 31; 13 : 22. *Cf.* Jos., *Antt.*, XV., 7, 7; XVI., 10, 3; *B. J.*, I., 21, 13. Also HOM. *Il.*, X., 11; *Od.* XIX., 438. STRABO, 5, 215. POLYB., 31, 22. CURT., 9, 1, 31. PLIN., 8, 61. AELIAN, *anim.*, 8, 24. SHAW, *l. c.*, 300. HARMAR, III., 79. D'ARVIEUX, III., 94, &c., 269). Herod is said to have been an admirable hunter, and killed 40 animals in one day. Game bitten by a dog was, of course, not eaten by the strict Jews. In hunting partridges, tame ones were used, in Sirach's time, as decoys (Sir. 11 : 31). The manner of hunting in countries penetrated by Greek cultivation, may be ascertained from XENOPH. *lib. de venat.*, and OPIAN's *ζωοηγετικά*.—(See BOCHART's *hieroz.*, I., 751-64).

LEYRER.*

Hus, John, (not *Huss*, as it is generally written, which the Cheskian would read *Husch*; in the genitive the name takes a second *s*, like *os*, *ossis*) was born in the year 1369, or, according to others, in 1373, at Husinec, a village of Bohemia. His parents were common people, but not without means. He studied at the University of Prague, and took the usual degrees. The turn of his mind was practical, and its development slow. History tells us very little of his youth, and it has been supposed that he did not distinguish himself among his fellow-students. In the whole appearance of Hus there was nothing which made the impression of greatness; his was more a passive than an energetic nature. He is represented to have been a tall man, with a thin, pale face; acute, learned, grave, and of austere morals. Even the Jesuit Balbinus bears testimony to this effect, in *Epit. rer. Bohem.*, p. 431. In the year 1398, Hus began his career at the University as teacher; and in the following year had the first open dispute with his colleagues, in reference to several dogmas of Wickliffe. Hus had been reading the works of this Reformer, since 1391, and, without question, these had exercised a great, but by no means the only, nor the chief, influence upon him. On the contrary, the origin of his theological tendency must be sought in the writings of Matthias von Janow. This worthy disciple of Milicz reproduced the idea of a universal priesthood, and labored for the moral renovation of the Church, according to the pattern of the apostolical. The same thing was the great object which Hus had in view. To this end his office as preacher, which he held in addition to his professorship, afforded him the best opportunities. While dean of the philosophical faculty (to which dignity he attained on Oct. 15, 1401), he was appointed preacher in the Bethlehem chapel, the charter of which required the gospel to be proclaimed in the vernacular from its pulpit. Here it was that the words first re-echoed, at whose sound the walls of

Rome shook. Hus appealed chiefly to the understanding of his hearers. The acuteness and perspicacity of his mind, the skill with which he took up the pith of a question, and the facility with which he developed it, his extensive reading, especially in the Holy Scriptures, the firmness and sober consistency with which he maintained a whole system of articles; together with the circumstance that in nearly all the other churches of Prague, there was no preaching, and the services were conducted in Latin by priests from Germany;—all these things made Hus so popular, that his chapel could not hold the multitudes which flocked to hear him. Dr. J. Nowotny is engaged, at present, in translating into German a collection of sermons by Hus, which the Moravian Brethren brought to Herrnhut, in the last century. This work¹ gives a better insight, than ever before, into the character of Hus as a preacher. From the contents of the sermons, it is evident that they were delivered in the last years of his life. They are eminently sermons for the times, and hence full of polemics. Hus generally treats his text in a homiletical manner, introducing explanations from the Church Fathers, especially from Augustine, and insisting on the necessity of vital Christianity. His castigatory discourses are directed especially against the clergy, of high and low rank. What his views were in this respect, is seen from his sermon preached on the 5th Sunday in Lent, *Judica* (comp. *J. Hus*, Predigten, Part II., p. 77). His opinion on withholding the Bible from the common people, is set forth in the sermon delivered on the 6th Sunday after Epiphany (comp. *J. Hus*, Predigten, Part I., p. 45). In other passages of these discourses, Hus opposes the sending of substitutes to the livings; speaks against those of the clergy who considered human statutes as of more importance than the commandments of God; and especially inveighs against such priests as led immoral lives—calling them simoniacs, betrayers and barterers of divine truth, and saying that they were men who studied papal rules, but showed utter indifference to what Christ commanded and taught. The sermons of Hus are important, not only because they excited the bitterest enmity against him, but particularly in so far as they make known the points in which he attempted a reformation of the Church. By our reference to their contents we have, however, anticipated the history of his career. To every step which Hus took against the Church, he was driven, solely and alone, by the stress of outward circumstances. His operations were not the result of a free, inner, and least of all, of a systematic development. This explains the circumstance that the consequences of his reformatory plans remained hidden to himself, and that he allowed certain abuses of the Romish Church to continue unopposed. The outward occasions for withstanding them were wanting. Thus, *f. i.*, we do not find a trace of his having disapproved of the worship of saints, or of the celibacy of the clergy, or of monasticism.

¹ Johannes Hus Predigten über die Sonntags-Evangelien, Part I., Görlitz, 1854; Part II., Görlitz, 1855; Part III., Görlitz, 1855. Also Johannes Hus Predigten über die Advents-Evangelien: Görlitz, 1854.

The first serious conflict between Hus and his opponents of the Reformation, was brought on by the discussion of the 45 theses of Wickliffe, which were afterwards stigmatized as heresies by the Council of Constance. On May 28, 1403, the faculty of the University of Prague met to give an opinion respecting these articles. They were condemned by a majority of votes, in spite of the strenuous efforts of Hus and his friends. But this condemnation was, in fact, illusory, for it was couched in the following language: No one shall *explain* the 45 articles in a heretical, wrong, or offensive sense. The clergy now appealed to Rome, and in 1405 a papal bull appeared, having in view the suppression and punishment of the heresies of Wickliffe. In consequence, Zbynek, Archbishop of Prague (appointed in 1403), decreed heavy penalties against all those who should venture to uphold and spread these doctrines. At the same time, however, Hus enjoyed the fullest confidence of his prelate, and was sent by him, as his commissioner, to examine into certain alleged miracles, said to be worked in the church of Wilsnack, through the agency of an old relic of the host. The miracles were found to rest on gross deceit, and the Archbishop at once forbade all further pilgrimages to the spot. This gave Hus the first occasion to take sides against superstition. He did so in his work: *Determinatio questionis, cum suo tractatulo de omni antiquine Christi glorificato*. Another token of Zbynek's favor, was the circumstance that he invited him to deliver the hortatory address, at a diocesan synod, before the assembled clergy, which duty Hus performed with evangelical boldness. But the good understanding between him and the Archbishop could not continue long. Through the instrumentality of Hus, a royal dict appeared (Jan. 26, 1409) distributing the votes in the University in such a manner, that to the foreigners, who had heretofore had a very great preponderance, was given only one, while the natives secured three. Great indignation prevailed among the former in consequence, and nearly all of them left Prague; some say as many as 44,000, others only 5000. This exodus furthered the Reformation throughout Bohemia, and it assumed a decidedly national character. From this time on, the Archbishop took a more positive stand against Hus and his party. In the same year the clergy of Prague renewed certain accusations which they had brought before the Archbishop, in 1408, against Hus. The latter, on his part, produced complaints against the Archbishop. The result of the appeals made by each to the Pope, was a bull from Alexander VI., forbidding, under pain of excommunication, the spread of Wickliffe's works, which were to be delivered to the Archbishop and examined by a commission, and all preaching in private chapels. This bull, which was published at Prague, March 9, 1410, caused very great dissatisfaction among the people, and at court. But the Archbishop carried it out, nevertheless. On July 16, more than 200 volumes of Wickliffe's works were publicly burned amidst the ringing of bells, and the solemn chanting of the *Te Deum laudamus*. Two days afterwards Hus and his friends were excommunicated. The

excitement which followed was so great that Wenceslaus forbade all further provocations under penalty of death; but, at the same time, commanded that the sentence of excommunication should not be obeyed, and that the Archbishop should indemnify the owners of the books which he had destroyed. Zbynek refusing to do this, the King stopped his revenues.

Meanwhile, Balthasar Cossa, a pirate, fornicator, and adulterer, had been elected Pope. To this holy father, John XXIII., Hus sent his second appeal, showing that the Archbishop's conduct had been arbitrary and unreasonable, and that to prohibit preaching, conflicted with the commands of Christ and the regulations of the fathers. To the people he expressed his views on this latter point, in a sermon delivered on the 4th Sunday in Lent, *Lactare* (comp. *J. Hus*, Predigten, Part II., p. 73). Several works from his pen, explaining more fully why he could not obey the Archbishop, and defending the writings of Wickliffe against the condemnatory sentence pronounced on them, also appeared at this time. These publications seem to have had their origin in public disputations held by Hus in the University. We mention especially: *Actus pro defensione libri Joannis Wiclef de Trinitate*. John XXIII. confirmed the decrees of Zbynek against Hus, set aside the appeal which the latter had made, and cited him to Bologna, where the papal court then was. At the persuasions of his friends, and of the King, he did not obey the summons, but sent three representatives to plead his cause. In the sermon referred to above, he gives eight reasons for not going in person (comp. *J. Hus*, Predigten, Part II., p. 71).

In the month of February, 1411, Cardinal Colonna, to whom the case had been intrusted by the Pope, issued a decree of excommunication, *in contumaciam*, against Hus, and threatened to lay under an interdict every place where he might stay. But when Zbynek found that Hus and his friends, supported by the King, did not heed this arbitrary proceeding, he was constrained to lend his countenance to a compromise, the principles of which were adopted by a committee that had been appointed for this purpose. In consequence, Hus delivered to the University, in official form, a confession of faith which was considered orthodox (Sept., 1411). But the Archbishop died (Sept. 28) at Pressburg, whither he had gone to invoke the aid of the Emperor Sigismund, without having sent the requisite testimony to the Pope. His successor was Albicus, physician to the King, a well-disposed, but weak and incompetent old man. The papal legate who brought him the pail, was commissioned to publish a bull proclaiming a crusade against Ladislaus, King of Naples, who supported the antipope, Gregory XII. This bull, under the presupposition of repentance and confession, promised to all who would personally take part in the crusade, or contribute money for its prosecution, the forgiveness of their sins; but put Ladislaus and his children, to the third generation, together with all his friends and adherents, under the ban, denying them a Christian burial, even in case they should be absolved before their death, and de-

creeding that whoever accorded any of them such a burial should be excommunicated, and not released from the sentence until, with his own hands, he had disinterred their bodies. The King permitted the publication of the abominable manifesto. This brought on the decisive crisis for Hus and the Bohemian Reformation. The national party in the University was dissolved. A majority of the professors retrograded, while Hus advanced. Some of his warmest friends became his bitterest enemies. Hus loudly declared the promised indulgence to be a gross lie and deceit, and announced a public disputation for June 7th. This took place, in spite of the efforts which were made to prevent it. An immense concourse of people gathered on the occasion. Hus drew up twelve theses against the papal bull. These he afterwards developed in his two works: *Quæstio de indulgentiis, s. de cruciata papæ Joannis*, and *Contra bullam papæ Joannis XXIII*. His well-known friend, Jerome, of Prague, took part in the disputation, and delivered a fiery address. Very great excitement followed among the people and the students. A procession was formed, having in the midst of it a wagon full of prostitutes, from whose necks the papal bulls were suspended. Near the pillory these documents were thrown on a heap and burned. The King now interfered, and decreed every further act of contempt against the Pope, and resistance to the bull, punishable with death. But Hus, nothing intimidated, thundered from his pulpit as before, even in the presence of the Queen, who continued to visit his church. Carried away by his eloquence, three young mechanics undertook to interrupt another preacher to whom they were listening, and called out: "Thou liest! We have heard from Magister Hus that these things are lies." They were arrested and beheaded, in spite of the efforts of Hus to save them by assuming the entire blame. When the news of their execution spread through the city, the people and students magnified these young men as martyrs, and buried them with great solemnities, in which Hus took the lead. This witness of the truth was now excommunicated a second time. Cardinal P. de St. Angelo, to whom the case had been intrusted by the Pope, issued the sentence to this effect: "If Hus should continue refractory for twenty days, the ban should be published in all the churches of Prague, on Sundays and festival days, amidst the tolling of the bells and the extinguishment of the altar-lights; whoever had intercourse with him should come under the same ban; every place of his abode should be put under an interdict." Hus caused a protest against this unjust sentence to be affixed to the walls of his church, and appealed from the corrupt Roman tribunal, "to the only incorrupt, righteous, and infallible Judge, Jesus Christ." But as the clergy of Prague universally published the ban, and strictly observed the interdict, dispensing no sacraments, and refusing the burial-service to the dead, Hus left the city (Dec., 1412) for a time, at the request of the King, and found a refuge in the castles of his friends among the nobility.

The involuntary leisure which he now had,

he devoted to literary labors. His chief work is *De Ecclesia*. In the introduction he sets forth the idea of the Church, in agreement with Wickliffe; the Church is the *corpus mysticum*, to which only the *prædestinati* belong. Afterwards he says that the Church consists of such exclusively, as have not sinned, or have ceased to sin. But, besides this *sancta ecclesia*, there is another; there is a twofold Church — *ovium hædorum, sanctorum reproborum*. The Church has a threefold head; the first is Christ, in his divine nature, as God, the *caput extrinsecum*; the second is Christ in his human nature, the *caput intrinsecum*; the third is a divinely appointed human leader of the Church. This brings him to a contemplation of the Church of Rome, in reference to which he arrives at uncertain and vacillating conclusions. In spite of these, however, we recognize the innermost tendency of his mind, in the explanation which he gives to the passage that forms the foundation of the Hierarchy: *Tu es Petrus*, etc., *super hanc petram, quum confessus es, quam cognovisti dicens: Tu es Christus*, etc., *ædifico ecclesiam meam*, i. e., *super me ipsum, filium Dei*. Peter has, among the apostles, *aliquam prærogativam*, but this depends altogether on moral pre-eminence, on *fides, humilitas, caritas*. If the Pope walks in the way of these Christian virtues, he is the proper *vicarius Christi*, and *pontifex maximus ecclesiæ*; but if not, he is *Antichristi nuntius, contrarius Petri, vicarius Judæ*. According to chapt. 13 of the work, Hus knows only an ideal Pope: *suppono, quod Papa significat illum spiritualiter Episcopum, qui gerit altissime et simillime vicem Christi, sicut fecit Petrus post ascensionem. Si autem Papa vocetur quæcunque persona, quam occidentalis ecclesia acceptat pro romano episcopo ad capitaliter decidendum: abusio est termini*. That the Pope and the cardinals are essential to the existence of the Church, he is not prepared to assert; it is possible that God may bring back his Church to the original state, when presbyters and bishops were the same. And yet he regards the *sedes apostolica* as the *auctoritas judicandi et docendi legem Christi*. Hus did not mean to found a new Church, or to separate from the existing one; but the principle which must eventuate in such a separation, is clearly expressed in this work, and in the polemical writings connected with the same. In view of the corruptness of the clergy and of so many Popes, there can be, he says, no thought of an implicit obedience to the ecclesiastical *præpositi*. Upon the whole, obedience can refer only to what is, in itself, permissible, and this is determined by reason and the Scriptures. In how far, however, the laity have a right to decide for themselves in the teachings of their spiritual overseers, is not clearly defined. Like Wickliffe, Hus indeed gives an objective rule to guide the judgment in *foro conscientiæ*, when he says: "The Christian must believe every truth set forth in the Scriptures, by the Holy Ghost, *et isto modo homo non tenetur dictis sanctorum, præter Scripturam, nec bullis papalibus credere, nisi quod dixerint in scriptura vel quod fundatur implicate in scriptura*." But who is to decide what is contained *implicite* in the Scriptures? From this point of view, Hus, after

all, points to the holy doctors. He had the formal, but not the material principle of reformation. His tragic end showed that it was impossible to put a piece of new cloth on the moth-eaten garment of Romanism; but that, on the contrary, new bottles were needed for the capacity of the evangelical spirit. And this is the church-historical importance of Hus. He became a martyr, but not a Reformer, because he attempted a reformation only of the outward life of the Church, without understanding the necessity of reforming its dogma.

At the instance of Sigismund, the Pope appointed a Council of the Church to meet at Constance. Hus was invited by the Emperor to appear before the Council, and received from him the promise of a free return to Bohemia, even in case he did not submit to this ecclesiastical judicature. Modern historians of the Roman Catholic Church attempt in vain to disprove this promise. Hus joyfully accepted the Emperor's invitation. By placards which he caused to be posted in Prague (Aug. 26, 1414), whither he had returned from his retreat in the country, he professed his willingness to be examined by the Archbishop and the diocesan synod then in session, and to suffer punishment if proved guilty of heresy. But he did not succeed in obtaining a hearing. So he left the city provided with a testimonial of orthodoxy from the papal inquisitor (Nicholas, Bishop of Nazareth), and with a copy of a protocol containing all the accusations which his opponents had drawn up against him. Three noblemen constituted his escort. He travelled through Germany, not only without disguise, but in his clerical robes; inviting, by posted placards in every place where he stopped, all who might wish to converse with him, to hear from his own lips an account of his doctrines. On Nov. 3, 1414, he reached Constance. During the first three weeks of his stay in this city, nothing was done in his case. But on the 28th of the month he was treacherously deprived of his freedom, in spite of the Emperor's safe-conduct, which he had received at Constance, and after having been kept under guard for eight days, was cast into a gloomy dungeon in the Dominican monastery on the bank of the Rhine. The unceasing efforts of Baron Chlum, who had accompanied him from Prague, to secure his release, were without avail, as well as the displeasure which the Emperor himself at first expressed. Fetters were put on the prisoner's feet, and at night his hands were chained to the wall. The unhealthy location of his cell brought on a severe illness, and he was removed to a more airy place in the convent, lest he should die a natural death. Here he had a relapse, and suffered intensely. In the midst of his pains, still loaded with fetters, he was obliged to prepare his defence. But his courage and confidence in God remained unbroken, as is seen from the many letters which he wrote at this time. He also composed at the request, and for the benefit of his keepers, who had a high regard for him, several short treatises on dogmatical and moral subjects. While Hus was in prison the controversy about the withdrawal of the cup from the laity, in the Holy Communion, broke out in

Prague. Being asked for his opinion, he said: to take the cup *licet et expedit*, although the flesh and the blood are *sub utraque specie*, so that the enjoyment of the one is sufficient; adding—*si potest fieri attendetis, ut saltem permittatur per bullam illis dari, qui ex devotione postulerint circumstantiis adhibitis*. But when the Council (June 15, 1415) expressly condemned the cup, he was filled with indignation, and wrote: "No passage of Scripture, only a bad custom, prevents the cup from being given to the laity; Christ and His truth must be followed; to such an extent has evil increased, that an institution of Christ is condemned as an error!"

The Pope having fled from Constance, Hus was committed into the hands of the Bishop of Constance, who had him brought to his castle, Gottlieben, on the lake. Here he was kept in close and severe confinement from March to June 5th. The remonstrances of the Bohemian nobility with Sigismund, that he permitted his safe-conduct to be thus broken, were fruitless. The Emperor silenced his conscience with the excuse, suggested by the prelates, that no pledge need be kept in the case of a heretic! On the day named above, Hus was admitted to a first hearing before the Council, which, however, broke up in confusion, when he attempted to defend his works from the Bible and the Church Fathers. The second hearing took place on the 7th of June, the Emperor being present. A number of accusations were brought against Hus, to all of which he replied. On the following day, the third and most important hearing occurred. He was examined in reference to his work *De Ecclesia*. The Cardinal d'Ailly, who conducted the examination, tried to represent Hus as a revolutionary character, and to incite the Emperor against him on political grounds. In this he was completely successful. Sigismund believed that the accused aimed at the overthrow, not only of the priesthood, but of kings. To the incessant cry, "Recant! recant!"—Hus replied: "I pray and conjure you not to force me to do what I cannot perform without sinning against my conscience, and without danger of eternal damnation." After the session was closed, the Emperor said to the Council: that single heresies among the many uttered by Hus on this occasion, were pernicious enough to condemn him to the stake; that even if he recanted he must not be permitted to preach, much less to return to Bohemia, &c. A retrospect of the questions before the Council, in the case of Hus, shows that they consisted solely and alone in canonical points. The accused and the accusers avoided the dogma, after the attempt to prove Hus a heretic in the doctrine of the eucharist, had failed. Hus sincerely desired to be instructed, but returned unconvinced and unconquered to his prison. It was now that he clearly saw, for the first time, the necessity of breaking with the Romish Church. With calmness and confidence he awaited the inevitable result of this step. The four weeks granted him for reflection, during which time every possible effort was made to induce him to recant, did not change his mind. At last the day of condemnation came. It was the 6th of July, the birth-

day of Hus. The Council held its 15th general session in the cathedral. Hus having once more made a fruitless attempt to defend himself, fell on his knees, and committed his cause to God and Christ. This was declared to be a mockery of the jurisdiction of the Church; whereupon he again appealed to Christ. Being reproached for having remained so long under the ban, he narrated the circumstances of the case, and, fixing his eyes on Sigismund, closed with the remark that he had voluntarily presented himself before the Council, on the strength of the safe-conduct granted him by the Emperor. Sigismund blushed at these words. The sentence having been read, Hus fell on his knees and prayed: "Lord Jesus, forgive my enemies; thou knowest that they have accused me falsely, and have brought false testimony and calumny against me; forgive them for thy great mercy's sake." Seven bishops then proceeded to degrade him from the priesthood, according to the forms usual on such occasions. A cap painted with figures of devils, and inscribed with the word, "Häresiarch," was put on his head. "Now we deliver thy soul to Satan," said the bishops. "But I," replied Hus, "commend it into thy hands, O Jesus Christ, for thou hast redeemed it!" He was forthwith led away to execution by secular officers. Before the door of the cathedral his books were being burned as he passed out. He smiled when he saw this. Arrived at the place of death, he prayed the 51st and 52d Psalms, thanked his jailors for their kindness, and was then fastened to the stake, his body with cords, his neck with a chain. Hus said: "Willingly do I bear this chain for Christ's sake, who bore a far heavier burden." Once more he was called on to recant, but declared that he was not conscious of having ever promulgated errors; that his chief purpose had always been to teach men repentance, and the forgiveness of sins. The pile having been ignited, Hus cried out: "Jesus, thou Son of God, have mercy on me!" — and again the same words a second time. Then the wind drove the flames into his face and choked his voice. But his lips continued to move in prayer. He died about eleven o'clock in the morning. His ashes were cast into the Rhine. The tradition that Hus, on his way to execution, foretold, under the image of a swan which should not be roasted, the coming of Luther after a century, is without historical foundation. The Council had the law on its side, but Hus eternal truth. Erasmus said: "*Joannes Hus exustus, non convictus!*"

Ulricus von Hutten commenced to edit the works of Hus. A complete edition appeared for the first time, in 1558, at Nuremberg, in two folios, under the title: *Historia et monumenta J. Hus atque Hieron. Pragensis*. A revised and enlarged edition was issued in 1715. Several of the treatises in it belong to Matthias von Janow. A complete picture of Hus can be given only after we have those of his works which are written in the Bohemian language, in more faithful translations than is now the case. Hence, the most important source for studying his history and writings is the recent work: "Die Gesch. v. Böhmen, grösstentheils nach

Urkunden u. Handschriften, von F. Palacky" (III., 1: Prague, 1845). Compare what this author says (p. 299) respecting Hus as a Bohemian writer, and his efforts to improve the language by fixed rules and a new system of orthography. T. PRESSER.—*De Schœnauitz*.

Hussites.—The people had been forgotten at Constance. All Bohemia rose up against the Council and against the Emperor. At Prague, serious disturbances broke out, as soon as the news of the execution of Hus reached the city; Wenceslaus himself was indignant, and the Queen openly took the part of the martyr. On Sept. 2d, 1415, the assembled Diet addressed to the Council a manifesto full of reproaches and threats; and, three days later, adopted a resolution authorizing the preaching of Hussite doctrines on every estate where the owner favored these. Nor was the opposition party idle. An association of Catholic barons was organized (Oct. 1st, 1415), which pledged itself to be faithful and obedient, in all things, to the King, to the Romish Church, and to the Council. Meanwhile the latter had attempted to justify its proceedings against Hus, in several communications sent to Bohemia, Moravia, and Silesia; and, in August, had dispatched the Bishop of Leitomyel to Bohemia, with the powers of an extraordinary apostolical legate. But being implicated in the condemnation of Hus, the man was so universally hated that he did not venture to show himself in public. In the beginning of 1416, the Council determined to adopt the severest measures against the heretics, and consequently cited (Feb. 20th) the 452 barons who had affixed their seals to the manifesto, before its tribunal, as *suspecti de fide*. Indeed, had it not been for the intervention of Sigismund, the King and his Queen would have been among the number. Meanwhile the Hussites had separated into two parties: the *Calixtines*, the more moderate, at whose head stood the University of Prague, and the *Taborites*, as they were afterwards called, who had their chief seat in the little town of Austin, later Tabor. In the beginning of 1417, the University issued a manifesto deprecating, and complaining of, the spread of opinions which were entirely too liberal. This manifesto was without effect, therefore a sort of Synod was convened at Prague (Sept. 28, 1418), which adopted 24 articles bearing on the questions of the day. These articles were in unison with the doctrines of the Church. But while the University thus upheld the authority of the Council, it departed as positively, in other respects, from the decrees of the same, especially in the matter of the Lord's Supper; pronouncing (March 16, 1417.) the Communion, in both kinds, to be eminently proper, and exhorting the Bohemians not to believe otherwise, even if an angel from heaven were to come and teach them.

In the way of answer to this declaration, the Council deprived the University of all its privileges, and decreed that the Bohemian heretics should be suppressed by force. Wenceslaus yielded to the representations of his brother, Sigismund, and restored the Catholic priests to the parishes from which they had been expelled. But soon these priests, and other zealous Roman-

sts, began to manifest their enmity towards the Hussites. Then multitudes of the latter flocked together for self-defence. Two noblemen were their leaders, Nicholas v. Hussinez and John Ziska. Among the 40,000 persons who sat down at several hundred tables, on Mt. Tabor, and partook of the Communion in both kinds, and who afterwards founded the city of Tabor, the most violent fanaticism was enkindled. Led by Ziska, a party of Taborites proceeded to Prague, and took bloody vengeance on the council of the New Town. When Wenceslaus died (August, 1419), complete anarchy ensued, which was increased by the growing doctrinal difference between the Calixtines and the Taborites. The latter rejected all laws for the Church, except the statutes and law of God, all doctrines and customs not founded on Scripture, all worldly amusements and sciences, inveighed against monasteries and pontificals, and fell into manifold apocalyptic errors. They are said to have taught that God was the only king of men, and that the government should be intrusted to the people, that the nobility should be rooted out, that taxes should cease, &c. Some of these doctrines they put into practice, by burning monasteries and maltreating priests and monks. In this extremity, the Bohemian States applied to the Emperor, who, however, instead of making common cause with the moderate party, offended all parties, and gave occasion to their coalition against him. The united Hussites successfully defended themselves against three of his armies, and even made incursions into neighboring parts of Germany. A Diet held at Caslau (1421), and largely attended by Catholic as well as Hussite nobles, refused to acknowledge Sigismund, and declared him to be an arch-enemy of the honor and of the persons of the Bohemian nation. At the same time, the so-called "Articles of Prague," previously drawn up by the Calixtines, were adopted. These articles contain the substance of the doctrines which were held in common by the Hussites: "1. The Word of God is free in the kingdom of Bohemia, and is to be preached by Christian priests, without hindrance. 2. The Holy Sacrament of the body and blood of Christ is freely to be given, in both kinds, of bread and wine, to all faithful Christians, in whose way stands no mortal sin. 3. Inasmuch as many priests and monks administer large earthly possessions, contrary to the commandment of Christ, to the detriment of their spiritual office, and to the disadvantage of the civil States, such administration is to be taken from them, and they are to live as ensamples to the flock, according to the Holy Scriptures, imitating the walk and conversation of Christ and His Apostles. 4. All mortal sins, and especially those of a public character, as well as other disorders, contrary to the word of God, are to be inhibited and punished by those whose office it is, so that the evil and false report concerning this land may be refuted, and the welfare as well of the kingdom, as of the Bohemian nation, may be furthered." These articles formed the basis of deliberation at an ecclesiastical convention which convened in the same year (July 4), at Prague. The next year Ziska separated from the Taborites, and after his death, his followers,

who called themselves *Orphans*, constituted a middle party between the Taborites and Calixtines, and seem to have approximated most nearly to the spirit and views of Hus.

After the third crusade against the Hussites had resulted in the great victory which they gained at Taus (Aug. 14, 1431), Sigismund declared that the heroic Bohemian nation could be conquered only by itself, and advised peace at any cost. The Council of Basle immediately opened negotiations with the Hussites, and subsequently received their deputies with the utmost politeness. After a discussion of 50 days, these became impatient, and left Basle. But the Council sent an embassy after them, and granted all their demands, with reservations indeed, which, at a convenient season, were to be turned to the subversion of the Hussite cause. Thus originated the well-known *Compactata* of Basle. Sigismund's foresight proved correct. For the Taborites, refusing to accept these *Compactata*, were attacked and totally defeated by the Calixtines, at Böhmishbrod, May 30, 1434. The Calixtines, under certain conditions, now acknowledged Sigismund as king; the remnants of the Taborites subsequently did the same; so that, after having solemnly promised to carry out the *Compacts*, and to permit the Utraquists, as the Calixtines were now called, to elect the Archbishop of Prague, the Emperor entered this city in triumph (Aug. 23, 1436), and received the Bohemian crown. But Sigismund soon forgot his promises, so that at his death, which took place in the following year, the parties were again in a state of violent agitation. The Catholics chose Albert of Austria as king—the Calixtines, Prince Casimir, of Poland. After the demise of the former (1439), it was finally agreed to intrust the kingdom jointly to a Catholic and to a Calixtine Regent, until the majority of his posthumous son, Ladislaus. In 1450, George Podiebrad, a Calixtine, became sole Regent; and after the short reign of Ladislaus (1453–1457), who showed himself a zealous Catholic, was elected king. During all this time the disputes between the parties had continued. In 1462, Pius II. declared the *Compactata* null and void. Podiebrad imprisoned the legate who appeared in B. to announce this decree, and for this was put under the ban. But in spite of Pius, and of his successor, Paul II., who even went so far as to depose him, Podiebrad maintained his throne until his death (1471). He was succeeded by Wladislav, a Polish Prince, who, although a Catholic, upheld the *Compactata*; originated the mutual agreement between Utraquists and Catholics, made at Kuttenberg (1485); and gave the former (1497,) the right to elect, as their spiritual head, an administrator of the archbishopric of Prague.

After G. Podiebrad had subdued Tabor (1453), the Taborites, as a party, disappeared. From their midst came the Bohemian Brethren (see Art.), who adopted their religious principles, but not their extravagant fanaticism. The Reformation in Germany was joyfully greeted in B., not only by the Brethren, but also by the Calixtines. These subsequently became adherents, partly of the Lutheran and partly of

the Swiss creeds, and, in 1575, united with the Brethren in a common confession. Thus the history of the Hussites, as such, ceases. From that time on, they shared the faith and the sufferings of the Protestant Church.

T. PRESSEL.—*De Schweinitz.*

Hutten, Ulrich von, one of the foremost champions of humanism and religious liberty in Germany, descended from an old knightly family of Franconia, and was born April 22, 1488, at Stackelberg. In 1499 his father placed him in the renowned monastery of Fulda, whence, however, he fled in 1504, unable longer to endure the rigors of a monastic life. Perhaps Eitelwolf of Stein, a friend of his father, encouraged H. to this step, having perceived his talents. He went to the University of Erfurt, where humanism was cherished, and a society of young men, zealous in its study, existed. But in the summer of 1505, a pestilence drove him and his fellow-students from Erfurt. He went to Cologne, and studied Thos. Aquin. and Scotus. There he also found incentives to the new movement, and gathered, as he richly could, material for inflicting upon the old system sarcasm and ridicule. He followed his friend, R. Aesticampianus, who was driven from Cologne for attacks upon the old religion, to Frankfort on the O., where a new university was founded April 27, 1506. There he found Eitelwolf of Stein, who kindly assisted him. He remained in Frankf. two years, pursuing literature, and enjoying the society of scholars. Then, seized with a vile disease, he started on a course of restless, aimless wanderings. He reached Greifswalde, and got into difficulty with the Burgomaster Lötze and his son; but soon had to flee, and being overtaken, was severely beaten, and robbed of his papers. Half naked he arrived at Rostock, and was kindly received. There he wrote a poem describing his maltreatment, and calling upon the whole literary German world to avenge him, mentioning poets and humanists by name. In Rostock he lectured on classic authors. Late in 1510 he went to Wittenberg, thence to Bohemia, Moravia, and Vienna, where he prospered until the spring of 1512. His poems and literary labors increased his fame. To reconcile his father, whom his flight from Fulda had estranged, he resolved to study jurisprudence, went (1512) to Pavia and Bologna, where he indeed learned Rom. jurispr., but felt equally repulsed from scholasticism as Cologne theology. The fruit of his new attainment was "Niemand," a satirical poem upon Rom. jurisprudence. He was now confirmed in his humanistic tendency and love of poetry. Ecclesiastical politics also claimed his notice, and he devoted his whole power to the deliverance of Germany from the papal yoke. Numerous troubles and sufferings in Italy embittered his feelings. Returning to Germany in 1517, an attempt of Duke Ulrich of Würtemberg upon the wife of Hans Hutten, led Ulrich Hutten to write a series of bitter articles against the Duke, and all tyrants like him. This brought about his restoration to his father's house, and general popularity. About the same time he took an active part in Reuchlin's controversy with the Cologne Dominicans. He participated, doubtless, in the *Epist. virorum*

obscur. (see Art.).—Hutten's opposition to Rome was based far less upon religious than national considerations. He desired Germany to be freed from the injuries inflicted by Romish tyrants (see his address at the Augsburg Diet, 1513, and "Römische Dreifaltigkeit"). And finding logic and satire unavailing, he urged the resistance of violence with violence. Hence he attached himself to Franz v. Sickingen, the man, as he believed, for his purpose, and formed plans for uniting nobles, cities, and peasants, in a great national scheme. Germany's freedom from the tyranny of the princes and of popery was the incentive and aim. At an assembly of the Upper Rhine nobles, at Landau, 1522, Sickingen was chosen Commander-in-chief. It was hoped that the Emperor was really not averse to the movement, but would, if successful, openly support it. The result is known; S. was defeated, and Hutten was involved in his fall. Soon after the war began, H. went to Switzerland, both for safety and to incite sympathy for Sickingen. At Basle, Erasmus shunned him, not wishing to be implicated in H.'s scheme. In Zurich, the Council refused to harbor him. Thence he took refuge to the island Ufnau, in the lake of Zurich, with a letter from Zwingli to Hans Schnepp. There he learned the issue of the war, and died broken-hearted Aug. 29, 1523.—(See HAGEN, "Deutschl. lit. Verhältn. im Reformationszeitalter," 3 Bände, Erlangen, 1841-44, and his "Ulrich v. H. in polit. Beziehung," in the work, "Zur polit. Gesch. Deutschl.," Stuttg., 1824; a crit. on Hagen in *Ullmann's Theol. Stud. Jahrg.*, 1845, H. 2. Cf. also *Zuschr. f. Prot. N. F. B.* 30, p. 268-275. An imperfect and defective collection of H.'s works was published by Ernst Münch, 6 vols., Berlin, 1821-23.)

KLÜPFEL.*

Hydroparastatæ (*ὑδροπαράσταται*, *aquarii*), a name given in derision to certain Eucharistites (see Art.) of Tatian's school, as Theod. says: *τοὺτον (τὸν Τάτιανον) ἔχουσιν ἀρχηγὸν οἱ λεγόμενοι ὑδροπ. καὶ εὐχαρίται*; so called because to mortify the body they used water, instead of wine, even at the communion (cf. CLEM. ALEX. *Pædag.* II., 2, and EPIPH. *Hær.* 46, § 2, p. 392). Theodoret is the first to identify the H. with Tatian, whilst Philastrius (*hær.* 77) and Augustine (*de hær.* 64) use the name in a more general way.

P.†

Hyginus, the 8th or 10th B. of Rome (137-141). According to the *liber pontif.* he was born in Athens, was a philosopher before his elevation, and "*Clerum composuit et distribuit gradus.*" He is (erroneously?) said to have introduced the custom of sponsors, the consecration of churches, and a number of rules for eccl. usages. The martyrologies assign Jan. 10, or 11, 142, as the date of his death. Many writers allow him to have been only a confessor.—A B. Hyginus, of Cordova, is mentioned as the first opponent of Priscillian.

TH. PRESSEL.*

Hymenæus, a false teacher, mentioned in 1 Tim. 1:20, as a warning against the peril of not only falling from the faith, but becoming blasphemers. Whether both H. and Alexander lived in Ephesus, cannot be determined. In 2 Tim. 2:17, another H. is named with Phi-

otus, to show how "vain babblings" soon lead to ἀσέβεια. Most commentators regard these as identical, as the sins rebuked are nearly allied.

TH. PRESSEL.*

Hymnology (cf. *Church Hymns and Church Music*).—The hymnologist is distinguished from the religious poet, so far as the latter produces the material, which the former uses scientifically, at least in a limited sense. In the full sense of the term science, Hymnology became such only of late. Indeed the name, after Wetzels *analecta hymnol.*, 1752, is first met with in Schmieder's *Hymnol.*, 1789, a work, however, which did not aspire to a scientific character. In the old Romish Church, only technical rules were needed for the preparation of Church hymns; thoughts upon the nature and importance of Church-singing are met with but occasionally, in authors who attempted to describe and explain Church customs. Thus GUIL. DULANDUS (*rationale divinorum officiorum*, l. II., c. 2): *ceterum propter carnales, non propter spirituales cantandi usus in eccl. instit. est, ut, qui verbis non compunguntur, suavitate modulaminis moveantur. Cantores repræsentant prædicatores, quos ad Dei laudes excitantes. Eorum namque symphonia plebem admonet in unitate cultus unius Dei perseverare.* Or, V., c. 2: *cantus in eccl. ætilitiam cæli significat.* In IV., c. 20, the various parts of the choir symbolize the various degrees of Christian perfection. The small treatise of Vicetius, B. of Treves (c. 563), *de psalm. bono* (see GALLAND. *bibl. patr.*, XII., 774), consists merely of praises of singing, and some practical directions; the song of the three men in the fiery furnace is thought an original model. In the comm. of the fathers on the Psalms, &c., we find only general remarks. Even recently Romish liturgists give the subject only cursory attention (cf. *Graf*, *Zur prakt. Theol.*, &c.: Tüb., 841; *Staudenmaier*, *d. Geist d. Christenth.*, &c., Tbl., 264, &c.); for, however much the Rom. Church avails itself of music in its worship, it does not cherish congregational singing, with which Hymnol. is mainly concerned. This explains, also, how the Evang. Church came only gradually to the consideration of H. as a science. The Reformers had first to provide for the practical wants of the people, and their hymnol. efforts were directed merely to this end (cf. SPANGENBERG's *cithara Lutheri*, 1569; HIER. VELLER's *Ausleg. geistl. Lieder.*; SCHAMELIUS, *schwerscheinende Stellen d. K.-ges.*, 1719; KÖPPING, *Katech. über Lieder*, 1847). During the Opitz epoch, prosody engaged too much attention to make it yield much for the æsthetics of hymns. It was only during the last century that an important advance was made, 1) by giving attention to the history of the composers of hymns (WETZEL, *hist. Lebensbeschr. d. Liederichter*, 1719; SCHAMELIUS, *Lieder-comm.*: Lpz., 737; GRISCHOW, *Nachr. d. Liederverf.*, 1771), and then to that of the hymns themselves (Beicht, &c., 3 Bde.: Dessau, 1782; Götz, *Beitrag*, &c., 1784; HEERWAGEN, *Literaturgesch.*, &c., 792-7); 2) by the criticisms which the Glaucha hymn-book, the product of the Halle pietism, provoked, and by the attempts of Rationalism to substitute its rhymes for the old hymns, in justification of which it was compelled to appeal

to hymnol. principles. The main product of this tendency was the Berlin hymn-book of 1780, which elicited many reviews. The most important work springing from this movement was Schmieder's *Hymnol.*, in which he attempts to determine the merits of hymns upon some general rules, and recommends, as the chief qualities of a hymn, that it be, 1) scriptural (without using, however, every figure or expression found in the Bible), 2) simple, 3) humane (free of expressions which might offend delicate ears!), and 4) decorous. This spirit of rationalistic reform, against which even Herder vainly protested, carried everything before it.—Thenceforward we have nothing on this subject until we meet RAMBACH's *Anthologie chr. Gesänge*: Hamburg, 1817-33, and a historical monograph named below. First in our times have due efforts been made to raise H. to a practical theological science. And now, as nearly 100 years ago, it is a practical reform, though in an opposite direction, demanding the investigation and settlement of principles. Not only have efforts been made to furnish hymn-books of a true churchly spirit, and free of mutilations (RAUMER's *Samml.*, &c.: Basel, 1831; d. Berliner *Liederschatz*, 1832; BUNSEN's *Versuch eines allg. evang. Gesangb.*, 1833, 1846; *Liedersg. v. Stier, Pauli, Knapp*); but the subject has also been theoretically discussed (as in the 2d Anb. to Bunsen's *Ges.-B.*; eine *Abhandl. K. v. Raumer* in his "Kreuzzügen;" *deutsch. Vierteljahrsschr.*, 1838, II.), and the awakened sense of the wrong which had been done to the Church in regard to its hymns, has sought vent in those loud complaints which Stier's "Gesangbuchsnoth," 1838, started (cf. KRAZ 1838, *Schede* 1852, &c.). The earliest practical effect of this movement was the Wittemb. G.-Buch., of 1842. But there immediately arose a controversy among the friends of reform, which is not yet settled. Some, disgusted with the flat novelties of the rationalistic period, desire only the old hymns, unaltered (STIP, *K.-fried, u. K.-lied.*, Hann., 1853); others think some regard should be paid to the change of time, especially in certain expressions. The above movement received an impetus, likewise, from the more comprehensive manner in which Schleiermacher, and his school, treated Pract. Theol., leading to the scientific discussion of Church hymns, as an essential part of public worship. Still, theoretical works on the subject are scarce. The first was by WEIS, *Versuch einer Theorie*, &c.: Breslau, 1842, not to be commended; then LANGE, *kirchl. Hymnol.*: Zurich, 1843, far superior to Weis. More recent are RUDELBACH, *hymnol. Studien*, in the *Ztschr. für luth. Th. u. K.*, 1855, IV.; NITZSCH, *prakt. Theol.*, II., 2, § 298-309; GAUPP, *prakt. Theol.*, I., § 60-65; ARMKNECHT, *d. heil. Psalmodie*, 1855; NAUMANN, *Einführ. d. Psalmges.*, 1856. There have been rich contributions to the history of our subject: MOHNKE's *hymnol. Forsch.*, 1831; DANIEL, *Thesaur. hymnol.*; Jos. MONE, *lat. Hymnen d. Mittlalt.*, &c., 3 Bde., 1853-55; WACKERNAGEL, "d. deutsche K.-lied," &c., 1841, and "Bibliographie," &c., 1855; KOCH, *Gesch. d. K.-l.*, 1st ed., 1847, 2d ed., 1852, 1853; HOFFMANN, of Fallersl., *Gesch. d. K.-l. bis auf Luther*, 2d ed., 1854; MÜTZELL, *geistl. Lieder*,

&c.; CUNZ, *Gesch.*, &c., 1854. To these have been added compilations for schools, &c. Especially acceptable are the numerous monographs which have appeared. AUGUSTI, *diss. de hymn. Syrorum sacris*: Bresl., 1814; HAHN, *Bardanes Gnosticus, Syr. primus hymnol.*, 1819; MIDDELDOFF, *über Prudent.*, in *Illgens Zschr.*, &c., 1832, II., St. 2; SCHNEIDER, *über Luther's Lieder*, &c., &c.

Concerning Hymnology as a science, we remark, primarily, that not all the poetry and music appropriated to public worship belongs to H. It excludes the chanting of the priest, which belongs to the liturgy. But H. has to treat of singing as a congregational act (see *Art. Church Music*). I. It must inquire how singing came to have a place in public worship. This will involve, 1) the discussion of the relation of art in general to religion and worship, and so of the contradiction found in determining this relation between the Christian and ante-Christian religion, and even between Christian confessions themselves; and these relations and contradictions must be explained with special reference to music. 2) Another point would be to determine the precise place of singing in Christian worship. Here the idea of sacrifice becomes especially prominent. 3) The difference between congregational and choir singing, as well as their connection, and the subordinate character of the latter, would then be ascertained.—II. Of congregational singing especially. A. Theory of it. 1) Its justification must be derived from the ev. idea of the congregation. 2) Its properties: it is *a*) essentially lyric, all other modes of thought must be subordinate, or momentary; *b*) objective; *c*) popular; it must be shown how all this impresses itself on *a*) the text, its conformity with Scripture, churchliness, popular poetic form, *β*) the music, chorals, melody, harmony, rhythms, unison, &c. 3) Significance of Church hymns, *a*) as bringing single congregations into communion, not only with other existing ones, but with the whole Church of all ages; *b*) as uniting the Church and family and schools (THILO, *K.-lied in d. Volksschule*, 2 Aufl., 1855).—B. Having thus fixed the idea of Church hymns, the history of the subject will follow. This must neither be purely literary, nor devotional, but scientific and theological.—C. Next to the history, which terminates in the present, will arise certain practical questions: 1) what may be gathered, from the history of the subject, for the use of the Church? 2) What is to be done regarding the diversity of hymns of different periods—allowable and objectionable changes—the harmony of the conservative and progressive spirit? 3) The best arrangement. 4) The proper selection of hymns, by the minister, for each public service—with regard to its opening and close, special occasions, metre, &c., adaptation of the hymn to every one present (an unreasonable demand), &c. Under B and C, as under A, the poetical and musical features would find a parallel place.—III. The treatment of choir-singing is, in general, the same as under II.—From all that has now been said, it is clear that much remains to be done in this field of science;

but, also, that there are many inducements to its cultivation. PALMER.*

Hypatia, daughter of the mathematician Theon, at Alexandria, flourished c. 391–415. To great personal attractions she added the higher beauties of virtue and knowledge. After learning mathematics with her father, she went to Athens to study philosophy, and subsequently, assuming the philosopher's mantle, she lectured upon Plato and Aristotle in Alexandria. Occupying the highest position as a Platonist, she enjoyed unbounded influence, and numbered among her disciples a Synesius, who submitted his writings to her criticism before he published them. Palladas, a cotemporary poet, compares H. to Astrea, the virgin of the heavens, and calls her a spotless star.—She always remained a virgin. Her tragical end has enhanced her celebrity. There are two diverse accounts. *Suidas* (III., 533) says that, as B. Cyril was one day passing her residence, he saw a great crowd of men and horses there, and, asking what it meant, was told that Hypatia dwelt there, and was receiving the homage of her adorers. Cyril became so jealous that he resolved to effect her death. *Socrates* (H. E., VII., 15) gives a more probable account: Among the adorers of H. was Orestes, Governor of Alexandria. He, incited by the arrogance of Cyril and the violence of his monks, repulsed all offers of a reconciliation. The people, regarding H. as the instigator of this hatred, made an attack upon her, under the lead of a precentor, Peter, seized her on the street, dragged her into an adjacent church, and there stoned her to death. Her limbs were torn asunder by the enraged mob, and burned (March, 415). This brutal act remained unpunished, but put a dark stain upon Cyril's character. An appeal of H. to Cyril, on behalf of Nestorius, is spurious (*FABR., bibl. Gr.*, IX., 187, &c.). DR. PRESSER.*

Hyperius (*Gerhard, Andrew*; called himself Hyperius, from his birthplace Ypress,) was born May 16th, 1511, of highly respectable parents. His father was an attorney, and, perceiving the talents of his son, carefully trained him, and on his deathbed (1525), urged his wife to send the lad to Paris, as soon as the war then raging should cease, that he might there more advantageously pursue his studies. After the peace of Cambray, H. went to Paris (July, 1528), thirsting after knowledge. Through the friendly influence, probably, of his countryman, Helsus, a Parliam. counsellor, and v. Kampen, a theologian, he was admitted to the Calvicum college, one of the oldest (founded 1270) of the University, and began a full philosophical course, under Joachim Ringelberg, a zealous humanist, then lecturing upon dialectics. The teacher (though much older) and pupil became warmly attached. The result of this friendship was not only the philos. writings (*Annot. in X. libr. Ethic. Aristot., Marp.*, 1553; a *Dialectics, Rhetoric, and Physices Aristot. Comp.*, Basil, 1574); above all, H. owed Ringelberg his taste for humanism, an excellent method of teaching, the first incentive to those exercises in debate, which H. subsequently instituted in Marburg, and, finally, according to R.'s rule: *quicquid didiceris, con-*

festum doceas (conf. Ringelb. *de ratione studii* l. d. Th. Erpen. *Lugd. Bat.*, 1642, p. 43), his skill in teaching. After three years, H. obtained the degree of Mag. Philos., and went home. In 1532 he returned to Paris, and commenced his theol. studies; but having no relish for the dry scholasticism of the Sorbonne, he privately read the Church Fathers, Church History, and canon law. His chief delight, however, was in the lectures of the humanists, especially those of John Sturm, the distinguished friend of Melancthon and Bucer, which, probably, sowed the seed of ev. truth on H.'s heart. He used travel as another means of improvement, passing thus through France, Upper Italy, and, after finishing his course in Paris, 1535, the Netherlands and Northern Germany, seeking, in Marburg, Erfurt, Wittenberg, and Leipsic, to become acquainted with the leaders of Protestantism and their principles. He embraced the ev. cause, and proved an important accession to it. Like Melancthon, he was intent upon placing the acquisitions of the Reformation upon a firm scientific foundation.—Invited by Charles of Montjoie, he went to England, and pursued new studies at Cambridge and Oxford. But the unfavorable turn of things after Cromwell's death, led H. to return, 1541, to the Continent. On his way to Strasburg, in hope of attaining a professorship, he stopped at Marburg, June 15, 1541. There the aged Geldenhauer, Prof. of Theol., desirous of relief from his labors, secured H.'s appointment to the post. He now found his proper position, and labored earnestly to solve the problem of Protestantism.—In consequence of frequent disputes about small matters, a mistrust of ev. theology had become prevalent, as H. himself complains (*de sacr. litterarum studiis non deserendis*, in the *Opusc. Basil*, 1570; and *de dijudicatione doctrinarum*, in the 2d ed. of the *Opusc. Basil*, 1580). Confidence in theol. studies had to be restored. This H. successfully attempted to do in his lectures. These, moreover, led to the publication of a series of exegetical monographs, included in his *Opuscula*, and a comm. on Paul's epistles, and the Hebrews (Zürich, 1582-4, 4 vol. fol.), which served Protestantism at large; the exeget. works are among the best of that period. His *Methodi Theologiae* (Basel, 1566, 1568, 1574, 8vo.), and *de formandis concion. sacr. sive de interpr. script. populari* (libr. II., first ed., Marb., 1553, and in quick succession five others; transl. into French, and published by a Rom. theol., Villavincensius, as his own), are works of the highest merit—the value of the latter having been enhanced by his *Topica Theologica* (Zür., 1561). The estimate

put upon his *de recte formando Theol. studio*, libr. IV. (Bas., 1556), may be inferred from the five editions through which it soon passed. It is properly the first full and scientific encyclopedia and methodology of Dogmatics.—To these literary merits, H. added important services done for the correction of the laxity of public morals, which had fallen into sad decay. In his *de S. Script. lectione ac meditatione quotidiana*, libr. II. (Zürich, 1561), he urged the civil authorities to require in every family the daily reading of the Scriptures.—He died Feb. 1, 1564.—(See the memorial sermons in *Hyperii Methodi Theol.*, libri III. (2), Basil, 1568; WAGNITZ, *ed. de formandis concion. sacr. Halæ*, 1781; MELCHIOR ADAM, *Vitæ Germ. Theol.* (ed. 3), Francof., 1706, fol. 178-190; TILMANN, *Vitæ Prof. Theol.*, Marb., p. 54-62; SCHRÖCKH, *Lebensbeschr. berühmter Gelehrten* (2), T. I., 237-44; STRIEDER, *Grundlage zu einer Hess. Gelehrten-gesch.*, VI., 293-312; Deutsch. Ztschr. für chr. Wissensch. u. chr. Leben., 1854, Nr. 30-32).

MANGOLD.*

Hypnistarii, a religious sect described by Gregory of Naz., whose father belonged to it before his conversion to Christianity (cf. *Orat.*, XVIII., 5, p. 333). Gregory says their religion was a mixture of heathenism and Judaism; from the former they obtained the custom of using fire and light in their worship; from the latter, the sanctification of the Sabbath, rejection of images, and scrupulousness in regard to certain sorts of food: "Ἐπιστάριοι τοῖς τὰν εὐνοίας ὁρῶντες, καὶ ὁ πατριάρχης δὲ μόνος αὐτοῖς σεβασίμος," Greg. of Nyssa (*adv. Eunom.*, lib. II., T. II., p. 440) says of them, calling them probably in reproach, Ἐπιστάριοι, that they agree with Christians in acknowledging one God, whom they call ὕψιστον, or πατριάρχον, but differ from them in denying that he is a father. Other accounts are based upon these two (so *Etymolog. Gudianum*, ed. Sturz, p. 547). The sect did not spread beyond Cappadocia, or exist long; it is not mentioned after the 4th cent. Whilst they were generally thought to be monotheists, Böhmer concluded from Gregory's remark concerning his father, ἐκ' εἰδωλοῦ πάρος ἦν ζῶν, that they admitted the existence of many gods. Having so few accounts of them, it is no wonder that opposite views have prevailed as to their true character. It is evident the sect was not Christian. Some think them related to Zoroaster. Ullmann regards them as eclectics, mixing Paganism and Judaism. Gregory commends their morality.—(C. ULLMANN, *de hypnistr.*: Heidelb., 1833; G. BÖHMER, *de hypnistr.*: Berol., 1834.)

DR. PRESSEL.*

I.

Ibas succeeded (435) Rabulas as B. of Edessa. Rabulas had taken sides with Cyril of Alex., and endeavored to bring Theodore of Mops. into discredit, as a heretic. Ibas pursued an opposite course (ASSEMANI, *biblioth. orient.*, I., 198, &c.), became suspected of Nestorianism, and was accused, before the Patr. Proclus, and Theodosius II., of mainly causing the schism between the Oriental and Egyptian bishops, and of having translated the works of Theodore M. into Syriac, and spread them throughout the East (ASSEM., *l. c.*, I., 200 &c. n. 1, and 350, n. 2; cf. MANSI, *coll. concilior.*, T. VII., 249, &c.). But the efforts of his enemies failed. In 449, after the matter was dismissed, Ibas was deposed by the Robber Synod (ASSEM., I., 202, 404; PAGI, *crit. in Baronii annales ad a. 449*, no. 12), Nonnus took his place until Ibas regained it at the Council of Chalcedon, 451 (MANSI, VII., 261). But the Jacobites did not recognize him (ASSEM., I., 202-3). He died in 457, when Nonnus again succeeded him (ASSEM., I., 202, 205; cf. 424). — Ibas, aided by Cumas and Probus of Edessa, translated the writings of Theodore of Mops. into Syriac (ASSEM., III., 85). His letter to Mari or Mares of Beth-Hardaschir, a B. of Persia, is celebrated (ASSEM., I., 350; cf. 203), and important as an authority contemporaneous with Nestorianism, and an evidence of Ibas' faith. It exists only in a Greek translation (*Acta conc. Chalced. act. X.*, ed. Harduin. II., 530; MANSI, *collect. concilior. ampliss.*, T. VII., 241, &c.). In it Ibas severely reproaches Cyril, but also disapproves of much in Nestorius, and shows himself a man of independent, and by no means partizan judgment. It was one of the three chapters condemned by an edict of Justinian, and the fifth oecumen. Synod at Constant. 553, although that of Chalcedon had pronounced it orthodox. — (See NEANDER'S Ch. H. GIESELER'S *do. Hall. Encyclop.*, 2. Sect. Bd. 15, p. 4. LE QUIEN, *oriens christ.*, II., 690. CHR. W. F. WALCH, *Entwurf einer vollst. Hist. d. ketzer. Spalt. u. Religionstreit.*, Th. 5, 650, &c.). E. RÜDIGER.*

Iberia, conversion of the Iberians.—This race, residing in the Caucasian isthmus (now Georgia or Grusia) is mentioned by Virgil, Horace, and Lucan, as a terrible, implacable, warlike people, whilst Strabo describes the entire nation, one caste excepted, as religious, peaceable, and devoted to agriculture, and says their cultivation resembles that of the Medes and Armenians. Their conversion took place, as Rufinus and Moses, of Chorene, relate, as follows: Under the Emperor Constantine, a Christian woman, perhaps a nun (Nona or Nunia), was captured by the Iberians, and became a slave. Her strict ascetic life secured attention and respect. It happened that a sick child was carried, according to their custom, from house to house, that if any knew a cure they might apply it. Having been brought to where Nona was, she said she could not help it, but that her Lord, Christ,

might. She prayed for the child, and it recovered. Afterwards the Queen of the country also took sick, and sent for pious Nona; who, pretending to no miracles, refused to go. The Queen then had herself carried to Nona, who prayed for her, and she recovered. The King (Mirus) desired to reward the Christian with costly gifts, but was told by his wife that she despised all earthly treasures, and only wished others to worship God. This made a deep impression on him. Subsequently having, on a chase, lost his way in a thick fog, he called on the God of Nona, and vowed to embrace his worship, if he would help him. The fog dispersed and the King reached home safely. His mind was now prepared to receive the gospel. The King and Queen aided Nona in teaching the people; teachers were invited from the Roman empire, and thus, c. 320-330, Christianity was established in a nation which, with some superstitions, has retained it to this day. That Nona went from Byzant. to Iberia, has been concluded from Procopius, V., 9, who says that an old monastery, maintained in Jerusalem, and renewed by Justinian in the 6th cent., was called Iberian. With this the account of Moses of Ch. agrees, calling the Christian woman an Armenian, and stating that application for teachers was made, not to Rome, but to the Armen. B. Gregory. From Iberia the gospel early spread to Albania, the Lazi, and adjacent tribes. TH. PRESSEL.*

Iceland.—When Harald Harfagr made himself sole master of Norway, and crowds of natives sought a new home, a number of the dissatisfied people went to Iceland, which had shortly before (860) been discovered. The scattered Celtic Christians there fled before the heathen immigrants, and the few Norwegian families who had previously become Christians soon fell from the faith. The new republic, therefore, soon became wholly heathen, only occasionally brought into contact with Christianity, through war or commerce. From mercenary considerations, some Icelanders were occasionally baptized, or received the sign of the cross, very few from conviction. Among true converts was Thorwald, Codran's son, surnamed Vidfürli (the traveller), who, sustained by Frederic, a Saxon B., made the first attempt to publish the Gospel in Iceland (981-5; NEANDER'S Ch. H., III., 300). This work was more energetically pressed by King Olof Trygvason of Norway (995-1000), who used all kinds of means to influence such Icelanders as visited Norway, and sent and supported missionaries on their island. First Stefnir went (995-7), then Dankbrand, then a Saxon priest. Two prominent Icelanders, Gizur and Hialti, succeeded in compromising the religious disputes which arose by having Christianity declared the religion of the island, with certain concessions to heathenism (1000). Without resistance, but reluctantly, the people consented to be baptized. In 1016-

20, Olaf Haraldson annulled those concessions. — An antecedent political dissolution, seemed indispensable to the conversion of the island, and various carnal motives had to be employed at first to produce any effect. Of course such effects were mainly external, much heathenism mixing with the Christianity so embraced. The effect of these heathen influences upon the organization of the Church is especially noteworthy. In their heathenism the temples of the Icelanders were private property, in which the owners officiated, there being no sacerdotal class. When Christianity was adopted this plan was mainly retained, and either the owners took orders and officiated in their own churches, or hired a priest. Consequently the priests were mostly farmers, merchants, or justices, or regular priests miserably poor and at the mercy of the landlords. The condition of the Bishops was little better. The first resident and native *B.* of Iceland was appointed in 1055. The taxes of a few temples which had been made public, yielded him a scanty support. The second *B.*, Gizur, endowed the See, and located it at Skalaholt, and in 1106 another at Holar. The Bishops were elected by the people, the priests chosen by the owners of the churches. Of course the clergy were worldly, ignorant, and rude. Considerable improvements were subsequently made by Gizur, who authorized the tithe system (1097), and Bishops Thorlacr and Ketill, who introduced the canon law for the government of the Church (1123; published by *Grim. Joh. Thorkelin* in 1776; *Jus eccl. vetus, sive Thorlaco-Ketillianum*, or, also, *Kristinnretr hinn gamli*). But even now yet the condition of the Iceland Church was but little in advance of that of the middle ages. Lay-patronage still prevailed. The clergy and even the Bishops were married. There was no independent ecclesiastical judicatory, excepting that in the discipline of the clergy a court of Bishops acted. — Originally the Iceland Church was subject to the Archb. of Bremen-Hamburg; when the See of Lund was founded (1103) it was transferred to it; and finally to that of Nidaros, founded 1152. The early attempts of the Norwegian Archbishops to secure independence of the State, of course brought them into violent conflicts with the government of Iceland also, especially in reference to the habits and condition of the priesthood. The authorities presented a stern resistance. But from 1238 the Archb. began to appoint the Bishops; and about 1256–64 the Church agreed to a subjection of the republic to the crown of Norway. Thenceforth the Iceland Church participated more decidedly in the affairs of Norway, and to the advantage of the hierarchy, because the throne thought it needed the aid of the hierarchy in suppressing the liberty of the peasants. An attempt of Arni Thorlacson, soon after his call to the See of Skalaholt (1269), to abrogate lay-patronage and the tithe system, &c., excited violent opposition, which was not allayed until 1277, through the intervention of King Magnus Lagabatar. But after his death, 1280, it broke out with greater virulence, through the attempt of King Erikir Magnusson and his officials, and the Archb. Jon, † 1283, and Iorundr, † 1309, to enforce a

new eccl. law. The dispute was finally (1297) settled by allowing the laity to retain all eccl. property of which they held at least the half. Thus restricted, the new law was then, 1356, likewise extended over the See of Holar. It was published by Gr. J. Thorkelin, 1777: *Jus eccl. novum sive Arnæanum*, or *Kristinnretr inn nýi*.

From this time until about 1500 the Iceland Church enjoyed external quiet; its internal condition was, however, extremely wretched. If the people could say the creed, paternosters, and Ave Marias, and observed outwardly the feasts and fasts of the Church, especially abstinence from flesh, they were accounted good Christians. Vows, pilgrimages, the worship of images and relics, especially Mariolatry, were everywhere encouraged. Iceland itself produced two or three saints, Thorlacr, Ion, and Gudmundr (the last never canonized). The adoration of the host was introduced in 1270. Superstitions abounded. The morals of the people were shameful, ambition, covetousness, and uncleanness prevailed. Iceland needed purification, in common with the entire Continent. But its Reformation occurred under the influence of that in Denmark. — Near the close of the 14th cent. the kingdom of Norway was united by inheritance with that of Denmark, and this union was confirmed by the union of Calmar (1397). Hence when the Diet of Copenhagen adopted Protestantism (1536), the movement naturally soon reached Iceland. A few clergymen and laymen who had embraced Luther's doctrines on the Continent, soon collected, and among them Oddr Gottschalkson, the author of the first Icelandic translation of the New Test., printed at Roeskilde, 1540. The bishops, and people generally, at first were hostile to the innovation; but the King's favor to it weakened their opposition. In 1540 Gizur Einarsson, a Lutheran, became *B.* of Skalaholt, and, although many difficulties had to be surmounted, succeeded in spreading the cause in his diocese. To counteract celibacy he married, and zealously opposed image-worship, and other Popish superstitions until his death (1548). Meanwhile *B.* Ion Arason of Holar adhered to Romanism, and after Gizur's death tried to usurp the See of Skalaholt, and suppress the Reformation in the whole island. Gizur's successor, Martin Einarsson, he imprisoned, and had the corpse of G. disinterred and buried in public ground. The King's officers were insulted, and stripped of their prerogatives, and foreign aid was treacherously solicited, of the Pope, the Emperor, and perhaps of Holland. All attempts to bring him to an account Ion treated with contempt. At length he and two of his sons (the zealous celibate had at least six!) were taken, and tried, with some irregularity, and executed for high treason (1550). Then outward opposition ceased, the Danish Liturgy and discipline were (1551) introduced in Holar also, and the articles of Ripen, as well as other regulations of the Danish Church, were adopted. — That the work thus begun and carried forward would, likewise, be rather external, is obvious, and for a long time the measures used to remedy the consequent evils were culpably inadequate. The royal

officers absorbed the Church revenues, so that little was left to support the clergy, and a lack of candidates compelled most clergymen to take several parishes; simple farmers, even, had sometimes to be employed. Gradually the founding of seminaries at both the cathedrals, especially the establishment of the printing office in Holar by the excellent Bishop Gudbrandr Thorlakson (1574) remedied these evils. His translation of the Bible (1584) was an eminent means of elevating the people; many stubborn superstitions now yielded to the spread of knowledge; so that, whatever evils still remained, the Church of Iceland in the 17th cent. was no worse in this respect than the churches of the Continent. The last execution for witchcraft occurred in 1690. And now the people of Iceland are above the average of other countries in morality and cultivation.—The Church of Iceland has been formed mainly after that of Denmark, only retaining some peculiarities. The chief magistrate is the *summus episcopus*, who exercises his authority partly through bishops, partly through civil officers. The Archb. was abrogated, and the bishops, in whose choice the people participate, were essentially superintendents, and enjoyed considerable power. Towards the end of the last cent. the See of Skalaholt was transferred to Reikiavik, and in 1825 a cathedral built near by; but the See of Holar was dissolved in 1801, so that the island forms but one diocese. Next to the Bishop are the provosts, whose office, formerly mainly financial, acquired a more ecclesiastical character after the Reformation. There are 19 provostships, under which the several parishes are arranged. The parishes were at first, against the rules of the Danish directory, supplied with clergy by the Bishops; but since 1563, each congregation chooses, under the management of the provost, whilst the tenant in chief has the right of investiture. The revenues of the 299 churches, and of the clergy, are still scanty, and various strange peculiarities may yet be found.—(See FINNUS JOHANNÆUS, *Hist. eccl. Islandiæ*, IV. Tom. 4to., *Havniæ*, 1772–78, reaching to 1740; cont. by PETUR PETURSSON, *Havn.*, 1841, 4to., to 1840. MÜNTER'S *K.-gesch. von Dänemark u. Norw.*, Th. 1–3, 8vo.: Lpz., 1823–33. K. MAURER, *d. Bekehr. d. norweg. Stammes*, &c., 2 Bde. 8vo.: München, 1855–6. HARBOR'S *Abhandl. in Det Kjöbenhavnske Vidensk. Selskabs Skrifter*, V., 209; VII., 1–100. JOANNES OLAVICS, *Synt. histor.-eccl. de baptismo*, &c.: Hafn., 1770, 4to.; *Diatr. histor.-eccl. de cognatione spiritali*: Hafn., 1771, 8vo. PETUR PETURSSON, *Comm. de jure eccl. in Isl.*, &c., *Havn.*, 1844, 8vo. HALDOR EINARSON, *Om Værdie-Beregning paa Landsviis og Tiende-Ydelsen i Island*, *Kjöbenhavn*, 1833, 8vo. For statistics: *Skýrslur um landshagi á Islandi, gefnar út af hinu Íslenzka Bokmentafelagi*: Copenh., 1855–6). K. MAURER.*

Iconium.—This populous city of Asia Minor, (called by Strabo, 12, p. 668, only a *παλιχτιον*, but by Pliny *H. N.*, 5, 27, 25, an *urbs celebratissima*), lay in a fertile plain at the foot of Mt. Taurus, near a lake. It was well built, inhabited by Gentiles and Jews (Acts 14: 1, 19),

Gallienus, as a Roman colony. Xenophon (*Anab.*, 1, 2, 19) reckons it the most Eastern city of Phrygia; Ptolemy (5, 6, 16), Cicero (*ad Div.*, 8, 8; 5, 20; 15, 4) calls it the capital of Lycaonia; and Ammian. Marcell. (14, 2) places it in Pisidia. Here Paul, coming from Antioch in Pisidia, on his first missionary tour, planted a church, but, assailed by the people, was compelled to flee to Lystra and Derbe (Acts 13: 51; 14, &c.; 16: 2; cf. 2 Tim. 3: 11). Iconium became distinguished during the crusades, and for a time was the chief city of the Seljukes (KORTUM, *Gesch. d. Mittelalt.*, I., 314, 220; ROBINSON'S *Palest.*). It is still an important place, with c. 30,000 inhabitants. Its old name was retained under the forms Cogni, Kunjal, Konia (see NIEBUHR, *Reise*, III, 113, &c.; CARMER, *Asia M.*, II., 65; HAMILTON, *Researches*, II., 205, &c.; WINER'S *Lex.*; PAULY'S *Real-Encl.*, IV., 51). RÜTTSCHEL.*

Iconoclasm (*εικονοκλάστας*, *εικονομάχος*).—The controversies concerning images occurred at a time when Christians, at least in the Orient, were forced in self-preservation to maintain opposition to Islam. The Church in Asiatic countries under Mohammedans, was, therefore, most zealous in guarding all those peculiarities which distinguished it from Islam. This secured to it a degree of self-subsistence which provoked the envy of the Church groaning under the tyranny of the Greek-Roman empire. To secure this same independence was the aim of the Church of the Empire. The idea of the freedom of the Church from the State, associated itself, also, with that of sole dependence upon the collective Patriarchs. But Rome had for centuries maintained this idea, with the assumption of the primacy among the Patriarchs, and now embraced it with self-sacrificing decision. At first the political state of Rome was less favorable to it than to the Oriental Patriarchate. But the Franks soon reversed this, and Rome became the sole head of a Church entirely free from the State, and even of a State-Church. Then the friends of the Church in the Greek empire, regarded it as most desirable to be connected with and united under Rome. This tendency corresponded with a growing inclination of the Eastern Church towards a Western element, that of a predominantly realistic apprehension of religion, which had gained such strength that the popular religion had acquired an ethnic-superstitious character, and overpowered the intellectualism of Greek Christians favored by the orthodoxy. The iconoclasm of that deistic intellectualism opposed all these tendencies, but ineffectually. The opposition to the women and monks who favored the superstition, excited hatred, as the despotic attempt of a barbaric government, and made all the friends of the Church *iconolatrists*. The friends of images were identical with friends of the Church and its independence. Hence iconolatry prevailed; but it prevailed before the ideas of the unity and liberty of the Church was fully developed; it prevailed through iconoclasts whom the monks and women had converted into iconolatrists, but who still remained enemies of the Church aiming at independence. The Greek Christians held, therefore, only to the unessential part of

the controversy. Cæsareopapism was strengthened, and instead of union, the two churches, both friends of images, became permanently separated. Eastern Christians were removed from participation in the great mediæval development of the West. The Greek Church became isolated, servile, petrified. In the West iconoclasm was of small importance, because relics engaged more attention than images, and the conflicts with Islam and the State were trifling. — (Sources: GOLDAST, *Imper. decreta de cultu Imaginum*, &c.: Frcf., 1608. MANSI, *Concil. coll.*, T. XIII. JOH. DAMASCENUS, *Λόγοι πρὸς τοὺς διαβάλλοντας τὰς ἁγίας εἰκόνας*, d. le Quien. THEOD. STUDITA, *Op. ed. Sirmond.* NICEPHORUS, *Brev. historię*, ed. Pelav.: Paris, 616. THEOPH. CONFESSOR, *χρονογραφία*: Paris, 655. Works: DALLÆUS, *de imag.*: Lugd., 1642. LAMBOURG, *hist. de l'hérésie des Iconocl.*: Paris, 679 et 1683. SPANHEMII, *hist. imag. restituta*: Lugd., 1686. WALCH, *Ketzergesch.*, Bd. X., II. SCHLOSSER, *Gesch. d. bilderstürmenden Kaiser*, &c.: Frankf., 1812. MARX, *d. Bildertritt*, &c.: Trier, 1839. GFRÖRER, *Allgem. K. gesch.*, &c. &c.).

Leo III., the Isaurian (717–741), aimed at a triumph of the State-Church over Jews, Monanists, and Mohammedans. But nothing so much repelled the last, as the image-worship which had become prevalent since the 5th cent. As late as 723 the Calif Yezid had commanded images to be removed from all the churches of his dominions. Leo also abhorred images, and resolved to exterminate them. A hasty attempt of some Bishops to execute this command caused an insurrection, and led the most revered theologians of the Greek Church, John Damasc. and Pope Greg. II., to oppose the Emperor. Leo persisted; in 730 he issued a second mandate; deposed the resisting Patriarchs, and responded to a Synod which Greg. III. summoned against iconoclasm, by cutting off the papal revenues in Sicily and Calabria, and attaching Eastern Illyria to the patriarch. of Constantinople. Gregory sought help from the Franks. John Damasc., living in Jerusalem, was beyond Leo's reach.—Constantine V., Copronymus (741–775) met with hostility from the iconolatrists, and was thus provoked to use severe measures to extirpate images. In 754 he convened a general Council at Constant.; all the Patriarchs staid away. Pope Stephan III., to escape the Lombards, threw himself into Pipin's arms. The 338 Bishops present attributed the introduction of images to Satan, and decided, upon the authority of the first six general Councils, that whoever made an image of Christ or adored it, was either a Nestorian or Eutychian. The Lord's Supper was the only proper representation of Christ. The worship of images was condemned by Scripture (John 4 : 24; 1 : 15; 20 : 29; Deut. 5 : 8, 9; Rom. 1 : 23; 10 : 17; 2 Cor. 5 : 7) and the Fathers (Ephiph., Greg. Naz., Chrysostom, Athanasius, &c.). But it was right to pray to Mary and the saints. Those who made and worshipped images were put under the ban, and John Damasc. was cursed under the name of Mansur. The clergy were required to sign these decrees. The monks refusing, were cruelly

persecuted, and to be utterly exterminated. But Rome withstood the storm. Stephan III. rejected the decrees of 754, and Stephan IV., at a Lateran Council of 769 condemned the iconoclasts. Leo IV. inherited his father's hatred of images, and was enraged at the Empress Irene for secretly worshipping them. His early death placed Irene in power. At first she exercised forbearance. But the monks gathered around her and soon inflamed her zeal. An attempt was made to hold a Council in Constant., 786, but a majority of iconoclast Bishops, and the soldiers, who held the views of Leo III. and Constantine V., being present, the scheme was frustrated. A more cautious attempt in Nicæa, 787, was successful. The Council of 754 was condemned, the *ἀσπασμός καὶ τιμητικὴ προσκύνησις* (salutation and adoration) of saints' images was approved, only distinguished from the real worship (*ἀληθινὴ λατρεία*) of God. All iconoclasts were condemned. These decrees, refuted by the *Libri Carolini*, and by the Synod of Frankfurt, 794, remained unassailed in the Byzant. empire until 814, because they harmonized with the religion of the people, and their leaders, the monks. The chief iconolatrism was Theodore, Abbot of the monastery Studium in Constant., who alone comprehended the controversy in all its importance. — When Nicephorus became Emperor, 802–811, he neither opposed the prevailing orthodoxy, nor complied with the demands of Theodore of Studium; but Michael I. (811–13) followed Theodore's counsel. In 813 the soldiers elected Leo V., Emperor. At first he proceeded cautiously against image worship, but in 814, yielding to the turbulent demands of the army, issued an edict against it. The Patriarch and monks were punished for their secret machinations against Leo. A new Patriarch, 815, annulled, at a Synod in Constant., the decrees of the 2d Nicene Council. Theodore of Studium, and his friends, were persecuted. Theodore, though banished, organized the friends of images and incited them to resistance. Michael II., Balbus (820–29) followed Leo V., and allowed the private worship of images and saints. He desired the strife to cease. The insurrection of a certain Thomas made further concessions to the friends of images necessary. But from 823 more decided opposition was again made. In the West, also, Michael investigated, by an embassy to Lewis the Pious, the condemnation of image worship, at a Synod in Paris, 825. Theodore died 826, without seeing his object secured. Michael's son, Theophilus (829–42) forbade the keeping of images in private houses, and cruelly persecuted the monks, although his mother-in-law, and wife, Theodora, were zealous iconolatrists. After his death they broke the oath made to him against images, and Theodora, exercising the regency with Bardas, Manuel, and Theoctistus, for Michael III. (842–67), had the decrees of 787 revived by a new Council at Constant. The images were solemnly restored to the churches, and Feb. 19, 842, was celebrated as the day of triumph for orthodoxy. Iconoclasts were severely dealt with, and never again acquired power.

A. VOGEL.*

Idolatry.—The idea conveyed by this term is derived from Holy Scripture. In the Old Testament, idolatry was designated by **זָבָח**, a lie (Ps. 40 : 4; Amos 2 : 4), or by **שָׁוָא**, evil, a lie, nothingness, or more frequently by **תועבה**, an abomination, while the later Jews denoted it by **עבודה זרה**, strange worship.

Idolatry, therefore, had in Hebrew no name descriptive of the idea signified by it. The biblical expressions indicate the judgment of monotheism concerning the worship of false gods, rather than name the thing itself, while the later Jewish designation intimates the non-Jewish origin of idolatry. In the New Testament, the use of the word *εἰδωλαστροφία* is derived from the LXX., who translate by *εἰδωλον* all the different names of idols, even where they are simply called

אֱלֹהִים, nothings; and thus one species of false worship, the actual worship of images (*idololatria*), gives name to the whole class (1 Cor. 10 : 14; Gal. 5 : 20; 1 Pet. 4 : 3). Afterward we find the comprehensive term *idolatria* (for *idololatria*) was formed, which includes also the erection and worship of other visible symbols (*εἰδωλα*) of the Deity beside images. Idolatry always appears in the Old and the New Testament as the extreme form of ungodliness. The Fathers describe it mostly after Rom. 1 : 23, sqq., as a taking away of the honor due to God: *deo fraudem facit honores illi suos denegans et conferens aliis* (TERTULL., *de Idololatria*, c. 11); or, *divinus honor alteri datur* (CYPRIAN); also, *Dei honorem usurpat et vindicat creaturæ* (HILAR. DIAC.); but oftener as a transferring of the worship of the Creator to the creature, *μετάθεσις τῆς προσκυνητικῆς ἀπὸ τοῦ πεποιημένου ἐπὶ τὰ πλάσματα* (GREG. NAZ.). — The first mention of idolatry made in Scripture, appears to be the allusion to the mysterious *teraphim*, in the house of Laban (Gen. 31 : 19, sqq.), which, as derived from *ta-raph*, to heal, and appearing in token of dangerous illness even in 1 Sam. 19 : 16, can hardly be anything else than amulets and images to charm away disease; but, in Judges 17 : 4, sq., they are to be regarded as representations of the one true God. To the same class, though suggested by the worship of animals among the Egyptians, belong the golden calf (Exod. 32 : 8) and the calf of Rehoboam (1 Kings 12 : 28; 14 : 9, sq.), as, indeed, Josephus calls the latter *δαμάρις ἐκωρύμους τῷ θεῷ* (*Antl.* 8, 3). Idolatry, without doubt, began with the symbolical worship, which was still closely connected with monotheism, and therefore, in Deut. 4 : 19, treated with a certain degree of allowance, though we cannot assent to the Jewish view of its origin, as the worship of the celestial bodies in the time of Enos (cf. MOSES MAIMONIDES, *de Idololatr.*, c. 1, from a misconception of Gen. 4 : 26), and just as little can we consider that it first made its appearance in the time of Heber. But that the worship of the great physical powers of the world, the sun, the stars, the elements, as symbols of the Deity, was the oldest form of idolatry, is evident from the fact, that not only the Canaanite and Phœnician worship points to such more distant background, as it were (comp.

MOVERS, *die Phœnicier*, I., 148, sqq. 157), but also the religion of India presupposes a grand symbolic representation of the divine (LASSER, *indische Alterthumskunde*, I., 756, sqq., also ROTH, *zur Geschichte der Religionen*); the Jews expressly call the oldest idolatry *the worship of the stars and planets* (Mos. MAIM., *loco citato*); and Sanchuniathon also, tracing idolatry back to Cain, regards *the worship of the elements* as the first phase of it. Hence, among Christians, no doubt remained concerning this point (FRANCISCUS MATERNUS, *de Errore Profanarum Religionum*, ed. MÜNTER., c. 1–5). Plato and Aristotle are weighty authorities for the origin of polytheism from a contemplation of the grand unity of God, and of the manifold character of the visible world (PLATO, *Philebus*, ed. STALLBAUM, pp. 16, 31; ARISTOTLE, *Metaphys.*, XI., 8); to which philosophers, Dicaearchus also may be added (PORPHYRIUS, *de Abstinencia*, III., 2). If, on the other hand, Clement of Alexandria considers the admiration of the celestial bodies, gratitude toward the inventors of agriculture, the consciousness of guilt and sin, the personifying of the passions, and the like, as sources of the myths, he does not mean to describe the origin of polytheism, but the gradual development of it as it existed before him in its various forms and combinations. From the original worship of the stars, in which the One Being, God, made known by the sacred tradition of primitive time, was obscured and hidden by the world and its phenomena, religion soon proceeded to a multiplicity of symbols along with the spread of nations now subjected to manifold physical influences in various countries. Another cause that developed the general worship of images from the false worship of God, was history. Nations cherished the memory of their ancestors and ancestral heroes, and lived under their controlling influence; and, when once they had abandoned the living God, the worship of their forefathers was a necessary consequence of their own filial piety, and of the authority which their forefathers, even after death, continued to exercise over them. The worship of *manes*, such as is the Chinese religion, thus arose, and along with it the worship of heroes, which many writers, as for instance Voss, taking a partial view of the matter, regard as the only source of the mythical religions. How the transition was next made to the symbolism of animal worship, and from that to anthropomorphism, to the ideas of mythology, and to the worship of images of the gods, is best explained by Creuzer (*Symbolik u. Mythologie der alten Völker*, 3te Ausg., I., 5, sqq.). Inquiries concerning the origin of myths naturally have their place here. The fathers of the Church did not fail to notice the share which even the sacred tradition of primitive times had in the formation of heathen religions, by way of symbolism and myths; and Lactantius (*de Falsa Relig.*, I., 11.) considers the *consensus gentium*, in the belief in gods, as an evidence that they were affected by such tradition. The older theologians of the Protestant Church were chiefly occupied in the contest against naturalism, which assumed as invincible the position that *the idea of one Supreme God is innate in man*, and that therefore

neither revelation nor tradition was needed to give this idea in the manner in which it appears as the foundation of the refined systems of polytheism. All further development into classes and families of gods, and the myths, were accordingly in their opinion a deliberate invention to subserve the interest of the hierarchy or the State. This view was held by HERBERT of Cherbury (*de Relig. Gentilium*, p. 6, 168, sqq.). Against such opinions, various writers contended with a solid array of learning; as G. J. VOSSIUS, *de Theologia Gentili et Physiologia Christiana* I., 3 sqq., et al.; VAN DALE, *de Origine et Progressu Idololatriæ* (C. I., c. 2, 3); SELDEN, *de Diis Syriis* (Lips., 1662, p. 25, sqq.). It was their belief, as well as FARMER'S (*The General Prevalence of the Worship of Human Spirits among the Ancient Heathen Nations*: London, 1783), that the demons, whether evil spirits or souls of the departed, were objects of veneration among the heathen even in very early times. The Jews gradually came to the belief that the gods were not a nonentity, as the prophets invariably represented them, but that they were actually living spirits of evil—a view which was adopted by the Fathers of the Church, and extended to oracles. It was in this way that our old theologians arrived at the doctrine of the worship of demons, from which, in later times, authorities receded, and S. J. Baumgarten, for instance, speaks simply of mutilated tradition as being the source of idolatry. TOLAND (*Lettres Philosophiques*, p. 99, sqq.), adopting the opinion of PLINY (*Hist. Nat.*; comp. CIC., *de Nat. Deor.*, I., 1), brought forward, in explanation of the origin of religion, merely the interest of rulers, who ascribed divine attributes to kings, lawgivers, and other persons distinguished for their influence or services among men. DUPUIS (*de l'Origine de tous les Cultes*.) derives all religion from the pantheistic view of the world, as being in his apprehension the natural view. Rationalism, resting on its Pelagian foundation, either leaned toward the views of naturalism or availed itself of the tendency of such authorities as Heyne, or J. H. Voss, and others. Heyne asserted that the myths, and along with them the systems of idolatry, were either the voice of historical events echoed back by a wondering and admiring age, or a mere expression of philosophical ideas; that is, that they were either historical or philosophical myths; while Voss referred the origin of the gods to philosophy, which clothed its higher ideas in the childlike garb of mythological tales for the people, and thus again ascribed it to priestcraft; and in his view the traditions concerning actual heroes was a fruitful source of religious myths. Others, as LOECK, have been inclined to see in the mythology of heathen nations only the play of a childish fancy. But above all the prejudice has prevailed, that a true philosophy or religious conception underlies the stories of the gods, and that the appearance of personal and historical forms was owing solely to the mode of viewing and describing the idea, or to a misunderstanding of it (BUTTMANN; G. HERMANN). Finally, a mere work of the priests (FR. CREUZER, in the earlier editions of his *Symbolik*), or a hierarchical system of nature, and so in fact a work of the

priests (WELKER), has been considered as the foundation of developed idolatry (K. O. MÜLLER, *Prolegomena zu einer wissenschaftlichen Mythologie*, pp. 316–344). K. O. MÜLLER has most profoundly conceived the origin of the conception of the several gods, and of idolatry withal, to be certain views springing up of necessity, real but not reflected upon, in a circle of whole nations, in which views the fundamental idea was in no instance pure and existing by itself, but always joined with what was actual and historical. From this view of primitive religion, which has not been duly considered, it was easy to pass to the idea prevailing in the modern philosophy of religion, which is most consistently set forth by HEGEL (*Vorlesungen über Religionsphilosophie*); and according to which, religion, from the beginning, has been in a course of steady development, the first stage of which was idolatry; or rather, idolatry existed not as a departure from God, but as the necessary first step toward God. By this procedure, the proper idea of idolatry is taken away in a pretended higher recognition of the connection of all religion which advances through manifold grades of development to the one absolute religion. HEINRICHS (*die Religion im innern Verhältnisse zur Wissenschaft*: Heidelb., 1821, S. 141, sqq.), KRAFT (*die Religionen aller Völker in philosophischer Darstellung*: Stuttg., 1848), fall in with these notions, and FEUERBACH and others go beyond them, and even fancy religion to be only a morbid phenomenon in the life of man.

All religious worship which is not offered to the true, invisible God of the Bible, is to be regarded as idolatry; as well as all worship which is rendered to Him in symbols chosen by man, and not appointed of God in the revelation made in Holy Scripture. Idolatry had its origin in that natural longing after God which was caused by a survey of the outward world, and by the primitive tradition whose voice still echoed down the tract of time, which longing, without the continual interposition of God, that is, without Divine Revelation, misses its true object, so that worldly existences were apprehended by men unconsciously in the place of God, and as God. The nature of this apprehension has varied according to the physical, historical, and social condition of a people, and has admitted the worship even of what is most unreal and accidental, as in the case of *feticism*, if priest or sorcerer had given it a sacred character. From the most ancient symbolism to the rudest acts of false worship, there are sometimes more, sometimes fewer intermediate steps; and it must be observed that the better cultivated among the heathen have the feeling that the idols are mere symbols, either of many gods, or of the one only God, while the mass of the people are always near *feticism*, or are actually fallen into it.

Idolatry used to be divided into *proper* and *improper*. The former was the true polytheism, the belief in the divinity of the image itself and of the various images; the latter was either, according to Baumgarten, the worship of many gods as simply subordinate to one god, or, according to J. H. Voss, the viewing of the objects of adora-

tion as mere symbols of the invisible God. There has been added to this, as founded on Col. 3 : 5, *figurative* idolatry; that is, an excessive, sinful regard for earthly and sensuous objects; and controversialists, going beyond the bounds of fairness, designate indiscriminately as idolatry all reverence of statues and paintings in the Greek and the Roman Catholic Church.

W. HOFFMANN.—*C. Short.*

Ignatius, Bishop of Antioch.—1) Of his life and labors we have no sure record. What is told—as that he was the child whom our Lord set up as an example to his disciples (Matt. 18 : 4); that he was a scholar of John (*Acta mart. c. 3*; *Euseb. chron. ad. a. 11 Trajani*) or Peter (*Greg. M. ep. 37, ad Athanas.*); that he was consecrated bishop in Antioch by the Apostle Paul (*Constit. Apost., VII., 46*) or Peter (*Chrysost. hom. in Ignat. Mart. c. 4*); that he was the first who promoted church-music and introduced antiphonies (*Socrates, H. E. VI., 8*), and the like—all belong to the sphere of the legend. Concerning his martyrdom we have *Acta* in several editions. A shorter one was first published by Usher in Latin (*Londini, 1647*), and then by Ruinart, in the appendix to his *Acta primorum martyrum sincera*, in Greek, 1689 (printed from still older editions are those of Hefele, *PP. app. ed. 3, p. 245*; *Petermann, Epp. Ign., p. 449*; *Cureton, Corp. Ign., p. 190*, which contains also, p. 222, a fragment of a Syriac translation). Larger Greek *Acta*, probably of the 7th cent., are to be found in Simeon Metaphrastes (*Cotelier, PP. AA., II., 163*; *Gulandi, I.*; *Petermann, p. 472*; in Latin, *AA. SS. 1, Febr., p. 24*). Finally, there is a yet later one in the *Vita S. Ign.* in *AA. SS.*, varying indeed from, but related to the Armenian, published first by Aucher (*Vita SS., II., 72*) and then by *Petermann* (p. 496). But even the shortest, and without doubt the oldest, of these *Acta*, is to be rejected as spurious. Eusebius (*Hist. eccl., IV., 15*), and perhaps Chrysostom, was unacquainted with it, and its contents show historical errors and contradictions, as, for example, that Ig. was sentenced by the Emperor Trajan himself in Antioch (*Uhlhorn, Zeitschr. f. hist. Theol., Jahrg. 1851, I., II., p. 248, sq.*). Thus the story of martyrdom rests solely upon the Epistles. These (even in the briefest Syriac version) intimate that Ig. was condemned, in Antioch, by the ordinary court, *ad bestias*, and conveyed to Rome to suffer death. On the way thither the Epp. purport to have been written. This, then, must have happened between the years 105 and 108 (the most probable date is 107 or 108). His bones are said to have been carried back to Antioch, where he was specially honored, as we learn from Chrysostom's homily on S. Ignat. martyr.

2) In all there are 15 *Epistles*, which bear the name of Ignatius, but they evidently vary much in age and value. Three of them, 1, 2 (*ad S. Joannem ap.*) and 3 (*ad S. Mariam V.*, to which is added a *Responsio B. M. V. ad Ign.*), exist only in Latin, and appear to have been originally composed in that language (*Cureton, Corp. Ign., p. 156*; *Petermann, p. 439*). Five, 4 (*ad Mariam Cassobolitam*, to which one of hers to Ign. is added), 5 (*ad Tarsenses*), 6 (*ad*

Antiochenos), 7 (*ad Heronem, Diaconum Antiochenum*), and 8 (*ad Philippenses*), occur in the Greek language, and in a Latin and Armenian translation (*Cureton, p. 119*; *Petermann, p. 289*). Seven, 9 (*ad Magnesios*), 10 (*ad Trallianos*), 11 (*ad Philadelphenses*), 12 (*ad Smyrnas*), 13 (*ad Ephesios*), 14 (*ad Romanos*), and 15 (*ad Polycarpum*), are found in a two-fold Greek copy, one larger (B) and one shorter (A). The former (B) was first published by Pacæus in 1557, and independently of him by Andr. Gessner in 1559 (lately in the collections *PP. AA.* by Cureton and Petermann); the latter (A) first by Archbishop Usher (1644, *Cod. Cajensis*), *L. Vossius* (1646, *Cod. Medicæus*), and Ruinart (*Cod. Colbertinus* of the Ep. to the Romans, 1689). The text now received is from the *Cod. Medicæus*. Of both we have old Latin translations; of A. one in the Syriac, fragmentary it is true, in Cureton, and another in Armenian made from it (Constantinople, 1783), which Petermann has collected). Finally, the three last numbered Epp. (*ad Eph., ad Smyrn., ad Polycarp.*) have come to light very lately in a still shorter copy (although but a Syriac version), and been edited and corrected from the Greek text by Cureton, first after two MSS. discovered in the Nitrian Desert in 1839 and 1843 (The Ancient Syriac Version of the Epistles of St. Ignatius, London and Berlin, 1845), and afterward more accurately in the *Corpus Ignatianum* by the aid of a third MS., discovered in 1847 (A Complete Collection of the Ignatian Epistles, etc., Berlin, 1849). Bunsen also gives a comparative view of the three editions (Hamburg, 1847). Petermann offers a rich collection of materials in his: *S. Ignat. epp. collatis edd. græcis versionibusque Syriaca, Armeniaca, Latinis* (Lipsiæ, 1849). A critical edition formed by the use of all this material is yet a desideratum, although Lipsius has made an excellent beginning toward it in the *Zeitschr. f. hist. Theol.*, 1856, I.

3) On account of the relation which the Ignatian Epp. bear to the earliest history of the Christian Church, the question of their genuineness has been very largely discussed, and because so many various copies are extant, the previous question, which of them must be regarded as original, must first be settled. Their critical history divides itself into three periods. The first extends to the discovery of the copy A. During this time it was determined that the three Epp. existing only in the Latin tongue should be rejected as spurious. Even Baronius gave them up. As to the others, opinions wavered. Whilst Bellarmine and Halloix declared them all genuine, the Magdeburg Centurionists doubted them, Calvin (*Inst.*, I., c. 13, 29) decidedly rejected them, though without sufficient reason, and some (as Scultetus) took middle ground by supposing interpolation. In the second period the result reached was that the 5 Epp. not named by Eusebius (4—8 in the enumeration already given) must also be considered spurious, and besides this, that the shorter copy, A., is much nearer the genuine text than the larger one, B. Meier (*Stud. u. Krit.*, 1836) attempted to defend the latter, but Rothe (*Anfänge d. chr. K.*, p. 735) and Arndt (*Stud. u. Krit.*,

839, I.) have thoroughly refuted him. On the other hand, diverse views in regard to the authenticity of the Epp. were entertained. It was favored chiefly by *Rothe* (l. c.), *Huther* (*Zeitschr. f. hist. Theol.*, 1841, IV.) and *Düsterdieck* (*De Ignatianarum epp. authentia*, Göttingæ, 1843); denied chiefly by *Baur* (über d. Urspr. des Episc., 1838, p. 147), who thinks they were composed for the purpose of strengthening the Catholic Church, after the middle of the 2d cent., and *Schwegler* (Nachap. Zeitalter, II., 59); whilst *Neander* was inclined on the whole to acknowledge the genuineness of the shorter copy, but with the limitation that it also was not free from important interpolations (Oh. Hist.). In the third period, new interest and discussion were awakened by the discovery of the shortest Syriac version of the 3 Epp. to the Ephesians, to the Romans and to Polycarp. The first editor, *Cureton*, at once gave his decided opinion that they are the genuine Ign. Epp., afterward interpolated to favor the doctrine of Christ's divinity and the episcopacy, and further enlarged by 4 spurious ones (*ad Mag.*, *ad Smyrn.*, *ad Phil.*, *ad Trall.*). This view he maintained in England against no strong opposition. In Germany, *Bunsen* supported it in the work before quoted, and in a second ("Ign. v. Ant. u. seine Zeit. Sieben Sendschreiben an Dr. Aug. Neander, Hamburg, 1847"), but with less success. *Baur* came out against him ("die Ign. Br. u. ihr neuester Kritiker. Eine Streitschrift gegen Herrn Bunsen, Tübingen, 1848") and argued for the originality of the shorter Greek copy, although he even regarded it as a forgery. In favor of this copy and its genuineness we find *Hefele* (*PP. AA. ed. 3, proleg. LVIII.*), *Denzinger* ("Ueber die Aecht. des bisherig. Textes d. Ign. Br.," Würzburg, 1849), *Uhlhorn* (l. c.) and *Petermann* (l. c.), whilst *Hilgenfeld* along with *Baur* regards the copy A. as more original, but at the same time not the work of Ignatius ("die apost. Väter," Halle, 1853, p. 274). On the other hand, *Ritschl*, in his history of the "Entstehung l. altkath. Kirche" (pp. 418 and 577), advocates the view that the genuine Ign. Epp. are contained in the Syriac version, but does not enter into details. *Weiss* has made a later attempt in defence (*Reuter's Repertorium*, 1852); a more extended justification, indeed we may say the first thorough one, has been given by *Lipsius* (*Zeitschr. f. hist. Theol.*, 1856, I.; comp. J. G. A. 1856, St. 152-154). Thus the controversy remains to this day undecided.

4) *The relation of the different copies or recensions.* Since B. is universally discarded, the question as to whether A. or S. is the original, is to be considered. The external evidences collected by *Cotelier*, more fully by *Cureton*, (*Corp Ign.*, p. 158) are decidedly more favorable to A. The oldest, the Ep. of Polycarp, *ad Phil.* 13, contains an undoubted quotation from A. The defenders of S. can only escape its force by declaring it an interpolation, but without sufficient reason (*Bunsen*, *Ritschl*, *Lipsius*). The following testimonies, that of *Irenæus* (c. *haer.*, I., 28) and those of *Origen* (*Prolog. in Cant. Cant. ed. de la Rue*, III., 30; *Hom. in Luc.*, ib. 38) decide nothing, because the brief passages

quoted are alike in both copies. *Eusebius* names in full (*H. E.*, III., 36) the seven Epp. of A., as also *Jerome* after him (*de viris ill.*, c. 16). The Ep. of Athanasius, *de Synodis Arimini et Seleucia* (ed. *Bened.*, I., 761), if it be altogether genuine, mentions *ad Eph.* (7) according to A. That Chrysostom was acquainted with S. alone, cannot be proven, since he cites merely two short sentences (*Hom. in S. Ign. Ed. Bened.*, II., 592, and *Hom. de Legislatore*, VI., 410), and the common reports concerning Ign. in the first suit as well, if not better, the 7 Epp. of A. Later evidences have no weight, and just as little can be gained from the Syriac MSS.—Thrown back thus upon internal grounds, it will certainly be of greater importance, if dogmatic diversities and later dogmatic views can be pointed out in A. That *Bunsen's* assertion of a Christological variation, according to which A. lays special stress upon the divinity of Christ, is erroneous, even *Lipsius* (l. c., p. 20) has acknowledged. Although the latter has set up a difference between the Christologies of the two, by which he supposes S. to rest upon Patripassian, or more correctly, modalistic conceptions, whilst A. finds its chief difficulty in the assertion of the true humanity of Christ, his position is scarcely tenable, since, leaving out of view the grave objections which spring from the development of Christological doctrine here supposed, the circumstance that in S. long passages, in which the humanity of Christ is asserted against the heretics are left out, is easily explained by the entire character of S. as an epitome; besides, particular passages in which the humanity is asserted occur even in S. (especially *ad Eph. inscr.*, where the interpretation of *Lipsius* is far from satisfactory) and others, which according to *Lipsius* are Patripassian, in A. alone (especially *ad Rom.* 6, which *Lipsius* indeed inserts in S.). Polemic references to the errors of Gnostic Docetism, abundant in A., are wanting in S., although a few traces may be discerned (especially *ad Polyc.* 1, 3, where *ἡτεροδιδασκαλοῦντες* are spoken of). Whether the combatting of errors is an argument against the genuineness of the Epp., see below. Passages bearing on episcopacy are for the most part wanting in S., yet enough remain to show that there is no essential variance between the two copies. In S. also the bishop is ranked higher than the congregation (*ad Pol.* 6) and represents its unity (*ad Eph.* 1), and the principle, that nothing shall be done without the bishop, which appears at large in A., we find plainly stated in S. (*ad Pol.* 4). Only in S. everything is fragmentary. The historical relations are essentially the same in both, and if ascertained to be true, the greater number of Epp. in A., and their greater length, can form no bar to this acknowledgment. Where they differ in this respect, it cannot be determined in many cases where the probability lies. In the chief variation in the Ep. to Polycarp it is manifestly on the side of A., since it is impossible that Ign. could have himself sent, as S. supposes, a successor to Antioch. Besides, A., where it varies from S., as in the Epp. wanting in the other, never contains such statements as facts derived from independent sources can

prove to be unhistorical. — In which the closer logical connection and the greater unity exists, whether it can be positively determined from particular passages that S. is an abridgment or A. an enlargement, is a matter of dispute. *Uhlhorn* has shown a better connection throughout in A., and endeavored to prove many traces of a secondary character in S. *Lipsius* always finds the reverse true (with a single exception (*ad Rom.* 6), where in S. a paragraph has been omitted by the negligence of the copyist), and everywhere in A. marks of interpolation. Just in this main point the question cannot be decided. Yet passages like *ad Rom.* 6, and especially *ad Eph.* 19, speak very strongly in favor of A. If S. is an abridgment of A., it must have been made in later times, for ascetic purposes, and can then have no historical value.

5) Still more undecided is the question of authenticity. The external evidences in favor of the Epp. have already been named. The quotation in the Ep. of *Polyc. ad Phil.*, is indeed ruled out by regarding that Ep. itself as spurious or interpolated (*Baur, Schwegler, Hilgenfeld*) — but the hypothesis of interpolation must be considered as very unfortunate, and the rejection of the whole Ep. by these scholars, who were preceded by *Semler* and some other older opponents of the Ign. Epp., so accords with their entire views of the post-apostolic age, and finds so little ground in the contents of the Ep., and so strong a barrier in the ancient testimonies in its favor (especially *Irenæus*), that hitherto it has met with few supporters. — Against the authenticity of the Ign. Epp. (the reference is now only to the copy A.) the following are the chief arguments: a) That the facts on which they rest are not historical. If, however, we derive these facts, not from the spurious legends of the martyrs, as *Baur* has done, but from the Epp. themselves, we will find them fully corresponding with the circumstances of the time. That Christians suffered martyrdom under *Trajan* is known; and that Ign. should be condemned *ad bestias* by the Governor of Antioch (and the Epp. intimate nothing else,) cannot appear strange when we read the accounts in *Hermas* (*Vis.*, III., 2), the *Ep. ad Diogn.* (c. 7), and *Justin* (*Dialog. c. Tr.* 110), where such sentences are recorded. That Ign. was sent to Rome, *εἰς εἶρην τοῦ δῆμου*, can be objected to with just as little reason, because the sending of condemned persons to Rome to fight there with wild beasts was first restricted by a law of *Severus* and *Antoninus* (*L.* 31, *D. de pœnis*). Such transportation did not yet depend upon the permission of the Emperor, and hence the mild disposition of *Trajan* cannot be arrayed against the fact, since he probably knew nothing of it. The route of travel was the usual one of the time, and that Ign., though a prisoner, had the privilege of receiving the envoys of the churches and writing epistles, because similar examples are recorded (*Lucian de morte Peregrini*, c. 12; *Tertullian ad martyres*; *Acta SS. Perpetuæ et Felicitatis*, c. 3), cannot be accounted strange, and the less so, since it is clearly enough intimated (*ad Rom.*, 5) that it was purchased by gifts. Nor is there the least difficulty in the circumstance, that Ign., in his Ep. to the

Romans, supposed that they might perhaps take measures to procure his liberation, since the way was open to them, he having been condemned by the Governor in Antioch, and not by the Emperor himself, to make appeal to the latter even against his will (*comp. L.* 6, *D. de appellat. et relationibus*). This entire class of objections, especially in the light of recent investigation, may be regarded as completely set aside. b) "The personality of Ign.," it is said, "as it appears in the Epp., agrees far better with a fabricated legend than real history." His "affected humility," and "mock-martyr heroism," give special offence (*Baur, Bunsen, Hilgenfeld*). Just the contrary is the judgment of *Rothe* (o. c., p. 715), who everywhere sees marks of genuineness, and denies to any one the capacity of discerning authorial peculiarities who does not decide with him. The argument is at all events very subjective, and of little weight. Whether the humility of Ign. was affected, or real, might be hard to determine, and though his martyr-heroism was perhaps not wholly free from earthly dross, since we discover in his *Ep. ad Rom.* an eccentric personality violently perturbed by an inward conflict, yet the image with its lights and shadows betrays no signs of fiction, but exhibits rather, in the sharp outlines with which it comes upon the stage, the stamp of genuineness. The most weighty arguments against the authenticity of the Epp. are undoubtedly the two following: c) In them heresies are combatted, which belong to a later period than the beginning of the 2d cent. It is a question whether two heresies, one Docetic and the other Judaistic, are attacked, or whether only one is to be admitted, to which both tendencies may be ascribed. *Pearson* (*Vindic.*, I., 2) favored two, whilst *Huther, Disterdieck*, and *Hefele*, find but one. The latter view *Uhlhorn* has defended at length (*l. c.*, p. 283), and *Hilgenfeld* the former (*AA. VF.*, p. 230), whilst *Lipsius* has come to the aid of *Uhlhorn*, and endeavored to refute *Hilgenfeld's* arguments. That only one heresy is referred to, would seem clear from passages like those *ad Mag.* 8–10, and *ad Phil.* 8, 9. In answering the question as to the period to which the heretics here combatted are to be assigned, the opponents of the authenticity of the Epp. disagree. According to *Baur* and *Hilgenfeld*, the latter of whom lays special stress on this argument, the Epp. presuppose the great Gnostic system, that of *Valentinus* and *Marcion*; according to *Lipsius*, on the other hand, the Docetism of the Epp. is indeed later than *Saturninus*, but earlier than *Valentinus*, and for this reason he places them between 130–140. It is easy to prove that the heretics of our Epp. preceded the great Gnostic systems, the blooming period of Gnosticism. They are manifestly attacked in their first rise, and are still few, *ῥῆγες* (*ad Mag.* 4; *ad Smyrn.* 5), *οἰστοὶ ἀπορεῖς*, and as the idea of number is very relative (*Hilgenfeld*), so the whole appearance of the heretics in the Epp. makes the impression that they have not yet grown to that threatening power to which Gnosis attained in 130–140. The particular elements of this error show less division than at a later time. The connection between Juda-

ism and Gnosticism is not indicated, as it comes out afterward in the Homilies, but as they are here, they belong to an earlier period. Whether, now, such heretics appeared about the year 108, depends upon the answer given to the still more comprehensive question, whether the germs of Gnosis existed already in the apostolic age, in fine, whether the heretics of the Pastoral Epp., and the Ep. to the Col., are to be regarded as positively Gnosticizing Judaists. If, as we certainly believe, the beginnings, though only the beginnings, of Gnostic doctrines are to be dated back in apostolic times, then the heretics of the Ign. Epp. form the true middle member, the transition link to the fully developed forms of Gnosis in 130, and opposition to them can afford about as little argument against the authenticity of the Epp., since after Gnosis had unfolded itself to what it became after 130, it would be altogether impossible for a forger or interpolator to represent its earlier stage as it occurs in the Epp. d) The ecclesiastical constitution of the Epp., it is said, especially the episcopate, belongs to a later era. It is indeed true, that the episcopate appears throughout in Ign. as an office different from, and superior to, that of the presbyter, yet he nowhere makes it of apostolic institution (not even in *ad Phil.* 1, which Hilgenfeld adduces; but the passage only treats of the installation of a particular bishop, and not of the institution of the office), and connects none of the Old Test. ideas of the priesthood with it. The presbyters still stand in high regard, and are almost always named with the bishop. The presbytery is the successor of the college of the apostles; the bishop, the vicar of Christ. As is clear from what is just said, the episcopate is regarded as a *congregational office* (*Gemeindeamt*), and not a *church office* (*Kirchenamt*), even not in *ad Smyrn.* 8, and *ad Eph.* 3). True, indeed, the episcopate has special importance in the eyes of Ign. for the sake of unity, which, as "ἄνθρωπος εἰς ἑῶν κατηρητισμένος" (*ad Phil.* 1), he seeks to strengthen, but to him only the unity of the congregation is represented in the bishop, whilst the "καθολικὴ ἐκκλησία" has its unity in Christ (see *ad Smyrn.* 8, where the phrase *κ. ἰ.* occurs). As head of the congregation, and vicar of Christ in it, the conduct of worship belongs to him, no marriages are to be concluded without his will, and no vows assumed without his consent. Ign. sees, it is true, in the episcopate an excellent means for preserving ecclesiastical unity against the inroads of heresy, but the bishops are not, for him, bearers of traditional doctrine on the ground of a special gift of the Holy Ghost, nor is any particular importance attached to the succession of the bishops. This form of Church government is certainly beyond the stadium of development found in Clemens Romanus and the Pastor of Hermas, since there a prominent presbyter, but still only *primus inter pares*, appears. And yet that of Irenæus is considerably in advance of this. In Irenæus the presbyters are put further in the background, and no longer figure as the successors of the Apostles; the episcopate has become a church-office, representing the unity of the Church, and the bishops, now regarded as the successors of the Apostles, are by their spe-

cial *charisma* the bearers of traditional doctrine—a progress far beyond Ignatius. Between Ign. and Iren., records are wanting by which we might trace the course of development in detail. Yet the ecclesiastical constitution of the Homilies, certainly more ideal than real, is further advanced than that of Ign., and Justin Martyr, in reference to worship at least, assigns a similar position to the bishop, for with him the *πρόεδρος* of the congregation has the conducting of it. We may add that, since with Ign. the episcopate appears as an institution still in its youth, and greatly needing recommendation, it need not be deemed so impossible a thing, that the form of Church government had already, about 108, progressed thus far in Syria—a land where many ecclesiastical institutions struck root, because a land in which the Church very early received a national character—in Asia Minor and in Rome (that this was the case in *all* congregations, is not intimated in the Epp.).—The question of the authenticity of the Ign. Epp., deeply interwoven as it is with all the important questions respecting the post-apostolic age, is by no means to be regarded as positively settled; but we are not wrong in saying, that the judgment concerning these Epp. has become much more favorable during the last decade of years. Many strong objections of an earlier date have been removed, and other difficulties brought much nearer to a solution.

6) *The doctrine of the Ign. Epp.* rests essentially upon a Pauline basis, since the Epp. of St. Paul are chiefly quoted. This is generally admitted. *Schwegler* alone (*N.-Apost. Z. A.*, II., 159) wishes to distinguish a mediating tendency in the prominence given to the *ἀγάπη* as the highest dogmatic idea, in which Christianity culminates, and according to *Hilgenfeld* (*l. c.*, p. 251) the Pauline idealism is thought to be modified in a realistic way. It were hard to prove either; and yet elements from the Gospel of John are brought in to modify the doctrines of Paul, since many references are made to the Gospel of the first-named apostle. *Baur* first attempted to point out Gnosticizing features in the Epp., and *Hilgenfeld* followed him more in detail—a view which harmonizes with the great latitude which these scholars give to Gnostic ideas. The outlines of the doctrines of the Epp. are about these: God has revealed himself to us in Christ, who, as *λόγος ἀίδιος*, became man (*ad Magn.*, 8; *ad Eph.*, 15), lived and suffered as true man (on which as opposed to Docetism he laid special stress), died and rose again. Ign. makes great account of the death of Christ. By it our salvation was effected (*Ταῦτα γὰρ πάντα ἔπαθεν, ἵνα σωθῶμεν*, *ad Smyrn.*, 2; comp. *ad Eph.*, 7; *ad Trall.*, 2; *ad Philad. inscr.*; *ad Trall. inscr.*). This salvation is appropriated by faith, whilst we die with Christ (*ad Magn.*, 9). By faith man comes to a new life (the *καὶνότης ἀδίδου ζωῆς*; comp. *ad Eph.*, 11), and this new life shows itself in love. In love the Christian character obtained by faith reveals itself (*ad Magn.*, 5), and since all virtues follow it (*ad Eph.*, 14), it is the end of Christianity, whose beginning is faith (*ad Eph.*, 14). Faith and love is the flesh and blood of Christ (*ad*

Trall., 8; *ad Rom.*, 7). The Holy Supper, which is brought forward very often, and in very strong language in the Epp., is the meat and drink of God (*ad Eph.*, 5; *ad Rom.*, 7), uniting us with Christ (*ad Phil.*, 4), a "φάρμακον τῆς ἀσθενείας" (*ad Eph.*, 20). In it at the same time the unity of the congregation completes itself; it is the *ἑνωστικόν*, yet so, that the prayer of thanks, the *εὐχαριστία*, appears as the special sacrifice. G. UHLHORN. — *Porter*.

Ignatius, Patriarch of Constantinople, a son of Emp. Michael I., was born c. 790, or 796, and a pupil of Tarasius, Patriarch of Constantinople. He lived in the midst of the strife which hastened the schism between the Greek and Roman Church. Leo V. had usurped his father's throne, and even emasculated Ignatius and put him in a monastery. He obtained his liberty again after some years, and by degrees reached the patriarchate (847). But his zeal for correcting the immoralities of the court soon led to his expulsion from office, by Michael III., and banishment to the island of Terebinthus. Photius, his opponent, succeeded him (858). Still Ignatius did not yield his claims, but maintained a party in Const., which led to a schism. Michael asked the mediation of Rome to heal the schism. Pope Nich. I. seized the opportunity of establishing a Roman primacy in the Greek Empire, and acted, not as mediator, but as judge. He reproved Michael for deposing Ignatius without his approbation (*MANSI, Conc. nova et ampl. Coll.*, XV., 160), and declared the deposition invalid, because the requisite number of witnesses (70) was not called in. He sent B. Zacharias and B. Radoaldus to Constantinople, but Photius won them to his side, and at the Council (861) they advocated his claims (*MANSI, l.c.*, 219, 241; XVI., 237). But as Photius did not avow the expected submission to Rome, Nicholas summoned a Council there, 863, which sustained Ignatius, and excommunicated Photius. Michael denounced this procedure; but Nicholas persisted, knowing that he had nothing to fear from a Greek Emperor, adopted for his course of conduct can. 9 of the Conc. of Chal. (*MANSI, VII.*, 369; XV., 201), threatened a ban, and expressed himself in accordance with the Pseudo-Isidorian principles, without quoting their language (cf. *NICOLAI, Ep.*, 70, *ad Hincm. et cæt. Episc.*). But Photius kept his place until Michael was murdered, and Basilus, the Macedonian, ascended the throne, who drove away Photius and restored Ignatius, 867. Nicholas now died, and Hadrian II. succeeded him. Ignatius soon became involved in a dispute with Hadrian, by claiming the Bulgarians for his diocese, whilst the Roman chair claimed them as having been converted by Latins (866). The disputes became very animated (*MANSI, XVII.*, 62) and survived Ignatius, who died in 878. His anniversary is Oct. 23. Besides his letters we have *S. Tarasii Vita* by Ignatius. — (See *SCHRÖCKH, K.-G.*, Th. 23, p. 355, &c.). NEUDECKER.*

Ignorantins (*Frères ignorantins, fratres ignorantiae*, the congregation of Christian instruction and schools), the name of a Jesuit institution in France, founded by Abbé Baptiste de la Salle (1724), the object of which was to give

gratuitous instruction in the public schools, in the interest of the hierarchy. Hence the Jesuits favored the society; it spread rapidly, and became a substitute for the Jesuit order, in 1764 and onward. At the outbreak of the Revolution the Ign. had 121 institutions, but in 1790 they too were driven from France. They fled to Italy, and began to labor there, when Napoleon allowed them (1806) to return, knowing that they would favor his schemes. In 1830 they had 250 large institutions; and now they have about 400, with 700 schools. They are also to be found in Germany and Bohemia, quietly laboring to advance their object. Their dress resembles that of the Jesuits. NEUDECKER.*

Ildefonsus, Archbishop of Toledo, born at Toledo, 607, of a distinguished family, educated under Isidore of Sevilla, became a monk, then Abbot of Agli, near Toledo, and finally, 658-67 (or 69) Archbishop of Toledo. Julian of Toledo says that Ildefonsus composed many works, which other duties prevented his finishing. We have, 1) *de illibata b. Virginis virginitate*, published in *bibl. Patr. Lugd.*, T. XII.; 2) two books *de cognitione baptismi et de itinere deserti quo pergitur post baptismum*; 3) a continuation of Isidore's *de viris illustr.* in *Fabr. bibl. eccl.*, p. 60, &c. In further continuation of it his successor St. Julian (680-90) wrote his life. — Two letters of Ildefonsus, with a reply of B. Quirinus of Barcelona, are in *d'Archéry Spicil.* — The Adoptians of the 8th cent. appealed to Ildefonsus also, as favoring their views (see *Alcuin, Opp. II.*, 568; I., 872. The Bolland Jan. 23. A Span. biogr. appeared in 1727. *Kurtz, K.-G.*, II., 1, 536). WAGENMANN.*

Illuminati. — There have always been fanatics, mystics, and theosophists, who have assumed the name of *illuminated ones*, as expressing their high attainments in the knowledge of God, and of the spirit-world. But the name was especially applied to the *Alumbrados*, or *Alumbrados*, a party which arose in Spain in 1575. Persecuted by the Inquisition, they soon disappeared, but arose again in France, in 1623, as *Guerinets*; there too they were suppressed in 1635. They believed that by inward prayer the soul might enter into such complete union with the being of God, that all its acts would be divine, so that such persons needed no good works or sacraments. A similar sect arose in 1722 in South France, who went so far as to assert that human nature might be wholly absorbed by the Holy Ghost. They also combined with their theory, all sorts of mysteries borrowed from the Freemasons, and continued until they were wholly suppressed during the Revolution of 1794 (*SHIRACH, Polit. Journal*, v. 1785-94). — But the name *Illuminati* is borne pre-eminently by the order founded May 1, 1776, by Adam Weishaupt, Professor in Ingolstadt, on a Freemason basis, and with Jesuit forms, the professed object of which was the attainment of individual moral perfection, and a general moral reformation, but which in reality developed tendencies destructive both for the State and the Church; because, in hostility to existing institutions, political and religious, it attempted to establish a religion of reason, to destroy positive Christianity, bring

about universal equality, and found a republic of unbounded liberty. Although Weishaupt was an excellent man, he lacked practical judgment, and did not see the dangers to which his substitution of naturalism for revealed religion unavoidably led. In 1780 Baron Adolph v. Knigge joined these Perfectibilists, and zealously promoted the order. He regarded Christianity not as a religion for all, but for the elect only, who really perpetuated it, through the schools of the mysteries, and that its proper sphere was Freemasonry. Whilst only a small number of the elect reached the highest grades of the order, it steadfastly pursued its aim of getting all the state offices into its own hands, and, in spite of its avowals of universal equality, acquiring unlimited power. To attain this object, its leaders employed the same means as the Jesuits, endeavoring to secure men of wealth and political influence as members, to surround rulers with its members, and to persuade them of its political importance, &c. Implicit, unquestioning obedience to officers was required of each member. Only the most cautious, zealous, and affable men could reach the higher grades of the order, and be initiated into its deeper mysteries, of which lower members had scarcely an idea. The mysteries related to religion, converted into naturalism and free-thinking, and to politics, substituting socialistic republicanism for monarchy. In the correspondence of the officers of the order in different places, a cryptography was used, commonly with figures, but also other signs. January was called *Dimeh*, February, *Benmeh*, &c.; Germany, the Orient, Bavaria, Achaia, &c. The order was designated by \odot , a lodge by \square . A letter for a chief of the order was marked *Q. I.* (*Quibus licet*), to open it; if intended for the chief of a higher grade, *Soli*; for a still higher one, *Primo*. Each *illuminatus* had a particular name; the founder was called *Spartacus*, Knigge was called *Philo*. — It is remarkable that the very men who proposed to secure universal equality, deprived their adherents of all liberty, and required them to be mere tools in their hands. The rapid spread of the order, which soon embraced not only men of rank and influence, but 2000 common members, must be attributed to the great activity and craftiness of its leaders, to the attraction which mysterious forms have for many persons, or to the combined efforts of some to make others serve their private schemes. It is said that even princes became members; but they were never admitted to the grades in which the deeper mysteries (political schemes) of the order were revealed. The chief seat of the order was in Bavaria, but it established itself in Berlin, Dresden, Leipzig, Vienna, &c., and extended to France, Belgium, Holland, Denmark, Sweden, Livonia, Poland, Hungary, and Italy.

Its organization was mainly the work of Weishaupt, who had been a Jesuit, but on the abolition of that order became its bitter opponent, and Knigge. It was patterned after Jesuitism. In 1777 Weishaupt joined the Freemasons, but he became more fully acquainted with the nature of this society through Knigge and Marotti. His aim at the outset was to

unite the Freemason order with his society, and thus, securing the success of his movement, finally absorb that order. Through Knigge's efforts he secured the adoption of illuminatism in Freemason lodges, but this also created many enemies to his order, who contributed to its downfall. It was Knigge, also, who had the order organized on the plan of Freemason. The order was divided into three classes, with various sub-grades. 1. The preparatory class, to which novitiates, Minervals, and *illum. minores* belonged. Applicants had to be 18 years old, and the novitiate lasted from one to three years, according to the talents of the member. Duly trained, he was placed under the constant supervision of his overseer, received a name, and was taught the cryptography of the order. Having completed his novitiate, he became a Minerval, received, as the sign of the order, a green band, with the picture of an owl upon it, holding a book, on which were printed the letters *P. M. C. V.* (*per me coeci vident*). Having qualified himself in this grade, he became an *illum. minor*; no special ceremonies were used on admitting him to this grade, only he was made acquainted with its rules, its motto, *Cave ne cadas*, and the sign of recognition, holding up the forefinger of the right hand. — 2. The Freemasons, divided into scholars, fellows, and masters; it included two higher grades, that of the *illum. major*, or Scottish novices, and *illum. dirigens*, or Scottish knights. An applicant for the former had to furnish a minute autobiography, and reveal the inmost feelings of his heart, and even then his promotion would fail if three members objected. To be admitted to the *illum. dirigens* the applicant had to swear that he would never belong to any other secret society, not even the Freemasons. When admitted, he was led into a lodge draped in green; there the members sat in their uniform, the president under a green canopy, wearing the St. Andrew's band, and the star of the order. On his right sat the priest of the order robed in white. Under solemn ceremonies he was dubbed a knight of St. Andrew of Scotland, and was told the sign of his order; crossing the arms, and taking hold of the elbows of the brother, saying: "Behold me, if thou seest no sign in me." The other replies: "Yea, I see the flaming star upon thy brow," and kisses him. The person admitted was called *illum. dirigens*, because he had supervision and control of the Minerval lodges. It was especially his duty to persuade Freemasons to join the new order. This was the highest grade which could be attained by those not admitted to the proper mysteries of the order. 3. The class of the mysteries, divided into the greater and lesser mysteries, the last, again, into the grades of priests and regents. If a Scottish knight wished to enter the grade of priests, he had first to answer various questions pertaining to religious and social life, and then was led blindfold to the lodge by a circuitous route; there a sword was put into his hands, and on being called: "Come in, unhappy fugitive. The fathers wait for thee, come in and lock the door after thee," he entered into a richly decorated room, in which there lay upon a table, standing before a canopy, costly jewels

and a simple white priest's robe, between which he was to choose. If he took the latter he was admitted. Then he was instructed in the peculiar secrets of the order, and received the dress of the grade, viz., besides the white robe, a broad scarf of scarlet silk, and a four-cornered hat of red velvet. The sign of the grade consisted in placing the hands crosswise upon the head, then offering the hand, fingers shut and thumb extended, to the other, who then took hold of the thumb. The brothers of a lower grade called the priest *Epopt*; the officers called him *Hierophant*. From the priest's grade they passed to that of *Princeps*, in which they advanced to still more radical views of religion and politics. The initiation took place in a room draped in black, with a skeleton in it, at whose feet lay a crown and a sword. Back of this room was another, with the door open, in which the president sat upon a throne. The candidate was led, manacled, into the first room, and there stood a while in meditation; then the president took off his manacles, put on him the dress of the order, communicated the sign, and pronounced him a *Princeps*. The dress was a white cloak with a red cross, a breastplate of white leather, also having on it a red cross, a white hat with a red feather, and red buskins. The signal word was *Redemptio*, whilst uttering which the brother reached out both his hands wide opened.—The grade of the *greater* mysteries also consisted of two classes, called *Magus* and *Rex*; in the former fully developed naturalism was cherished, in the latter socialism and republicanism. There were no special initiatory ceremonies. The brothers were the *Areopagites* of the order, at whose head stood the General (*Weishaupt*) with a privy council, composed of the higher officers, the provincial colleges (the presidents of a province, elected by the regents), the national directories, and the *Areopagus* consisting of twelve members; the last was the highest court of the order, but under the General.

The Order continued a secret until it sought to absorb the Freemasons; and even then its seditious and irreligious tendencies remained long unknown, although the former were suspected in Bavaria in 1781. They became public in 1783, when the order rapidly sank. Various causes hastened its dissolution, but especially its tyrannical rules, the mistrust it engendered, the ambition of its members, and rivalry between *Weishaupt* and *Knigge* themselves. By an edict of June 22, 1784, the Elector Charles Theodore dissolved the order in Bavaria. *Knigge* then left it, but it still existed secretly. The government seized its books and papers, and exposed its entire character by publishing them (Munich, 1787). The members of the order were imprisoned and banished. A price was put on *Weishaupt's* head. He found a safe retreat with Duke Ernest of Gotha-Altenburg, and died in Gotha Nov. 18, 1830.—(See *Grosse Absichten d. Orden d. Illum.*, &c.: Münch., 1786; *Nachtrag zu d. grossen Absichten*, &c.: Münch., 1786. *R. Z. Becker*, *Grundsätze &c. d. Illum.*, &c., 1786. *Weishaupt*, *Apol. d. Illum.*: Frankf., 1786. *Philo's* (*Knigge*) *endliche Erklärung*, &c.: Hann., 1788. *Voss*, *Ueber d. Illum.*, 1799). NEUDECKER.*

Images, among the Hebrews.—In Exodus 20 : 4, &c., the Israelites are expressly forbidden to make images for religious uses, if not for all purposes. No image of the invisible, eternal Creator should be made or worshipped by the creature, especially as all such images must be inadequate. But the law did not prohibit all kinds of imagery in their worship; on the contrary, certain artistic symbols were prescribed in the arrangement of the sanctuary, as the cherubim (Ex. 25 : 18, &c.; 26 : 1; 36 : 35 [cf. Jos. ANTT., 3. 6, 2]), and these with olive-trees (1 Kings 6 : 23, 32, 35), oxen and lions (1 Kings 7 : 29, 36), flowers (Ex. 25 : 31, &c.; 1 Kings 6 : 18, &c.), the twelve colossal oxen supporting the brazen sea (1 Kings 7 : 25), and even the brazen serpent (Numb. 21 : 8, &c. On these several symbols see the respective articles). But with these simple and innocent symbols the people were not satisfied; for they added, partly ancient religious images of their own, partly such as they imitated from the surrounding heathen, until the pure worship obtained from God, was well nigh superseded. This worship had primarily to contend with the ancient custom of the Shemitic race of having *house-gods*, *teraphim* (see Art.) appealed to as oracles (Hos. 3 : 4; Zech. 10 : 2). Rachel took such (resembling the human form, 1 Sam. 19 : 13, &c.) with her to Canaan, where we find them in spite of Jacob's remonstrance (Gen. 31 : 19; 35 : 2); and they are found not only during the anarchical period of the Judges (17 : 5; 18 : 27), but to the reformation under Josiah (2 Kings 23 : 24; Ezek. 21 : 26). This indicates their Mesopotamian-Babylonian origin. They were not associated with the worship of Jehovah, but retained alongside of it, at least sporadically, for several centuries.—The inclination of Israel to the use of images is further explained by their long abode in Egypt, where animal-worship prevailed (see Art. *Calf*). Bethel especially became a centre of such idolatry (Amos 3 : 14; 7 : 10, 13; Hos. 10 : 15; see *Jeroboam*), and continued such until Josiah abolished it (2 Kings 17 : 28; 23 : 15, &c.). At Beersheba in Judah, it was also established (Amos 5 : 5; 8 : 14); but, otherwise, from the time of David and Solomon, the worship of Jehovah without images was general there, and hence, probably, the people of Judah, no less inclined to sensuous worship than the Ephraimites, were more easily drawn into heathen idolatry. And if in patriarchal times, the Canaanitish worship of sacred trees and stones, as memorials, or images of deities, passed over to Jacob's descendants (Gen. 28 : 10, &c.; 31 : 35; see v. Lengerke, *Kanaan*, I., 251, &c.; Ewald, *Alterthüm.*, 124, 234, &c.), which of course the law forbade (Levit. 26 : 1), it is easy to see how the cultus of related surrounding tribes would influence the Israelites after their establishment in Canaan; and especially during a period of civil disorders (Judges 17 : 6), and when the more distant tribes were so far from the regulating and restraining power of the stated worship at Shiloh. Hence in different places, the worship of Ashtoreth, Moloch, Chemosh, &c., was practised. Under Samuel, indeed, a purer religion began to predominate, and under David idolatry proper may have disappeared;

nt in the last years of Solomon it again became scendant, through the influence of his strange wives (1 Kings 11 : 1, &c.). And in spite of the reactions effected by prophets, and more pious kings, as Asa, Josiah, Hezekiah, idolatry and star-worship continued until the exile (2 Kings 23 : 4, &c.; Jer. 2 : 3, 4; Ezek. 16 : 15, &c.; 7 : 20, &c. &c. See *Idolatry*).—The mentioned images of the deity, usually consisted of

figure (לפפ) carved out of wood or stone (rarely metal), plated with some precious metal (מספ), both terms being used to designate the entire image. The prophets often describe the folly of worshipping such impotent images (Jer. 10; Is. 44, &c.).—Of non-religious images, only the lions at Solomon's throne are mentioned (1 Kings 10 : 29, &c.). After the exile, the Jews became more strict in regard even to such, at least the orthodox Pharisees applied the Mosaic prohibition to all kinds of images (Jos., *Antt.*, 17, 6, 2; *B. J.*, 1, 33, 2), even to architectural ornaments (*B. J.*, 2, 10, 4; *de vita*, 12), and objected to the imperial ensign being admitted into Jerusalem (*Antt.*, 18, 3, 1; 15, 8; *B. J.*, 2, 9, 2; *TACIT.*, *hist.*, 5, 5). But this rigid view was not universal. John Hyro. adorned his castle with colossal figures (*Antt.*, 2, 4, 11), and Queen Alexandra allowed portraits of her children to be painted (*Antt.*, 15, 2; 19, 9, 1). RÜRSCHL.*

Image-worship in the Romish Church, or rather the *veneration* of images; for that Church complains of being unjustly accused of an idolatrous worship of images. And it must be admitted that she has guarded herself, by definitions, against such objections. As in the case of the general reading of the Scriptures, and of good works, her formal avowals seem to favor the truth, whilst they yet admit of error, and have practically led to it, so in this case. She distinguishes between the adoration and worship of saints, and yet in fact the devotions of her people are directed far more to saints than to Christ. Thus also with images of saints. The Council of Trent (Sess. XXV., *de invoc. Sanct.*, &c.) decrees: "*Imagines porro Christi, Deiparæ Virginis et aliorum Sanct. in templis præsertim habendas, et retinendas; eisque debitum honorem et venerationem impertiendam; non quod credatur nesse aliqua in iis divinitas, vel virtus, propter quam sint colendæ,*" &c.,—and appeals to the 2d Nicene Council. This honoring and veneration involves the consecration of their images, offering incense to them, and the use of the appropriate prayers, in the *Pontif. Rom.*, &c. Whilst, therefore, the Rom. Church avoids the term *adoration*, or *worship*, she practises the thing. Her nice distinctions are not noticed by the multitude, but her acts are. And even some Romish theologians favor the popular view of the matter. Thomas Aquinas puts the following dilemma: if we regard an image *per se*, no veneration is due to it, but if regarded as an image of Christ, it would be vain to inwardly distinguish between the image and its subject, so that adoration and worship belong to it as well as to Christ (III., *Sent. dist.*, 9, *qu.* 1, *art.* 3; *Summa qu.* 23, *art.* 4, 5). Bonaventura

correctly argued: as all worship paid to the image of Christ avails for Christ, worship is due his image (*cultus, latriæ* 1, III., *dist.* 9, *art.* 1, *qu.* 2). Bellarmin teaches: the images of Christ and the saints are to be worshipped, not only indirectly, but directly, *ita ut ipsæ (imagines) terminent venerationem, ut in se considerantur et non ut vicem gerunt exemplaris*. The image itself is holy because of its resemblance to a holy thing, its consecration, and its sacred use. Hence, a less degree of adoration is due them than to God (*de imag. SS.* 1, II., *c.* 10); that is, the difference is one of quantity, not quality. To such views the Rom. Church has never objected.—History shows that these views are the result of a gradual, slow development. The Catholic Church of the first three centuries repelled the very arguments, urged by heathen in favor of images, as are now employed in their vindication. The heathen said: "We do not worship the images, but the beings they represent;" to which LACRANT., *Just. div.*, lib. II., *c.* 2, rejoins: "You honor them, because you believe they are in heaven; why then not raise your eyes to heaven? why gaze at the wood and stone?" &c. The Council of Elvira (305) decreed, *c.* 36: *placuit, picturas in eccl. esse non debere, ne quod colitur aut adoratur, in parietibus depingatur*. They feared that the use of images would lead to idolatry. They were introduced into churches in the 4th and 5th cents., as a means of instructing the ignorant masses then becoming Christians; they were pronounced the Bible of the laity. Their use was soon perverted, but earlier in the East than West. But in the West, likewise, the idolatrous tendency soon showed itself. Hence, Serenus, *B.* of Marseilles, broke and removed certain images which he saw were adored. Greg. M. approved his course, and reminded him of what Paulinus of Nola, and Nilus, had said, that pictures were simply to serve as narratives to those who could not read (*lib.* IX., *ep.* 105). He assumes as a general principle, that the invisible might be exhibited in visible forms (*lib.* IX., *ep.* 52). But soon afterwards we learn that he also kneeled (*prosternimus*) before the image, mentally adoring Christ. Hence the Rom. bishops accept the decrees of the 2d Council of Nice. Charlemagne published the Carolinian Books against that Synod, which, whilst allowing the use of images in churches, do so *only* for the purposes of commemoration and ornament. For, it is added, if intelligent persons would not worship the images themselves, the common people would be tempted by them to idolatry, if any prayers were offered before them (*lib.* III., 16). True to this position, the Council of Frankf. on the M., 794, and of Paris, 825, reaffirmed it, although Pope Hadrian anathematized the rejection of image-veneration; indeed, the Council of Paris freely avowed an opinion adverse to that of the Pope. During the whole 9th cent. this opinion prevailed, only Claudius of Turin, Agobard, and a few others dissenting. Jonas of Orleans, the opponent of Claudius of T., says distinctly (in *de cultu imaginum*) that images were hung in churches *solummodo ad instruendas nescientium mentes*.—This last view the Rom. Church still maintains (Decrees of Trent, *l. c.*), only she had

added what the Frank. C. so correctly forbade, a mistake, it is true, almost unavoidable in their position. (See *Iconoclasts*.) HERZOG.*

Immunity, ecclesiastical.—In Church language, a distinction is made between *immunitas ecclesiastica* and *imm. ecclesiae*. The latter is equivalent to the right of a refuge, the former to *libertas eccl.*, and designates exemption from general public duties. The ministers of religion, among all nations, enjoyed certain privileges and liberties not granted to others. Thus Roman priests, whose prerogatives were transferred, after Constantine, to the Christian clergy (see J. GOTHOFREDUS, in the *Paratheton* to the *Cod. Theodos.*, l. XVI., t. X., *de paganis, sacrificiis et templis*, in RITTER's ed., T. VI., P. I., 280, 281; and FABROT on c. 14, l. c. 320). These included, especially, exemption from civil and congregational offices, *census*, *munera sordida*, *parangariae*, and *metati onus* (GOTHOFREDUS, l. c., t. II., *de episcopis*, &c., l. c., p. 20, 21). To this was added the prerogative of a special eccl. court (see *Jurisdiction eccl.*). These privileges extended to the persons and families of the clergy, and to the property of the Church, but not to their private property, nor to such persons as became clergymen only to escape obligations. These principles were ever maintained in the Rom. Empire, as is evident from Justinian's including them in the new codex, of 529 (cf. c. 1, 2, 3, 6, &c., *C. de episc. et cler.*, l. 3, of 343, 357, 360, 377). Justin. added (532) the *immunitas tutelae* (c. 52, *C. cit.*, l. 3), which he subsequently defined as forbidding bishops and monks from assuming such tutelage (*Nov. CXXIII.*, c. 5, *Auth. Presbyt.*, *C. cit.*, l. 3).—The Germans also granted many privileges to their priests (*Cæs.*, *de bello Gall.*, VI., c. 13, 14), which were then transferred to Christian clergymen, who also enjoyed those granted by the Roman law (*secundum legem Rom. eccl. vivit. Lex Ribuaria*, t. LVIII., § 1, &c.). And Clotaire I., 560, allowed the Church the exemption at 30 years, fixed in the Rom. law (*Const.*, c. 13, in PERTZ, *Mon. Germ.*, III., 3). The Church itself took care that earlier privileges were not curtailed, by appealing to the imperial constitutions (c. 40, *Can. XVI.*, qu. I., c. 23, *Can. XXIII.*, qu. VIII.), and inflicted upon offenders eccl. penalties. The protection which the Church secured to all her clients, greatly increased her wealth. This relation was called, in the 6th cent., *mitium* or *mitium legitimum* (cf. ROTH, *Gesch. d. Beneficialwesens*: Erlangen, 1850, p. 163, &c.). To this were soon joined other rights, since the exemption from taxes involved the right of levying upon those protected the taxes which they owed the exchequer. This was called *emunitas*, and rested upon a royal grant. To the other fiscal taxes belonged costs of prosecution and fines, which the person enjoying the immunity could draw. Hence, immunity was granted *absque introitu iudicium*. To this was subsequently added the right of summons to the army, by which the Church assumed military duties. From these immunities, for which we early find the expression *territorium*, the spiritual lordships subsequently arose (RETTBERG, *K.-G. Deutschl.*, Bd. II., § 97).—The strict maintenance of this immunity was repeatedly urged

by Frankish edicts (*Capit. Syn. Vernensis*, a. 755, c. 19, 28. *Cap. Molens.*, a. 756, c. 8, &c.) and no less the liberties granted to the clergy and eccl. property. Lewis the Pious ordered that every church should have a *mansus* free of all imposts (*Capit. a.* 816, c. 10; c. 25, *Can. XXIII.*, qu. VIII.); this law was renewed by the *Capit. Wormatiense*, a. 829, c. 4, *Conc. Mâdense*, a. 845, c. 63 (c. 24, *Can. XXIII.*, qu. VIII., *Wormat.* a. 858, c. 58, &c.). Property subject to tribute, however, which the Church might additionally acquire, was subject to existing taxes, unless exempted by a special royal privilege (*Capit. III.*, *Caroli M.* a. 812, c. 11., *Capit. IV. Ludov.*, a. 819, c. 2). Subsequently, also, the Church and clergy were so burdened with taxes by rulers, and in cities, that the Lateran Council of 1179, c. 19, and 1215, c. 46, forbade this under penalty of the ban, except that the aid of the clergy might be demanded in cases of necessity (c. 47, X., *de immunit. eccl.*, III., 49), whereupon Fred. II. decreed that those who abused their immunity should be mulcted threefold, and subject to public penalties (*Const. Frid. II.* of 1220, § 2, in PERTZ, *Mon.*, IV., 243). Still this law was violated, and Alex. IV., 1260, Bonif. VIII., 1296, and Clem. V., 1311, had to reiterate earlier threatenings (c. 1, 3, *de immunit.* in 6°. III., 23, c. 4, *de censibus* in 6°. III., 20. *Cap. to Clem. de immunit.*, III., 17, c. 3. *Clem. de censibus*, III., 13). And though the Council of Trent (s. XXV., c. 20,) claimed divine authority for this prerogative, and the *Bulla in causa Domini* (see Art.) repeatedly urged the matter, complete immunity has not always been maintained. For the clergy, especially bishops, were often required to furnish the King, and his train, gifts for their journey (Du FRESNE, *Gloss.*, *gistan*).—Existing laws, in general, exempt clergymen from civil duties. H. F. JACOBSON.*

Impanatio, or *assumptio*, is one of the many modifications of the doctrine of transubstantiation (see Art.). After various obscure hints which, if developed, would have led to the theory of impanation, it was first distinctly set forth by Abbot Ruprecht of Deutz († 1135), who argued that as God, in becoming incarnate, did not destroy the human nature assumed, so the substance of the bread and wine in the sacrament is not destroyed, though he literally unites with it; and as the Word, which became incarnate, was not changed into flesh, but assumed flesh, so the sacramental elements, when raised up to actual union with him, are *non mutatum* into the taste and nature of blood, but invisibly and insensibly assume both, and so the divine and human immortal substance which is in Christ (*Opera ed. Col.*, 1602, I., 267; *Comm. in Exod.*, II., 10; *De opp. Sp. S.*, III., 21, 22; *De divinis offic.*, II., 9; *Opp.*, II., 762, &c.). He also declares that whoever ate the visible bread of the sacrifice, but by unbelief rejected the invisible bread joined with that, slew Christ; proving that, whilst he held to a real spiritual participation, he rejected an impanation of the Logos, as parallel with the incarnation.—Ruprecht's contemporary, Alger, or Adelher, of Liege († 1131), in his vindication of transubst. (*LL. III.*, *de sacra corp. et s. D.*, in *Bibl. max.*, PP. XXI.: Lugd. 1677), first used *impanatio* in the sense of trans-

abst.: in pane Chr. quasi IMPANATUM, sicut leum in carne personaliter incarnatum (p. 251. ff. Bibl. max., l. c. XVIII., 441). This is the doctrine which John of Paris († 1306) preferred (*Determinatio de modo exist. corp. Chr., &c., ed. Petro Allix.: Lond., 1686, 8vo.*). We may reach, he says, that the substances of the bread *manerent sub suis accid. in Sacr. altaris non in proprio supposito, sed tracta ad esse et suppositum Chr., ut sic sit unum supp. in duabus naturis.* There are not two corporities — humanity and divinity — but one body, because a body is not, but possesses, corpority. Peter escaped by death from a compulsory renunciation of this view. But as *impanatio* shared the difficulties of transubst., without its simplicity, the view was soon dropped, though Occam († 1347) still clung to it.—(See SCHRÖCKH's *K.-gesch.*, Bd. 28, p. 54, &c., 71, &c.; MÜNSCHER's *Lehrb. d. Dogmen-gesch.*, 3 Aufl. v. Daniel v. Kölln, II., 1, 144, n. 2, § 145, n. 12, 13; KLEE, *do.*, II., 202; LAGENBACH, *do.*, § 196; *Ersch u. Gruber, Encycl.*, II., 16).—Subsequently, *Andr. Osiander*, and *Luther* (by Carlstadt, Bellarmine, &c.) were unjustly charged with holding *impanation* (FUS-NEGGER, *dissert. de impan. et consubst.*, Jenæ, 677). Cotta (on J. Gerhard's *loci theol.*, X., 65, &c.) understands by it: *localem corporis in pane, tanquam in receptaculo, et vini in sanguine inclusionem.* But it is thus often confounded with consubstantiation (see *Lord's Supper, controversy*). Those holding *impanatio* are also called *dessearii*, from *adesse*. L. PELT.*

Incapacity, absolute disqualification for ordination, as in unbaptized persons, and women. Of course, a person desiring consecration to an ecclesiastical office must be a member of the Church. But baptism is *janua ecclesiæ, vitæ spiritualis*, and the foundation of all other ordinances (c. 60, *can. I., qu. I., capit. Theodori Cantuariensis, &c. &c.*). A *baptismus fluminis* and *anguinis*, it is admitted, may save, but not constitute a member of the visible Church. Hence the Council of Nice (325, b. 19, c. 52, *can. I., u. I.*) decreed that when clergymen of sects who did not properly baptize (Cataphrygians, &c.), entered the Catholic Church, they must be rebaptized to be ordained. And it was repeatedly declared that if it was discovered that persons ordained had not been baptized, they should be baptized, and then reordained (c. 112, *dist. IV., de consecr. [Leo. a. 458] c. 60; can. I., u. I., &c.*), although a priest ordained by an unbaptized priest, had not to be baptized, according to Innoc. II. (c. 2, X. *de presb. non bapt.*, &c.).—The incapacity of women has never been questioned in the Church (Gen. 3 : 16; 1 Tim. 2 : 12; 1 Cor. 14 : 34, 35. TERTULL., *de veland. virg.*, c. 8. August., c. 17, *can. XXXIII., qu. I., &c. &c.*). Hence the decrees against ordaining, consecrating, or blessing women as *presbyteræ* (*viduæ*) or *diaconæ* (*diaconissæ*), also against their teaching in promiscuous assemblies, handling sacred vessels or garments, and carrying incense around the altar (*Conc. Laodic., a. 372, c. 11, in c. 19, dist. XXXII. Conc. transic., I., a. 441, can. 26; Epæonense, a. 517, an. 21; Aurelianense II., a. 533, can. 18 [ed. Brunet. II., 126, 170, 187]; cf. c. 23, can. XXVII., u. I., Novella Justin. VI., cap. 5; Conc. Car-*

thag. IV., a. 378, c. 36, in c. 29, dist. XXIII., c. 20, dist. IV., de consecr. Pseudoisidor in c. 25, dist. XXIII., c. 41, 42, dist. I., de consecr.). Abbesses were forbidden to bless nuns, hear confessions, and preach publicly (c. 10, X., *de pœnit. et remiss.* [V., 38] Innoc. III., a. 1210).—The evangelical Church also regard unbaptized persons and women, as incapacitated for ordination. H. F. JACOBSON.*

Incorporation.—The incorporation of a benefice consists in its being united with a monastery, institution, &c., *quod spirituali et temporalia.* We meet with such incorporations as early as the 9th cent., effected to increase the revenues of spiritual corporations, and for other reasons. The result was, that previously self-subsistent offices were absorbed by the corporation with which the benefice was united, and which also assumed the duties of those offices; thus a *parochus principalis* was obliged to discharge the cure of souls, by a vicar whom he appointed with the bishop's confirmation. Upon this vicar devolved the *cura animarum actualis*, whilst the monastery, &c., only held the *cura habitualis*. For such cases the canonical precepts often urge the appointments of perpetual vicars, though only temporary vicars were frequently appointed, or the duties left merely to members of the order not residing in the parish.—Essentially different from these *pleno jure*, or *utroque jure*, incorporations, were those unions of benefices with spirit. corpor. which related only to temporalities, often called *incorp. quoad temporalia*, in which merely the property was transferred, and the right to its revenues, on condition that the incumbent of the benefice was paid *portio congrua*. In this case the *spiritualia* continued as before, and the Bishop appointed a person proposed by the monastery, &c., to the office. Such clergymen, though really *parochi*, were called *vicarii*, were perpetual, and subject only to the Bishop (c. 1, X. *De capellis monarch., III., 37; c. un. De capell. monach. in VI., III., 18*). The Council of Trent took action against the many abuses which sprang out of these unions (s. 7, c. 7, *De reform.*; cf. s. 24, c. 13; s. 7, *De reform. c. 6*). Since then the evil has abated (see NELLER, *Diss. de genuina idea et signis parochialitatis primitivæ ejusque principio incorp.*, and *Ejusdem Diss. de juribus parochi, &c.*, in SCHMIDT, *Thes. jur. eccl.*, VI., 441, &c.). WASSERSCHLEBEN.*

Independents, or *Congregationalists*, in England and America, are those who hold that any number of Christians, who may associate for worship and religious transactions, constitute a Church, with full authority for self-government independently of any higher court, and for the discharge of all ecclesiastical functions.—*Origin and fundamental doctrines.* The fierce persecutions waged against the Puritans under Queen Elizabeth drove many Presbyterians to Holland. There, sore with the violence attempted against their consciences under episcopal authority, they adopted the opinion of their leader, *Robert Brown* (see Art.), that every congregation was an independent society, not subject to any higher eccl. authority, whether of bishops, councils, presbyteries, or synods. After *Brown's* secession, this party found a better leader in

John Robinson, who somewhat restricted the principle of Independence, and better organized the party. Previously, the congregation, after due consultation, decided all questions by the vote of the majority, even electing ministers in that way; Robinson had some rules adopted, requiring certain qualifications in persons elected to church offices. Brown, embittered by intolerance, had, with no less bigotry, denounced all other forms of Church government as antichristian; Robinson, whilst regarding his own form as most apostolical, recognized others, also, as allowable. This broad concession involved the principle of perfect toleration. Early in the 17th cent. the name "Brownist" was supplanted by that of *Independents*, favored by declarations of Robinson in an apologetic work: "*Cœtum quemlibet particularem esse totam, integram et perfectam eccl. ex suis partibus constantem immediate et INDEPENDENTEM (quoad alias eccl.) sub ipso Christo;*" but this name first became general when the Independents took an active part in the political movements of the 17th cent.—by which, however, they and the Episcopalians became very obnoxious, so that the Independents then usually styled themselves *Congregationalists*. Although single congregations gradually approximated other Prot. churches in their forms and regulations, the maintenance of independence, and the rejection of established creeds, continued to be their distinctive characteristic. They use no liturgical forms, and the only bond of union between the members of each congregation, is faith in the Gospel of Christ, and the recognition of the Bible as the only rule of faith. The consociation of several congregations, or their representatives, to consider matters of general interest, is not forbidden by them, but the acts of such assemblies have no binding authority.

History.—**Henry Jacob**, a friend and fellow-believer of Robinson's, returned to England in 1616, and organized some Puritans into the first Independent congregation, after the model of the English congregations in Holland. Jacob became its pastor. For twenty years it escaped the vigilance of the State church, as its meetings were held in different private families. At length a spy of the B. of London detected them; several members were imprisoned, others fled to New England. Soon, however, views so consonant with the dominant opinions of those times, found other advocates. In 1640, a congregation discovered in the house of Stephen More was brought to trial. The members confessed that they acknowledged Christ as the only head of the Church, and denied the right of any temporal power to bind the conscience. But so mighty had the current become in favor of such sentiments, that a confession which, but a year previously, would have cost a man his ears (NEAL, Hist. of the Puritans, II., 398), was now made with impunity. The meetings multiplied. It was found that their forms of worship, &c., agreed essentially with those of other Protestant churches. They observed the sacraments, preached, read the Scriptures, had pastors, ruling elders, &c., like others. During the struggles of Parliament with the King and Church, the Independents increased, especially

as Cromwell and Milton were among their adherents. But historians like Clarendon do them gross injustice in charging them with opposition to all civil authority, with treasonable desires and schemes, and with the death of Charles I. These accusations are prompted by Romish and hierarchical predilections, which call for a union of Church and State, whilst Independents maintain that the civil and spiritual swords should be in different hands. Formally to disclaim such accusations, the Congregational societies in and about London published a solemn Declaration, in 1647, setting forth their principles as being especially in full harmony and good citizenship. That most Independents sided with Cromwell and favored extreme measures is not to be denied, but their views were those of but private individuals; as a body they had no political creed, and several of their clergymen petitioned Fairfax on behalf of the King (NEAL, III., 537, &c.).—Under Cromwell's Protectorate, their number and influence grew rapidly, many prominent and learned men joining them, whom Cromwell appointed to important posts in Colleges and Universities. They now began to feel the need of union among themselves. An assembly was held in the Savoy, attended by the ministers and delegates of more than a hundred congregations, which adopted, Oct. 12, 1658, a few weeks before Cromwell's death, a Confession of Faith and Discipline, entitled, a "Declaration." But to save their principle of independence, this declaration was not invested with binding symbolical authority; and to guard against all hierarchical schemes, it was enacted, that no one should be ordained without having a call from some particular congregation. They used similar precautions against all civil interference in Church matters, excepting when Christians were guilty of civil disturbances.—Whilst Independents may boast of having established the principle of eccl. self-government, it must be conceded to their honor, that they never abused civil power for purposes of intolerance, but that in an age when religious persecutions and oppression were thought obligatory, they sacredly maintained liberty of conscience. Some individuals, indeed, may have cherished hopes of securing general assent to their views (as Milton, in his remarkable treatise on the best means of getting rid of hirelings, 1659), but such views were not general, and only excited the wrath of Episcopalians, who, on the restoration of the Stewarts, had the *Act of Uniformity* passed, 1662 (see *England, Church of*). A season of persecution now opened upon all Dissenters: their meetings were prohibited by the *Conventicle-act*, and offenders were imprisoned and fined. Thousands fled to New England, and there founded congregations wholly on their own principles, and were zealous in spreading the Gospel among the Indians. Here their views of the relation between the Church and State became a fundamental principle of government. They formed associations, composed of several congregations within certain geographical limits; these held annual meetings consisting of the clergymen and lay delegates at which they consulted together upon matters

general interest, and, in an advisory way, commended suitable measures for the adoption of the congregations. The several associations have specific terms of membership, for protection against irregularities in doctrine and practice; thus approximating to Presbyterianism. From New England they have spread to the western portion of the United States, and founded numerous congregations there. Several of the most distinguished colleges of the United States were founded by them (Yale, Amherst, Harvard University, &c.), and continue under their patronage.—After the expulsion of the Stuarts, whose Cæsareopapistic despotism caused many persons to join the Independents, they were finally granted full liberty by the Toleration Act of William of Orange, 1689. Since then they have rapidly spread in England. Their active zeal for the spread of the Gospel, and the advancement of Christian culture among all nations, has won for them universal admiration and esteem. The London Missionary Society owes them its origin, and many other Christian enterprises, of the most extensive usefulness, have been suggested, or sustained, by their beneficence. DR. G. WEBER.*

Index librorum prohibitorum, is, in the Romish Church, the list of such books as are forbidden to be read, on account of doctrines in them hostile, or thought hostile, to that Church. From the name, the Index would be a product of the 16th cent., but the prohibition of such books sprang up with the pretensions of Romish bishops and Popes to supreme power. Indeed, it necessarily associates itself with the idea of the universal Catholic Church, out of which there is no salvation. The full development of this idea by Cyprian (*J. E. Huther*, Cyprian's *Lehre v. d. Kirche*, Hamb. u. Gotha, 1839,) led to the belief that unity in doctrine was essential to the unity of the Church, and that every real seeming variation from received doctrine must be rejected as heresy. All speculations, therefore, and every spirit of inquiry, have ever been regarded by the hierarchy as its dangerous enemies. At first, heathen and Jewish works were condemned (see even *Conc. Carth.*, a. 400, can. 1), then burnt. Next the writings of heretics (as Arius) were burnt; and this continued to be done from the 5th cent. And as books of heretics were published also with eccl. titles, the post. canons of the 5th and 6th cents. (c. 60) commanded such offences to be punished with expulsion. So the Council of Elvira (813) threatened those with an anathema who should reculate condemned books. At this time, already, it had become customary to forbid reading books which priests pronounced heretical, and to regard the offender as guilty of the heresy taught in the book. Above all, translations of the Bible were thought pernicious. Thus Gregory VII. (1080), in a letter to Wratislaw of Bohemia (*Mansi, Collect.*, XX., 296); and though Innoc. III. (*Epist.*, lib. II., ep. 141, . 1199,) says searching the Scriptures is not to be censured, he adds: *Tanta est divinæ Scr. profunditas, ut non solum simplices et illiterati, sed etiam prudentes et docti non plene sufficient ad ipsius intelligentiam indagandam.—Unde recte fuit olim in lege divina statutum, ut bestia, quæ*

montem tetigerit, lapidetur; ne videlicet simplex aliquis indoctus præsumat et sublimitatem Scr. s. pertingere vel etiam aliis prædicare. The frequent attacks made upon immoral Popes, and upon the hierarchy in general, led to the prohibition of the Bible along with heretical books. The *Conc. Tolosanum* (1229) issued the decree (c. 14) which expressly forbade laymen possessing it (*Hegelmaier*, *Gesch. d. Bibelverbots*: Ulm, 1783, p. 123. See *Bible, Reading of*, &c.). When the Inquisition arose, it obtained control of this matter, and the *Conc. Biterrense* (1246; *Mansi*, l. c., Bd. 23, p. 724,) speaks in general (c. 36) of theological works, which laymen and clergymen were forbidden to have. But the more zeal the Papacy showed against such works, the more was it resisted, especially by the fore-runners of the Reformation, whose writings threatened to sever its life-chord. A Synod of London (1408) forbade the reading of Wickliffe's writings, unless previously approved, and those of Hus were thought entirely heretical. The evil increased with the invention of printing, as *Alex. VI.* (*RAYNALD, Annal. ad a. 1501, no. 36*) complains; and *Leo X.*, at s. 10 of the Lateran Council (May 4, 1515,) ordered, in the decree "*Inter sollicitudines*," that no book should be printed without the approbation of a bishop, legate, or the Inquisition, on pain of excommunication; a book otherwise published should be confiscated and burnt.—The Reformation, in spite of prohibitions, produced and circulated many books pernicious to the papacy. This trouble had reached its climax when the University of Louvain, by order of Charles V., prepared and published an index of such books (1546) as were thought dangerous. A new edition appeared in 1550; meanwhile the papal legate in Venice, *John della Casa*, also published an index (1549; see *Schellhorn's Ergötzlichk.*, II., 3). During the suspension of the Council of Trent, Paul IV. (1557) directed a special congregation to issue a new index of forbidden books, which is properly the first official *Index libr. proh.* of the Romish Church, entitled: *Index auctorum et librorum, qui tanquam hæretici aut suspecti aut perversi ab Officio S. R. Inquisit. reprobantur et in universa Christiana republica interdicuntur.*, Rom., 1557; enlarged (1559) by Vergerius, whilst Paul (1558) forbade all Romish theologians and scholars to read such heretical books as had been previously allowed; but this was little heeded, even in Italy. There most of the prohibited books were burnt (see *NAT. COMES, Hist. sui temp., lib. XI., Venet.*, 1581, p. 263). Those which Paul's index prohibited were mainly such as defended the autonomy of the State against Papal aggressions, the supreme authority of Councils, and episcopal prerogatives, or assailed the general and special pretensions of the hierarchy. The Index divided the authors of prohibited books into three classes: 1) those whose books were entirely forbidden; 2) those some of whose books were prohibited; 3) all anonymous books after 1519. It closed with a list of 62 publishers of heretical books. The reading of these books was punished with the ban and disgrace.—The Council of Trent, at its 18th session, appointed a committee to prepare a new Index. This committee, however, re-

ported, at the 25th session, that it was unable to come to any conclusion, and recommended that the matter be left to the Pope. Accordingly Pius V. issued a new Index, based on that of Paul IV., but extended by the addition of 10 rules, which the Trent committee had followed. This, often erroneously called *Index Tridentinus*, was published in accordance with the bull *Dominici gregis custodia* (March 24, 1564), for the government of all Christendom, but was never received in Germany, France, or the Netherlands. The most important of the 10 rules relates to translations of the Bible. By the 3d rule, the translation of the eccl. writings of condemned authors are so far allowed as they contain nothing contrary to Romish doctrines; translations of the Old Test. to be used by the learned only by consent of the Bishop, and then *non tanquam sacro textu utantur*. Translations of the New Test., by authors of the first class, are wholly prohibited. The laity were allowed, by rule 4, to use, by permission of the Bishop or Inquisition, only approved versions. Rule 10 confirms the regulation of Leo X. This Index was published in Rome by Aldus Manutius, 1564, then, revised and enlarged, by Greg. XIII., Sixtus V., Clem. VIII. (1595). Sixtus V. also appointed a congregation to prepare the *Index libr. expurgandorum*, or *expurgatorius*, a list of books from which offensive passages had been expunged, first published by order of the Duke of Alba: *Index expurg. libr., qui hoc sæculo prodierunt*, Antv., 1751; Dublin, by Milliken & Son, 1837. Several similar works subsequently appeared in Spain and Italy, among them one by J. M. Brasichellen, or Brasichelli, aided by the Domin. Thos. Malvenda (Rom., 1607), which was itself placed on the prohibited list. The Spanish Inquisitor-General, Antonio a Sotomajor, issued one prized for its completeness: *Noviss. libr. prohib. et expurg. Index, Madr.*, 1648. The Rom. Index was again published in 1819, but it is continually receiving additions. The Congregation of the Index still exists in Rome, but its influence, even in Italy, is feeble. Maria Theresa forbade the publication of the Rom. Index in Austria, and in Germany the special privilege of the Government is necessary to its publication (see PEIGNOT, *Diction. critique littér. et bibliogr.*, &c., Par., 1806).

NEUDECKER.*

Indifference, religious (*indifferentismus*), is among the chief evils connected with the history of Christianity, and claims consideration in polemic, moral, and pastoral theology. Assuming various forms, often confounded with true faith, so far as this tolerates fanaticism, itself devoid of truth, for there can be no sincere neutrality in Religion, it exhibits one of the most noteworthy religious maladies of our day. For more than a century the Church has constantly complained against this evil (see DANZ, *Universal-Wörterb. d. theol. Literat.*, 449, and the suppl., 54). It has even been favored by orthodox theologians. *Buddeus* (*instit. theol. dogm.*, p. 60,) distinguishes between *indiff. universalis* and *particularis*. The former regards all religions alike, because it believes in none (atheism), or only in a natural religion (naturalism); the latter considers the differences of the various

sects as unimportant, jumbles together either all or most of them, or at least several, while it accepts revealed religion. Others distinguish between gross and subtle indifference: the one regarding each religion as sufficient for salvation, the other considering it immaterial to what Christian sect a person may belong.—Reinhard (*Moral*, I., 752,) reckons indifference among the general failings of conscience, and distinguishes between infidelity, levity, and indifference: the first professes to have investigated the subject; the second carelessly declines all investigation, either from predominant worldliness, or pride; the third regards religion only for some external advantages which may be gained from it.—But all these definitions consider indifference, not as holding against religion *per se*, but against the differences existing among the various confessions or sects. Indifference is a disinclination to what is essentially religious in those diversities, from an avowed preference for what is religious outside of them, a religion consisting in having no religion. We must, however, distinguish disregard for essential religious distinctions, out of regard to what is essential, from actual indifference. In this view, not everything is indifference which is condemned as such. The manner in which Christ's disciples treated some precepts, seemed to the Pharisees like indifference; and the evangelical union sentiments of our day are denounced by bigoted confessionism as indifference. It is impossible to consider real indifference as wholly an exaggerated regard for what is essential in distinction from what is unessential. This advocacy of what is essential only is the deadly foe of fanaticism; whilst real indifference is but an *alter ego* of fanaticism (NITZSCH, *System*, p. 39). Indeed, the most prominent indifference cannot establish itself without fanaticism. The phantom of a natural coldness of man towards religion & towards religious diversities, contradicts the fact that man's religious consciousness cannot be externalized. Apparent indiff. in such cases is always produced by a secret aversion or attraction, infidelity or superstition, fanatical hate or love. Fanaticism directs its indifference against the inner sanctuary and sole foundation of religion, by blindly contending for the isolated outer sanctuary and its diversities; blindly, because the outer sanctuary is desecrated by severing it from the inner. Indifference assails the outer sanctuary, the manifestation, establishment, and distinctions of faith, because it has fanatically embraced a *faith of its own kind*, supposed to be harmonious, unique, and universal. In the sphere of natural religion, or the lowest grade of religious life, indiff. appears mainly as stupidity, with regard to the high import of religious traditions and usages. As here, through the ever-varying religious forms of Fetichism, it may sink into full barbarism and want of religion. But the same holds in the relapse of the "Alleinslehre" to a positivism back of the symbolical forms of primitive monotheism, of that doctrine regarded as a religion; for as a philosophy it is not stationary, and its efforts may be salutary. In the sphere of revealed religion (including the mediæval Church), indiff.

ence turns from positive traditions and definitions, to seek the essentials of religion in a titious natural religion. Thus the Israelites, falling between two opinions, fell into Baalism; a sun seemed to them a general object of human religiousness. Mediæval humanism (so far as left the line of churchliness,) spread itself in its form, from the time of Alex. Comnenus, over the Western Church.—Whether in the sphere of religion of faith, indiff. can assume a higher form, is the main question. Usually the contest is between the remains of a legal indiff., e., naturalism, and those of a fanatically legal ecclesiasticism. But when infidelity endeavors to exhibit itself as indiff. over against developed church faith, it becomes mythological in its character; that is, whilst adopting the original, fundamental idea of Christianity, it regards all historical developments of that idea as equally mythical, and entitled respectively, therefore, to no exclusive consideration. It may, indeed, assume various forms, opposing the letter of the Bible to Confessions, or it may oppose those Confessions as laws to the entire fulness of churchly and Christian life. But here, again, as mythologism comes into play. Belief in the letter of the Bible, alone, makes the entire Church a myth; and abstract confessionalism makes a myth of the Church of the present and future, and of the great saying: "There shall be one fold and one Shepherd." It is true, indiff. may adopt a negative, mawkish, syncretistic unionism; but this then will, in its essence, always flow in with mythologism or literalism. Real union, however, holds the same relation to indifference as faith to infidelity.

J. P. LANGE.*

Indulgences.—The granting of indulgences is exclusively peculiar to the Romish Church.—Its sacrament of penance includes, besides *contritio cordis* and *confessio oris*, a *satisfactio*, consisting of *good works*, by doing which the penitent compensates for past sins. The ancient discipline of that Church was so stereotyped in regard to the manner of these penances, that the measure of satisfaction was determined solely by the time of their duration. But, gradually, pilgrimages and attendance at a newly-consecrated church, were also regarded as penances (c. 14, X., *de pœnit. et remiss.*, 5, 38), and especially *almsgiving*. Thus arose the practice of commuting penances for money, the amount being determined by the ability of the penitent. Penitentials of the 9th cent. are full of such *commutations*.—The doctrine of indulgences was first developed by scholastic theology, on the basis of that system of commutation, completed by *Thom. Aquinas*, and retained, unaltered, by the Council of Trent (see GIESELER'S *Eccl. Hist.*, §§ 35, 81).—It distinguishes the *natural* consequences of sins from their *penalties*, and these are partly *temporal* and partly *eternal*. After sin is committed, those penalties are irrevocably incurred. True, the Christian has obtained justification in baptism, and thus secured the possibility of escaping both kinds of penalties; but confession, satisfaction, and absolution, secure only the remission of the sin and its *eternal* penalty, whilst the *temporal* penalties incurred still remain (*Trident.*, s. 6, *decr. de justific.*, c. 16.

and *can. 30, eod.*). These include the chastisements which God inflicts either on earth or in purgatory, before he admits sinners as purified into heaven, the censures and punishments which the Church imposes, and finally penances themselves. It is for the remission of these the Church claims power, because, with the power of the keys, she claims to have received a general authority over the sins of the faithful, and, with this, power to remit them. Trent (s. 25, *de indulg.*) hurls an anathema against all who deny this power. Of course, there is no proof of the existence of such power, but the Romish Church argues that, as in receiving the power of the keys, such penalties were not specifically excepted, and as the nature of both temporal and eternal punishments is the same, power to remit ecclesiastical (not natural) penalties must belong to her; to this it is added that the decree of Trent essentially approximates to the Protestant view, which denies the Church only the power of remitting divine penalties. In this sense, Pius VI., *Const. Autores fidei*, expressed himself strongly against the opinion of the episcopalists, who allow indulgence only in the way of remitting penances. Those alone who are in purgatory are admitted to be beyond eccl. jurisdiction, so that in regard to them indulgence cannot be granted as a judicial pardon; but as they continue in the communion of the Church, it is bestowed *per modum suffragii* (ALEX. HALES, *summa*, p. 4, Q. 23, art. 2, membr. 5; TH. AQUIN., *summa suppl.*, p. 3, Q. 25, c. 28, X., *de sent. excomm.*, 5, 39; BENED. XIV., in *constit.* a. 1749; *Bullar. Bened.*, Tom. 3, p. 87, § 14).—But were such penalties gratuitously remitted, the divine justice would be violated, which demands proper satisfaction for every sin (Trent, s. 6, *decr. de justific.*, c. 14). But this requires that good works be regarded as *opus operatum*, which renders substitution possible, i. e., *vicarious satisfaction*, a doctrine supposed to be found in *Origen* (*hom. in num.*, h. 22; *Exhort. ad martyr.*; *Cyprian. de lapsis*, c. 36, &c.). And with this is connected their doctrine of the communion of saints: Christ and the saints performed more good works than were necessary; this *thesaurus meritorum*, *thes. supererogationis perfectorum*, is available for the entire Church to which they belonged; only, the Pope has the dispensation of them in his hands. This completes the idea of Indulgence. And this completion of the idea we owe to Alex. Hales († 1245) (see *Extrav. comm.*, c. 2, *de pœnit. et remiss.*, 5, 9. Trent, s. 14, *de pœnit.*, c. 8).—The measure of those grants is mostly fixed by days, months, and years; though sometimes *indulgentia plenaria* is bestowed. The relation of indulgence to the sacrament of penance is also seen in this, that whoever would obtain it must confess, so that it is still annexed to *satisfactio*. And this is appealed to as a proof of its usefulness (*Tid. s. 25, dec. de indulg.*).—Besides, the Romish Church always makes indulgence dependent upon some special service, participation in missions, the worship of relics, &c., attendance at church, pilgrimages, &c. So that an indulgence may be general, or local (*particularis*). The most general is that of the Roman *year of jubilee* (see Art.).—A general indulgence

is always dispensed by the Pope; particular indulgences, full or partial, may be granted by many places, through Papal privilege, at times during particular festivals, or longer, sometimes perpetually. Such indulgences must be published by the Bishops and two capitulars of the diocese. *Quæstores elemosynarum* are abolished (*Tid. s. 21, c. 9, de ref.*). In the management of this department of labor, the Pope is assisted by the *Congr. cardinalium de indulg. et sacr. reliquiis*. In a subordinate measure, Bishops also have jurisdiction over indulgences; at the consecration of churches they may grant them for one year; at other times for 40 days. This right is suspended *sede vacante*, but papal faculties can extend it (*c. 14, X., de pœnit. et remiss.* [5, 39], *c. 1, 3, in eod. in VI^o.* [5, 10], *Bened. XIV., de synod. dioces., lib. 2, c. 9, n. 7*). In granting breves of indulgence, the permission of the civil government is always necessary — (PERMANEDER, *K.-recht*, 2, 403; AMORT, *de origine, progressu, valore et fructu indulg.*, Aug. Vindeb., 1735, fol.; J. B. HIRSCHER, *die Lehre von Ablass*. Tub., 1844, Aufl. 5). MEYER.*

Inheritance.—As, according to the Mosaic law, the land of Canaan was distributed among the several tribes, and then again subdivided among the respective families of each tribe, as a perpetual inheritance (*Lev. 25 : 13, 23*; *Numb. 27 : 1, &c.*; *32 : 18*; *33 : 54*; *34 : 14*; *of. Ps. 16 : 5*), so each individual of God's people obtained a heritage, which was not, however, properly his own, but God's, to whom the entire land belonged. Hence, these real estate inheritances could not be permanently alienated, but only the use thereof be disposed of for a limited period; in the year of Jubilee all reverted to the original owner, or his heirs, if it had not been previously redeemed (*Lev. 25*; *Ruth 4*). Thus we can see how such property came to be sacredly regarded, so that a genuine Israelite, like Naboth (*1 Kings 21 : 3, &c.*; *of. 2 Kings 9 : 10*), would for no amount part with his inheritance. But besides this inheritance, other possessions might be acquired (*Josh. 14 : 6, &c.*; *24 : 30, 33*; *Numb. 33 : 54*). But all such property, including slaves (*Lev. 25 : 46*), passed, at the father's death, to his legitimate sons, the first-born receiving a double portion, and providing for the widow, unmarried sisters, and younger brothers (*Gen. 21 : 10*; *31 : 14, &c.*; *25 : 5*; *24 : 36*; *Deut. 21 : 17*). The children of prostitutes inherited nothing (*Judges 11 : 2, 7*). This right of primogeniture was legally protected (*Deut. 21 : 15*), though David and Rehoboam disregarded it (*1 Kings 1 : 2*; *2 Chron. 11 : 22*); it might also be forfeited (*Gen. 25 : 31*; *49 : 3*; *48 : 5*). It was an exception for daughters to receive real estate (*Josh. 15 : 18*; *Job 42 : 15*), but they inherited it when there were no sons; then they had to marry within the tribe, to prevent the alienation of the family inheritance (*Numb. 27 : 1, &c.*; *36 : 1, &c.*; *Josh. 17 : 3*; *1 Chron. 23 : 22*; *Ruth 4 : 1*; *Tobit 6 : 12*. *Jos., Antt.*, 4, 7, 5, must allude to a subsequent modification of this law. See *Thaasith*, 30 b.). If there were no children, the brother, uncle, or nearest relatives, became the heirs (*Numb. 27 : 9, &c.*; *cf. PHILO, opp.*, II., 172 M.). It might also happen that a faithful slave became the heir, either by marrying

the daughter, or by being adopted, &c. (*1 Chron. 2 : 34, &c.*; *Gen. 15 : 2, &c.*; *cf. Prov. 17 : 2 and 30 : 23*). These provisions rendered a will superfluous, excepting for personal property (*Dent. 21 : 16*), hence there is no word for this idea in ancient Hebrew; for the phrase in *2 Sam. 17 : 23*, and *Isa. 38 : 1*, does not involve the making of a will. But the case was changed when the Jews lost their country, which rendered great modifications of existing laws necessary, or entirely annulled them. Then wills became common (*Jos., Antt.*, 17, 3, 2; *B. J.*, 2, 2, 3), though with such restrictions as conformed them to Mosaic precepts (*of. Gal. 3 : 15*; *Heb. 9 : 17*); they were called *קְדֻשָּׁה* = *sanctum*, by the Rabbins *קְדֻשָּׁה*. The father might also, during life, make a partial distribution of his property (*Tub. 8 : 21*; *Luke 15 : 12*). Contentions about an inheritance also occurred (*Luke 12 : 13, &c.*). — See EWALD, *Alterthum Isr.*, p. 156, &c.; SAALSCHUTZ, *mos. Recht*, &c. RÜETSCHL.*

Innocent I.—XIII., Popes.—Innocent I., native of Albano, the son of one obscure Innocentius, succeeded Anastasius I., May 18, 402. The powers to which, at so early a date of the Christian Church, he laid claim as Roman Bishop, were as absolute as those acquired by his later predecessors, and by dint of discretion and persevering energy he advanced the authority of the Roman See not inconsiderably. A short time after his election he gave the churches of Eastern Illyria in charge of the Bishop Anysius of Thessalonica, after whose death Rufus obtained the same office, with the express understanding that he should hold it as vicar and legate of the Roman pontiff. In the decretal, addressed by Innocent to Victorius, Bishop of Rouen, a number of important rules respecting Church discipline were laid down. In the first, all ordinations of Bishops made without the knowledge and consent of the Metropolitan, were prohibited as uncanonical; in the second, military service was declared incompatible with the clerical office; the third conferred on the provincial bishops exclusive jurisdiction in the disputes of clergymen, reserving the right of appeal to the Roman See in important cases; the following three prescribed the dismissal of all priests that had been married to widows, divorced women, or concubines; the ninth provided that priests and deacons, after their consecration, shall have no intercourse with women. In the decretal addressed (406) to Exuperius, Bishop of Toulouse, the Pope renewed the prohibition of priest marriage, and rebuked the practice of dealing more leniently with adulterous men than with adulterous women. In the year 404 the Pope was requested by Augustine, in the name of the Bishops assembled at Carthage, to intercede in their behalf with the Emperor Honorius against the Donatists, and this Innocent did effectually. He also very earnestly commended the cause of Chrysostom to the favorable consideration of the Emperor Honorius, who, after fruitless remonstrances, was about to make war on that account against his brother Arcadius, when the invasion of Italy by the barbarians diverted him from that per-

pose. Innocent now renounced all connection and fellowship with the enemies of Chrysostomus; but the statement of Baronius, that he excommunicated Arcadius and his wife, Eudoxia, is unfounded. How high ground Innocent took in the assumption of power over all Christendom, may be seen, indeed, from various acts of his. He severely censured the Macedonian bishops for calling in question what had been settled by papal authority. In a letter to the Archbishop of Antioch, he maintained that the prerogatives of the See of Antioch were not owing to the merits of the city, but to the fact that St. Peter had ministered there; and were, for that reason, second only to those of Rome, where St. Peter finished what he had commenced at Antioch. In a letter addressed to Decentius, Innocent declared unequivocally, that the Western churches were bound to conform in their rites and exercises with the Roman Church. When a North African Council, held at Carthage, reported to Innocent their resolutions about some doctrinal controversy, with the request to accede to them, he eagerly seized this opportunity to assert the supremacy of the Roman pontificate. In his answer (417) he expressed himself well satisfied, that, by submitting the subject to his decision, the Council had manifested a due deference to the Apostolical See. Such a dependence of all Christian churches on Rome he represented as indispensable for the establishment of general rules in the government, and the preservation of unity in the worship, of Christian churches. As to the subject-matter, he declared his entire concurrence with the North African bishops in rejecting the Pelagian doctrines about the relation of Nature to Grace. It should, however, not be inferred from this, that Innocent's views on this subject coincide altogether with those of Augustine. Neander (Church History, II., i., 827) remarks that Innocent, making the communication of Divine Grace depend on the worth of the individual, differs, in a material point, from St. Augustine. Innocent excluded, by the power of his apostolical authority, Pelagius and Coelestinus, with their followers, from the Church. Shortly before his death he wrote two more letters, one to Jerome, to whom he administered consolation, and another to John, Bishop of Jerusalem, with whom he remonstrated for abetting the sect of Origines and opposing Jerome. Innocent died March 12, 417. He was admitted by his successor in the number of saints. — (Comp. SCHÖNEMANN, *Epist. Pont.*, II., 507, sqq. EGGS, *Pontificium doctum*, i. 63, sq. — II., *Gregorius Papareschi*, a Roman. He was chosen, after the death of Honorius, Feb. 14, 1130, by a part of the cardinals; whilst the others elected the wealthy Cardinal Peter Leonis, who took the name of Anacletus I. The latter had a powerful ally in Roger, King of Sicily, and forced his competitor to seek refuge in France. Here he obtained the support of the heads of monasticism, Peter of Cluny and Bernard of Clairvaux, whose influence led to his acknowledgment by King Louis VI. and the Gallican Church. Owing principally to the vigorous eloquence of Bernard of Clairvaux, the cities of Lombardy submitted to Innocent, and the Synod at Pisa (1134) pro-

nounced in his favor. Emperor Lothaire II. finally reinstated him in Rome (1134), but the schism continued until Anacletus' death (1138). — At the Council in the Lateran (1039) Innocent announced the restoration of concord in the Church: on the same occasion he condemned Arnold of Brescia, whom he ordered to leave Italy, and not to return without papal consent. Soon after, Innocent excommunicated Roger of Sicily, who had invaded the Duchy bestowed by the Emperor upon Rainulph; but in the war that ensued the Pope was taken prisoner by his enemy, and had to offer a compromise in order to regain his liberty. According to its terms Roger was absolved of excommunication, and confirmed in the possession of Sicily, Apulia, and Capua; but he had to swear allegiance to the Pope, both for himself and his successors, and to receive his kingdom as a feudal dependence of the Church. On the 29th of Sept., 1139, Innocent returned to Rome. About this time he reiterated the sentence of several councils, condemning the errors of Abelard. The King of France, who had done so much for Innocent, incurred, nevertheless, his displeasure, and was put under an interdict, because he disagreed with the Pope about the election of an Archbishop in Bourges. This interdict was kept up till 1143. The last years of Innocent's life were spent principally in subjecting the rebellious cities, Tivoli, Palestrina, Tusculum, and Albano. At length even the Romans renounced their obedience, restored the Senate, and elected municipal officers. While Roger was on the point of sending succor to the Pope, the latter died, Sept. 23, 1143. Innocent II. was not equal to the exigencies of his times. About his numerous letters see *Fabricius bibl. lat. med. et inf. æt. ed. Mansi*, IV., 33, sqq. — III. — *An anti-Pope.* — Landus, of the Frangipanni family. He was one of the rivals, who, after the death of Hadrian, contested the accession of Alexander II. He was seized by Alexander in the vicinity of Rome, and lodged in the monastery Cava. This ended a schism that had lasted twenty years, under four successive rival popes. — III., *Lothaire.* — One of the most eminent heads of the Church, equally distinguished for clearness of mind, erudition, and energy. He greatly added to the authority of St. Peter's chair, and during the 18 years of his pontificate, he ruled over Christendom as no Pope did before or after him. He was the son of Count Trasimund, and belonged to the noble family of the Conti. While yet quite young, he held several ecclesiastical offices under Lucius III. and Urban III.; by Clement III. he was appointed dean of the Cardinals. At that time, while under a depression of mind, he wrote his book: *De contemptu mundi sive de miseria humanæ conditionis*. On the day of Coelestin III.'s death (Jan. 8, 1198), Lothaire, who was only 37 years old, was chosen pope. The greater part of Italy was at that time subject to the Germans; Rome was not, but it was undecided whether to acknowledge the Pope, or to establish a free commonwealth. Innocent commenced with restoring papal authority in Rome and the Pontifical States; the imperial Prefect of Rome had to take the oath of allegiance to him, and the

vassals of the Emperor were driven from the Marches. Under his auspices the cities of Tuscany entered into a league and ejected the Germans who had been invested by Henry IV. with the territories of the Church. The Empress Constance, in order to secure Sicily to her son Frederick, was compelled to receive it as a fief from the Pope, on such terms as the latter himself dictated. After her death he administered the regency over the two Sicilies with a vigorous hand, being both the guardian and feudal lord of the young orphan Frederick. When he had thus consolidated his power in Italy, he began very efficiently to interfere in the affairs of Germany, assuming the right of deciding between the two claimants of the imperial throne. His partiality to the Guelfs inclined him to decide in favor of Otto IV. But the successful warfare of Philip against his antagonist, led at length to negotiations which left the chances of Otto very precarious. The Pope revoked the sentence of excommunication against Philip (1207), and his legates opened a Diet of princes at Nordhausen. While this was pending, Philip was assassinated by Otto of Wittelsbach, and civil war in Germany thus brought to a close. Otto IV., though at first obsequious to the Pope, from whom he received the imperial diadem (Sept. 27, 1209), soon began to vindicate his rights in Italy; he occupied the estates bequeathed to the Church by Mathilda, and the Duchy of Spoleto: he even threatened to seize the States of the Church and the lands of Frederick. Regardless of the ban which the Pope hurled against him (1211), and which was most rigorously enforced, the Emperor undertook, in the following spring, another campaign against Italy, during which he subdued Apulia and Calabria. The Pope now had the sentence of excommunication and deposition solemnly proclaimed in Germany by his legate, Siegfried, Archbishop of Mayence, and absolved the princes of their oath of allegiance to the Emperor. This bold step, followed up by the support of the last Hohenstaufen Frederick, as candidate for the empire, actually led to the dethronement of Otto IV. and the elevation of Frederick, who was crowned at Aix-la-Chapelle, July 25, 1215. Otto had henceforth to content himself with his hereditary estates in Brunswick. With equal vigor Innocent enforced the acknowledgment of the papal supremacy in other countries. Philip Augustus, King of France, who had repudiated his lawful wife, Ingeburgis, was forced by the Pope's interdict to restore her to her rights. Alfonso IX., King of Leon, who had married in a forbidden degree, was excommunicated for refusing to dismiss his wife: in this case, however, Innocent did not carry the point. Peter, King of Arragon, was, for a similar reason, restrained by the Pope from marrying Blanca; and the same submitted to the exaction of an annual tribute, when Innocent crowned him in Rome, 1204. John, Prince of the Bulgarians, solicited and received a crown from the Pope. But no potentate was more deeply humbled than John, King of England. When two rival candidates claimed the Archbishopric of Canterbury, Innocent, setting both aside, appointed his friend, the Cardinal Stephen Lang-

ton. As John resisted this arbitrary act, Innocent put England under an interdict, and excommunicated and finally deposed the King (1208). The English throne was offered to Philip, King of France, who would have invaded England, had not John yielded, and reaccepted the crown, as the Pope's vassal. The bishops and barons, who despised the King for his pusillanimous conduct, wrested from him the Magna Charta (June 15, 1215), and though the Pope assailed it and its authors with the customary hierarchical arms, neither these nor the King's temporal power could effect its overthrow. Very favorable prospects for the extension of papal dominion seemed to open in the East. Constantinople was conquered (April 12, 1204) by crusaders, a Latin empire established, and Count Baldwin proclaimed the first Emperor. Innocent, while disapproving of the act, was not loth to take advantage of it, and appointed a Patriarch of Constantinople. This proved, however, no real gain. The new empire bore within itself the germs of speedy dissolution, and crippled all vigorous efforts for the recovery of Palestine. The 4th Lateran Synod, opened by Innocent in Nov., 1215, forms an apt conclusion of his eventful life. This Council adopted 70 canons, by which the tenets of the Church and the most important judicial and disciplinary rules were settled. The main objects of the Council were to promote a crusade, to exterminate heresy, and to reform the Church. The suppression of heresy had, indeed, been a favorite scheme with Innocent since his elevation, and he had vigorously pursued it, by his unrelenting persecution of the heretics in Southern France, by the instigation of a crusade against the Albigenses, and the establishment of an inquisitorial tribunal in Toulouse. In his letters he advocated the harshest measures against persistent heretics, whose very bones he ordered to be removed from consecrated ground. The Council at the Lateran enjoined on all faithful princes an unflinching persecution of heretics, threatening with the usual penalties all who should be recreant to this duty. The like severity was displayed against the pagans in Liffland, who were to be converted by word or—sword. Jews were forbidden to have intercourse with Christians, and only Christian subjects were recommended to the protection of their sovereigns. Another important feature of this Council was the confirmation of the two monastic orders of Francis of Assisi, and Dominic Guzman. Innocent, who had opened the Council with a presentiment of approaching death, felt a desire to direct his meditations to the Invisible, and performed his ministerial duties as often as he could. He died July 16, 1216. About his writings, comp. *F. Harter*, *Hist. of Innocent III. and his contemporaries*: Hamburg, 1834-42, 4 vols. — IV., *Sinibald Fieschi*.—He was elected the successor to Celestin IV., June 25, 1243, after the papal chair had been vacant for eighteen months. Fieschi belonged to one of the first Genoese families, and was considered the best jurist of his time. It was generally expected that by this choice the controversy between the Emp. and Pope would be terminated, since Innocent had, while card-

l, taken sides with Frederick II. But the mutual distrust with which they were regarding each other's steps, prevented the consummation of an agreement that had been entered into. The Pope, whose freedom was hampered by the terms of Frederick, secretly repaired to Lyons, where he summoned a Council, with the ostensible purpose of correcting some abuses in the Church, procuring aid for the Christians in the East, and reconciling the Church with the Emperor. But the Council had hardly met, when Frederick was put to the ban, deposed, deprived of his kingdoms, dignities, and powers, and the electoral princes were directed to hold another election. Though Louis IX., of France, offered his mediation, and though the Emperor had his orthodoxy attested by the Archb. of Palermo and other prelates, Innocent adhered to his sentence. The contest now grew warmer, and was waged on both sides with reckless animosity.—The Pope stirred up an insurrection in Sicily (1246), which was, however, of short duration; he also instigated the Landgrave of Thuringia, Henry Raspe, to aspire to the imperial crown. The Emperor, on the other hand, punished as rebels all who acknowledged the validity of the interdict; he banished most of the monks, and suppressed the rebellion in Apulia. Henry Raspe was discomfited by King Conrad; William of Holland, to whom the imperial crown was then given by Innocent, found very little support, and the cause of the Pope seemed desperate in Germany, when Frederick died, Dec. 13, 1250. His son Conrad did not, however, give up the contest. At the head of a large army he repaired to Italy, to take possession of Sicily, which had been kept for him by the illustrious Manfred. The Pope now offered the crown of Sicily to different persons as a prize, bestowing it finally on the English prince Edmund, when death, which has more than once opportunely succored the papal cause, suddenly closed the career of Conrad (May 21, 1254). Upon the promise of Innocent to respect the rights of young Conradin, the guardian of the latter, Manfred, entrusted him with the regency of the kingdom; but when it became apparent that he had ulterior views, Manfred declared war against him, and signally defeated a papal army, December 2, 1254. Five days later Innocent died at Naples. During the pontificate of Innocent IV. some missionary enterprises were set on foot. Several Franciscans and Dominicans were despatched to Persia (1245). To Conrad, the Master of the German Order of Knights, the Pope ceded the rights on Prussia, which he divided in four bishoprics.—Innocent is the author of "*Apparatus super quinque libros decretalium*," a work which has been called: "*Canonistarum splendor et juris pater*." In the "*Apologeticus*," written against Peter de Vineis, Chancellor of Frederick II., he advocated the jurisdiction of the apostolical chair over the Empire.—(Comp. *Fabricius, bibl. lat. med. et inf. æt. ed. Mansi*, IV., 36, sq. *Egg's pontific. doctum*, p. 442, sq.—V., *Pierre de Champagni*, also called after his native city, *De Tarantaise* (now Moûtiers, in Savoy) was elected (Jan. 21, 1276) successor to Gregory X. The short time of his pontificate, which lasted five months only, was

well spent in reconciling several cities and States of Italy, as Lucca, Pisa, Tuscany, which had been arrayed against each other as partisans of the Guelfs and Ghibelines. His project to consummate the union of the Greek and Roman Churches, to which the Greek deputies had assented at the Council of Lyons, was thwarted by his death (June 22). He was a prolific author. Besides postils and other trifles, composed in the taste of his times, he wrote some philosophical treatises: "*De intellectu et voluntate, de materia cæli, de æternitate mundi, de unitate formæ*, etc.; his theological works comprise an introduction to the canonical law (*abbreviatio decretorum*); a commentary on the four books of the *Magister sententiarum*, and interpretations of the Scripture. His learned contemporaries culled from his writings 100 erroneous propositions, a defence of which was undertaken by Thomas Aquinas. —VI., *Stephen Albert*, a native of Mont, in the diocese of Limoges; succeeded Clement VI., Dec. 18, 1352, and was at that time Bishop of Ostia. Before proceeding to the election of a pope, the cardinals adopted a number of resolutions, for the purpose of protecting their own independence and rights against the encroachments of papal despotism. All cardinals in the conclave took an oath, that they would be guided by these rules if elected, a few of them adding the reservation, *si jure niturentur*. Among the latter was Innocent VI., and it was his first official act, after his election, to annul those very resolutions as illegal. As head of the Church he was distinguished for his accurate knowledge of law, and the strictness of discipline that he enforced in the Church. The Commendams and Reservations, granted by his predecessors, were revoked by him, "*quod occasione commendarum, sicut experientia docuit, ut plurimum divinus cultus minuitur, animarum cura negligitur, hospitalitas consueta et debita non servatur*," etc. The heavy taxes, also, to which the clergy were liable at their installation, were abolished, "since," said he, "the sheep ought to be tended by a shepherd, not by a mercenary." A frugal simplicity in the mode of life was practised by himself, and recommended to the cardinals; while, on the other hand, the auditors of the Rota, who, till that time, had received no compensation, were allowed a liberal salary, "as hungry people," he used to say, "were inclined to help themselves at the expense of others." Innocent reduced the entire States of the Church to obedience, but when he wrested also Bologna from the powerful ruler of Milan, Bernabo Visconti, the latter proved to be an adversary who knew no respect either for Pope or Church. Peter of Castile, the cruel persecutor of his brothers, and poisoner of his own wife, was put to the ban. At the request of Charles IV., who had been crowned by this Pope, April 5, 1355, he established the feast of the Holy Spear, to be celebrated in Germany and Bohemia on Friday of the first week after Easter. To the order of mendicant friars, who had greatly sunk in the respect of the people, he restored their former privileges. Innocent VI. died Sept. 12, 1362, with the reputation of being a sincere and just man. He left no writings except a few letters

and bulls.—**VII.**, *Cosmos Megliorati*, of Sulmone, in the Abruzzi. Under Urban VI. he had been appointed Archbishop of Ravenna and Bishop of Bologna. Boniface IX. made him cardinal, and deputed him as legate to reconcile the warring provinces of Italy. When he was elected, Oct. 17, 1404, to succeed Boniface IX., he was already 65 years old. All the cardinals had, before making a choice, solemnly bound themselves that they would use all means in their power to terminate the great Western schism, and even to lay down the papal tiara, if that should be deemed expedient. Immediately after Innocent's election, a riot broke out in Rome; the Ghibelines, with Giovanni and Nicolo Colonna for leaders, clamored for the restoration of the people's ancient rights, while the Guelfs favored the concentration of power in the hands of the Pope. The people being victorious in the bloody contest that ensued, Innocent had to yield to their demands. But the young Nepota, Ludovico Megliorati, indignant at their insolence, conspired with his friends, and assassinated a number of distinguished Romans. Innocent being suspected of having connived at the crime, fled for his life to Viterbo (1405), but was led back to Rome in triumph, when it appeared that the suspicion was groundless. The Neapolitan troops, however, which the Colonna had brought to Rome, still continued to infest the city and its vicinity, till Innocent found himself finally constrained to excommunicate Ladislaus, King of Naples, and to divest him of his kingdom, which he held as an ecclesiastical fief. Ladislaus, who was afraid of his rival, Louis of Anjou, now accepted the terms of the Pope. About this time, Benedict XIII., the anti-Pope, proposed a conference for the alleged purpose of restoring the peace of the Church; but Innocent, who knew, that under this pretext he merely courted the favor of the Christian powers, refused the request; and for some time the two rivals indulged in violent reproaches and recriminations. Innocent died soon after of apoplexy, Nov. 6, 1406. A rumor that he had been poisoned, seems to have no better foundation than the suddenness of his death. Innocent was good natured, frugal, and generous; but he has been justly censured for nepotism.—(Comp. the two *Vitæ Innocentii VII.*, *Muratori III.*, 2, p. 832–837).—**VIII.**, *Giovanni Battista Cibo*, a Genoese, was chosen, Aug. 29, 1484, successor to Sixtus IV. In his youth he was for some time at the court of Naples, but soon obtained, in Rome, a charge in the service of Cardinal Philip of Bologna, through whose recommendation he was appointed by Paul II., Bishop of Savona. Sixtus IV. made him Bishop of Melfi, and (1473) cardinal. Not long after his accession to the papal chair, he exhorted all Christian princes to become reconciled with each other, and to unite for a general war against the Turks. But his appeals remained ineffectual. He went himself twice to war against Ferdinand, King of Naples, and instigated Renatus, Duke of Lorraine, to claim Ferdinand's throne. A peace was concluded, Aug. 12, 1486, but Ferdinand broke it, and was dethroned (1489) until peace was restored, 1492. Innocent's zeal to arm the Christians against

the Turks did not prevent him from striking a profitable bargain with Bajazet II., whose unfortunate brother, Zizim (Dachem), he kept in duress for the consideration of an annual sum of 40,000 ducats, to which the generous Sultan yet added the lance that had pierced the Saviour's side. At the same time the Pope received the regular tax which was levied in the Christian countries for an enterprise against the Turks. The persecution of witches and sorcerers in Germany, and their barbarous punishment, was rigorously enjoined by this Pope. He appointed for that purpose two commissioners, who wrote an absurd and disgusting book about the trial of witches (see *Witches and Witchcraft*). He attempted to stay the progress of the Hussites in Bohemia, condemned 200 propositions of *Pico de Mirandola*, and prohibited the reading of them, on penalty of excommunication. The last years of his life he spent in indolent ease, enriching himself by the sale of offices that he created. He died July 25, 1492. His numerous offspring (he had 16 children) are sufficient evidence how little he respected the vow of chastity; and his open preferment of them to profitable offices, evinced a shameless indifference to the opinion of the world. One of the eight cardinals that he created was the son of Lorenzo de Medicis, who, at the time of his appointment, had not completed his thirteenth year.—(Comp. *Vialardi's Vita di Papa Innocenzo VIII.*: Ven., 1613).—**IX.**, *Antonio Faccinetti*, succeeded Gregory XIV., Oct. 30, 1591. Pius IV. delegated him (1561) to attend the Tridentine Council; Pius V. appointed him nuncio at the Republic of Venice, Gregory XIII. made him Patriarch of Jerusalem, President of the Inquisition, and (1583) Cardinal. Though his pontificate lasted two months only, his regulations during that time prove that he had good designs. Several projects of an utilitarian character occupied his mind when he died, Dec. 30, 1591. He left a number of writings (*Moralis adversus Macchiavellem*, in *Platonem de Politicis*), most of which remain as manuscripts in libraries.—**X.**, *Giambetista*, succeeded Urban VIII., Sept. 15, 1644, at the age of 72 years. Both his success and the obloquy attached to his name are due to his connection with Donna Olympia Maidalchini, his brother's widow, with whom he is accused to have been on too familiar terms even before his brother's sudden death. Though Innocent was indebted for his elevation to the brothers Barberini, he initiated his reign by a judicial proceeding against them, with the design to seize the immense riches which they had amassed under the preceding pontiff. They fled to France, where they roused the sympathies of the French government. An armed expedition was undertaken in their favor, Piombino and Portolongano were conquered, and the Pope was finally compelled to reinstate the Barberini into all their domains and dignities, of which they had been stripped by a papal bull during their absence. More satisfactorily to the Pope ended his quarrel with the Duke of Parma, a part of whose possessions, Castro and Ronciglione, he annexed to the Pontifical States.—Two protests of Innocent's (Oct. 14 and 26, 1648) against the Westphalian peace, as well as his

all (Nov. 26, 1648) by which the articles of peace were declared void and without effect, remained, of course, unheeded, since protests and prohibitions of whatever kind, and from whatever source, were in the articles themselves disavowed as totally inadmissible. At a later time his protest, which has never been revoked, acquired more importance; and several of Innocent's successors have reaffirmed its validity. For the history of dogmatics no act of Innocent of consequence, except the condemnation which he passed (1653) on five propositions of Jansen.—When he entered upon his reign, the papal chamber was in debt to the amount of eight millions of scudi; and it must be confessed that, with the aid of Olympia, he devised most ingenious expedients to replenish his coffers. Money was procured by systematic extortions and the unscrupulous reception of bribes, by a most scandalous traffic in offices, by the sequestration of convents, to the number of 2000, the revenues of which were confiscated, by the appointment *universalis maximique Jubilæi* for the year 1650, by the oppressive monopoly of the papal chamber in grains, to which may be ascribed the ruin of agriculture in the States of the Church. Innocent died Jan. 5, 1655. His character was not without some noble traits, but blemished by his obsequiousness to the intrigues and avarice of Olympia. The *Vita di Donna Olimpia Maidachina* is, according to Ranke (Hist. of Popes), a fabrication.—**XI.**, who belonged to the family of the *Odeschalchi*, was called to the papal chair, Sept. 21, 1676, after the death of Clement X. In his youth he devoted himself to the study of law, and received at Naples the degree of LL. D. In the discharge of his duties as Prothonotary, President of the Apostolical Chamber, Commissioner of the Marka di Roma, and Governor of Macerata, he acquitted himself most creditably. Through the influence of Olympia, to whom he presented a magnificent silver vessel, he became cardinal, and afterwards legate of Ferrara, and bishop of Novara. His elevation to the pontifical chair was mainly due to the French party and the recommendation of Louis XIV. Innocent XI. effected a number of very salutary reforms, both in Church and State. He abolished benefices and cardinalships that had solely served for the support of nepotes; he rendered the examination for the various ecclesiastical degrees stricter than it had been before; he introduced economy in his own household, demanded of the clergy correctness of conduct, encouraged catechetical lectures and the establishment of schools for children, and admonished the clergy to preach no dialectic sophistries, but Christ crucified. He also discarded the castrati of the papal chapel. Against the ethics of the Jesuits he declared himself most emphatically, in the bull dated March 2, 1679. A rupture with France was occasioned by his resistance to the privilege, arrogantly claimed by the French ambassadors, of shielding criminals, not only in their palaces, but in the whole quarter of the city where their residences happened to be. As the Pope refused to accredit the French ambassador, De Levardin, who would not renounce this pretension, the repre-

sentative of Louis XIV. entered Rome with an escort of 800 guards and 200 servants, and defied the Pope's sovereignty in his own capital. Innocent excommunicated him, but the controversy did not end till several years after Innocent's death, when the French Court waived its pretended rights. Another source of ill feeling between the Pope and the King of France was the *regale*, or prerogative, claimed by the King, of receiving the revenues of a bishopric, and of presentation to its dependent livings, as long as the See was vacant. Several bishops protested against this assumption, and Innocent sustained them in three briefs, the last of which was quite minatory to the King. A Synod of the French clergy, summoned by the King (Nov. 9, 1681), not only awarded to the crown the contested rights, but issued a solemn declaration to that effect, called the *Quatuor Propositiones Cleri Gallicani*. The Pope had a copy of these publicly burned by the hangman, and withheld his confirmation from all bishops who were appointed during and after the Synod. The abrogation of the Edict of Nantes, and the persecution of the Jesuits, met with the cordial approval of Innocent, whose joy was so unbounded that, in a brief to the King of France, he extolled the zeal of that monarch for the promotion of Christian faith, and that he celebrated the expulsion of the Protestants from France with a *Te Deum*, and the booming of cannon. Notwithstanding this, the old differences between him and Louis XIV. remained unsettled. Innocent died Aug. 12, 1689. The French and the Jesuits continued, after his death, to disparage his name, and successfully resisted his canonization, which was proposed under Benedict XIV.—(Comp. *Mar. Guarnacci, Vita et res gestæ Pont. Rom.* I., p. 106–126; *Phil. Bonamici, Life and Hist. of Pope Innocent XI.*, transl. from the Latin (Rome, 1776, 4,) by *Le Bret*: Frankft. and Leips., 1791; *Ranke*, III., 159, sqq., Append., 283, sqq.).—**XII.**, *Antonio Pignatelli*, was elected, Feb. 12, 1691, successor to Alexander VIII., at an age of 76 years. He strove to emulate the virtuous government of Innocent XI., by whom he had been appointed successively Cardinal, Bishop of Paenza, Legate of Bologna, and Archbishop of Naples. He sought to abolish nepotism forever, restraining by a bull (June 22, 1692), all future popes from bestowing on their relatives any possessions, revenues, and offices dependent on the Apostolic Chamber. The *Bullarium magnum* contains a great number of regulations amending the discipline in convents and churches. The controversy respecting the *regale* (see Innocent XI.) was terminated by a compromise, which limited the King's prerogative to the older territory of France, and excluded its operation from the later acquisitions. The inquisition at Naples was the cause of a quarrel between the Pope and Charles II. of Spain; neither monarch lived to see it adjusted. In the controversy between Bossuet and Fenelon, about Fenelon's book, "Explication des maximes des Saints sur la vie intérieure," the Pope, who acted as umpire, decided in favor of Bossuet (1699). Innocent died Sept. 27, 1700. Shortly before his death he bequeathed a large sum of money to the hospital

that he had erected, and the proceeds from the sale of his furniture to the poor. He left the reputation of a benevolent, just, generous, and pious man. — (Comp. *Guarnacci, Vita, &c.*, I., 389–404; *Ranke*, III., 170, sqq.; Appendix, 290, sqq.). — **XIII.**, *Conti*, was elected after the death of Clement XI. (May 8, 1721), after an excited conclave, during which the Cardinals came to blows, and hurled inkstands at each other. He had been raised to the rank of Cardinal by Clement XI. As he was generally esteemed for his prudence, learning, and conciliatory spirit, it was hoped that he would restore peace to the Church. Italy had reason to be satisfied during the three years of his pontificate. The English Pretender, James III., found in him a zealous friend. Emperor Charles VI. was invested by Innocent with the crown of Naples, upon formally acknowledging the Pope as feudal lord over that kingdom, but Clement XII. declared this act null and void. Innocent protested, but without effect, against Parma and Piacenza being bestowed as imperial fiefs. He materially aided Malta, when it was threatened by the Turks, with funds, and by an appeal to the Christian princes. Though opposed to the Jesuits, and not disinclined to abolish the Order, he stood by the *Constitutio Unigenitus*, which his predecessor had reluctantly granted. Innocent died March 7, 1724. — (Comp. *Guarnacci, Vita, &c.*, II., 381, sq.; *Life of Innocent XIII.*: Cologne, 1724; *Ranke*, Appendix, p. 302, sqq.).

TH. PRESSEL.—*Seidensticker*.

Inquisition (*Inquisitio hæreticæ pravitatis*, also *sanctum officium*) is the name given to the spiritual tribunal which exists in the Romish Church, to spy out and punish those who depart from the dogmas of Rome, either orally or in writing. It is a degeneration and perversion of the old Church discipline, which was originally in the hands of the rural Bishops, whose duty it was to check false doctrines, and also to improve the visitation of the churches of their districts to spy out rising heresies. They punished discovered heretics with ecclesiastical punishments, the greatest of which was excommunication, by which the heretic was at the same time regarded as given over to the devil. Banishment was also connected with it as a civil punishment, and towards non-Christians even death, as appears from Diocletian's Edict to Julian, proconsul of Africa, against the Manicheans. The death-penalty on account of one's faith, was not inflicted by Christians upon Christians until in the 4th cent. The first Christian Emperor who legally issued the death-penalty against certain heretics, especially the Manicheans, was Theodosius (382), although celebrated Church fathers, as Chrysostom (Homil. 29 and 46, in Matth.) and Augustine (see *Augustini Epist.* 93, *ad Vincentium, contra Gaudentium*, Lib. I., Ep. 185, *ad Bonifacium*.) declared against it. On the other hand, already Jerome (*Epist.* 37, *ad Riparium adv. Vigilantium*.) attempts to justify it by Deut. 13 : 6, sq., and Leo the Great (440–461) approved it (*Leonis Opp. Epist.* 15, *ad Turribium*). The clergy committed its execution to the civil power, and thus sought to preserve the Church from the shedding of blood, and from blood-guiltiness. The persecu-

tion of heretics was, and remained now, it is true, in the hands of the Bishops; but on account of the spreading degeneration of the clergy, they were wanting in zeal for the faith of the Church. The synodal judicatures were to remove this evil, as the *Concilium Taranconense* (516). c. 8, expressly decrees, and the capitulars of Charles the Great, repeatedly commanded. (Compare *F. A. Biener*, Beitr. zu d. Gesch. d. Inquisitionsprozesse: Lpz., 1827, p. 28, sq.) This mode of inquiring after unchurchly views and opinions remained hereafter still in the hands of the Bishops, but received a more regular form since the 11th cent. Meanwhile, the Papal chair adopted other measures to discover and punish heretics, which promised it greater success in rooting them out. It found instruments upon whose devotion it could reckon in the legates; through these it now permitted the affairs of the Church to be managed, even at the expense of episcopal rights. It invested them with large powers, transferred to them the authority to punish; and they fearfully exercised it towards all who were suspected as being heretical, or as being opponents of the hierarchy. Pope Innocent III. now first organized the spying out and punishment of heretics into a permanent institution; by the 4th Lateran Council (in *Mansi, Conciliorum nova et ampliss. collectio, &c.*, T. XXII., p. 986, sq., c. 3), the persecution of heretics was made the chief business of the Episcopal Synods, in the form, that every Archbishop or Bishop visit either personally, or through the archdeacon, or some other suitable person, the parish in which, according to rumor (*in qua fama fuerit*), there were heretics, and put under oath two or three of the inhabitants of irreproachable character, or, if necessary, all the inhabitants, to point out those who were known as heretics, or those who held secret meetings, or departed from the faithful in their walk and conduct. The refusal to take oath justified the suspicion of heresy, *hæreticæ pravitatis*; the careless Bishop was deposed (comp. *Biener, l. c.*, p. 60, sq.). In name, the Bishops still conducted the matter, but the legates had supervision over them, and in fact conducted the persecution of heretics.

The organization of the inquisition, begun by Innocent III., was perfected by the Council of Toulouse, 1229, by publishing, to this end, 45 decrees (see *Mansi*, T. XXIII., p. 192; *Planck's Geschichte der kirchlichen Gesellschaftsverfassung*, IV., 2, p. 463, sq.). In this way it was constituted in Toulouse and the remainder of South France. But notwithstanding the rigid and definite regulations, and notwithstanding the terrible zeal of the legates in urging the Bishops to carry them out, the papal chair did not even approach the desired end. To accomplish this more certainly, it took the affairs of the inquisition away from the Bishops, made it a papal institute, and subjected the Bishops themselves to its tribunal. Accordingly, Gregory IX. appointed, in 1232, in Germany, Aragonia, and Austria, in 1233 in Lombardy and South France (see *Concilium Bitterense*: Beziers, anno 1233, in *Mansi*, T. XXIII., p. 269, sq.; *Raynald*, Annal., a. 1233, n. 59, sq.), the Dominicans permanent papal inquisitors; later also the

Franciscans became such. At the same time arose a *Militia Jesu Christi contra Hæreticos*. Raynald, l. c., n. 40, sq.). The Dominicans found terrible models of shocking cruelty in their work in the earlier papal legates, Peter of Castelnau (*de Castronovo*), Arnold, Milo, *et. al.*, whom they imitated first in Toulouse, Narbonne, Albi, and generally in South France. They were greatly assisted in their bloody work by the civil power; King Louis IX., already in his *Mandato ad cives Narbonnæ* (1228, in Guil. Catel. Hist. des Comtes de Tolose, *ibid* 1633, p. 340, sq.), making it the special duty of the civil authorities to punish all heretics. In similar manner, Duke Raymund VII. of Beziers (1233) was compelled to enact such laws (*Mansi*, T. XXIII., p. 265). The judicial prosecution, however, soon disappeared from the civil process, so that it soon became an instrument of priestly vengeance and envy. The name of an accusing witness was not allowed to be made known to the accused, as had already been decreed by the Councils of Beziers and Narbonne (1235); this decree was renewed by Innocent IV. (1254), in the bull *Cum negotium*. Even such as were themselves accused were allowed to be witnesses. The suspicion of holding a heretical opinion justified arrest. An admission was extorted by harsh treatment and imprisonment, but it also was Innocent IV. who, in the bull *Ad exstirpanda* (1252), first decreed that the civil authorities should apply the torture to the arrested, not only to extort admission, but also to compel them to accuse others. The arbitrariness and cruelty with which even the innocent were treated, led King Philip the Fair (as early as 1291) to command his officers to conduct with caution the arrest of those accused by the inquisitors, and Clement V. decreed (1311) that the inquisitor should not proceed against accused persons without the co-operation of the Bishop of the diocese (*Biener*, l. c., p. 72, sq.). Evidences of the unprecedented cruelties of inquisitors, see in *Ph. a Limborch's Hist. Inquisit. cui subjungitur Liber sententiarum Inquisitionis Tholosanæ, ab a. chr. 1307-1323*: Amst., 1632.

To enlarge the sphere and increase the pecuniary income of the inquisition, a very wide meaning was given to the word heresy. It was not confined to views which departed from the dogmas of the Church, or to sectarian tendencies, but was made to include usury, fortune-telling by the hands, signs, lots, &c., insulting the cross, despising the clergy, pretended connection with the leprous, with Jews, demons, and the devil, demonolatry and witchcraft. The punishments were loss of reputation, of civil and ecclesiastical rights, severe imprisonment in jail or on the galleys, and death in different ways, either by simple execution, or preceded by tortures, or by immuring, or, and most frequently, by fire. There was no appeal from the decision of the tribunal. The confiscation of property was always one of the mildest punishments, and a source of wealth to the clergy and the Church (*Limborch*, l. c., p. 171). Concerning the knavery practised by the inquisitors, in accusing even the innocent, and robbing them of their property, see *M. Menard*, *Histoire de la ville de Nîmes*, T. I.: Par., 1750, Preuves 73.

The Council of Narbonne (1243), Philip the Fair, and Louis XI., sought to restrain the inquisitors in inflicting money-penalties; but in vain. At length the people turned against them, and there occurred bloody insurrections, as in Albi and Narbonne (1234), where the inquisitors were banished in 1235, as also in Toulouse, where, in 1245, some were murdered. Nevertheless, they still continued to swing the bloody lash. But what insurrections and royal edicts in France were not able to accomplish, was brought to pass by ecclesiastico-political events, as the papal schism in the 14th and the reformatory councils in the 15th cent. The former crippled the power of the hierarchy with the latter, and limited thereby the power of the inquisition, so that it now proceeded against secret or suspected heretics only on the accusation of sorcery and connection with the devil (comp. the Breve of Nicholas V., in Raynald, a. 1451). In the 16th cent., the time of the Reformation, the clergy, supported by the Guises, were able to kindle violent persecutions against the Huguenots, and endeavored to restore the inquisition to its former power, but it had now lost its territory. Paul IV., it is true, published a bull (April 25, 1557), to re-establish it (*Raynald*, a. 1557, No. 29), and Henry II. compelled the Parliament to pass a corresponding edict, but Paul, who, on his deathbed, commended the inquisition as the main support of the Romish Church (*Schröckh*, K.-G. seit d. Reformation, III., p. 248, sq.), died already in 1559, and the new attempt to re-establish it failed; and in France, where it took its rise first, it also first began to decline, in spite of priestcraft and Jesuitism. But from France it cast its net over neighboring and distant countries, even beyond the ocean, through the aid of the Jesuits.

From France, the inquisition, as organized by the Council of Toulouse, spread almost immediately to Germany, where the Dominican, Conrad Droso, or Torso (see *Illgen's Zeitschr. für K.-G.*, 1840, III., p. 55), but especially Conrad of Marburg (see *Gesta Trevirorum*, ed. *Wytttenbach et Müller*, T. I., p. 317; *Alberici, Chronicon ad ann.* 1233, p. 544), were first, and with fearful cruelty, active in establishing it from 1231-1233. Although its death-sentences were approved by the Emperor, Frederick II., in 1232 (see *Pertz, Monumenta hist. German.*, T. IV., p. 287, 326), the opposition of the people and the nobles was so general against it, that Germany, for more than 100 years, was only visited by its bloody sentences occasionally; new attempts to re-establish it entire here, never succeeded according to the wishes of the hierarchy. The Beghards, who, since the middle of the 14th cent., appeared in Constance, Spire, Erfurt, Magdeburg, and farther north, reopened a wide field for the inquisition in Germany. Pope Urban V., in 1367, appointed again Dominicans to be inquisitors, among whom Walther Kerling became specially notorious. After the Emperor Charles IV., in 1369, issued special mandates in favor of the inquisition, Gregory XI. (1372) limited the number of inquisitors for Germany to five, whilst as early as 1399, Boniface IX. increased the number for North Germany alone to six. But in proportion as the reformatory tendency

increased in Germany, did the inquisition meet with opposition. At the instigation of the two inquisitors, Henry Krämer (*Institutoris*) and Jacob Sprenger, Innocent VIII. issued the bull *Summis desiderantes affectibus* (Dec. 5, 1484, in *E. D. Hauber's Bibliotheca, Acta et scripta magica, &c.*: Lemgo, 1739-45, St. I., p. 1, sq.; *G. C. Horst's Dämonomachie oder Geschichte des Glaubens an Zauberei, &c.*: Frkf., a. M. 1818, II., p. 17, sq.), which sanctioned anew the existing doctrines concerning heresy in regard to sorcery and witchcraft, as also their prosecution by the inquisition. Soon after, these two inquisitors published, partly to expose the whole system of sorcery and witchcraft, and partly to vindicate the action of the inquisition against them, the notorious *Malleus maleficarum* (Col., 1489; comp. *Hauber, l. c.*, St. I., p. 39, sq.; 2, p. 90, sq.; 5, p. 311, sq.), which has been justly regarded as a monstrous bastard of priestcraft and scholasticism. Many sacrifices were now again offered by the inquisition, and many perished through it even during the Reformation; this was also the case in Austria, Bohemia, Hungary, and Poland, although now it only acted periodically and in single places. The Jesuits attempted later to re-establish it there and in Bavaria (1599); also during the 30 years' war, it showed itself here and there again, but Maria Theresa abolished it entirely in her kingdom, and soon thereon it disappeared entirely from Germany.

Whilst the inquisition appeared only as a temporary manifestation in the Northern States of Europe, as in England, Sweden, Norway, Denmark, it found a much wider field in the Netherlands, and in the southern countries. As early as the 13th century, and later, it exercised its power against the heretical parties in the Netherlands, especially, however, at the time of the Reformation, when these parties greatly increased. After Charles V., already at Worms, May 8, 1521, had issued a severe edict against the evangelicals as heretics, he also immediately appointed his Councillor, Franz von der Hulst, and the Carmelite Nicolas of Egmont, as inquisitors. They began to inflict the usual penalties on their victims, banishment, &c. The Regent of the Netherlands, Margaret of Austria, in connection with the Bishop of Arras, Granvella, was especially active in behalf of the inquisition. The printing, sale, and possession of heretical books was strictly forbidden, and the magistrates were required, under penalty of loss of office, to be active in discovering heretics, and send a quarterly report of their labors to the Regent. The informers received a considerable reward for any proof (*Raumer's Briefe*, I., p. 164, sq.). Nevertheless, the Reformation spread, and the inquisition was not even able to prevent the rise of fanatical sects, as the Anabaptists, &c. In these circumstances, Charles believed that he would be able to uproot the Reformation more certainly by a new mandate for the organization of the inquisition after the Spanish form (April 20, 1550). (see *Sleidani, Commentarii, ed. chr. car.*, Am Ende: Frkf., ad M. 1785, T. III., p. 203; *Gerdesii, Hist. Reformat.*, T. III., App., p. 122). But this attempt failed also. Maria, the widowed Queen of Hungary, who in secret inclined to the Reformation, was

now Regent. Deputations of citizens made her aware of the threatening dangers; she went immediately to Germany to Charles, and effected a change of the mandate, in so far that in a new form of it (issued Sept. 25, 1550), the words "inquisition" and "inquisitors" were omitted. It still was opposed, and could only be published in Antwerp on the condition of the municipal rights being preserved (*Gerdesii, l. c.*, T. III., p. 216, sq.). That the inquisition was very active up to this time in the Netherlands is certain, but the accounts that, under Charles V., 50,000, or even 100,000 persons, lost their lives by it in that country (*Sculleti, Annales*, p. 87; *Gratii, Annales et Historiæ de rebus Belgicis*: Amst., 1658, p. 12), are much exaggerated. When Philip II. received the Netherlands, he determined neither to postpone, nor to modify, but rather to increase the punishment of heresy. Granvella encouraged him in this. The inquisition at once manifested great zeal, but its cruelties aroused a violent opposition. Finally, the cities Louvain, Brussels, Antwerp, and Herzenbusch, united in demanding the abolition of the inquisition. Their example was imitated, and in Feb. 1556, a league of the nobility, called the Compromise, was formed, which demanded the same (*Schröckh, K.-G.*, III., p. 390, sq.).—After some delay this was accomplished in 1567. Hereupon, however, the terrible Alba came into the Netherlands with unlimited power; Margaret resigned the regency, and he now proceeded with unheard of cruelty against those who had become suspected, or whose riches attracted him. But even he failed in uprooting the Reformation as a dangerous heresy, and he was recalled by Philip in 1573. The southern and northern provinces concluded the treaty of Ghent in 1576, the fifth article of which (*Dumont, Corps universel diplomatique*, T. V., 1, p. 278.) abolished the mandate and the edict which had been issued against heretics. Philip now attempted again to uproot heresy by force; the northern provinces thereupon formed the Utrecht Union, sundered themselves from him (1579), and obtained finally their independence of Spain, which was guaranteed to them in the Westphalian peace; whilst in the southern provinces, many were still persecuted by the Jesuits, but still the inquisition now also disappeared here.

Of all the southern countries of Europe, Portugal retained the inquisition the longest. It came from Spain to Portugal, and was first and chiefly directed against the Jews. It became here a royal tribunal, in that the King appointed the Great Inquisitor, who was confirmed by Rome; the chief tribunal had its seat at Lisbon, and all other tribunals of the kingdom were subject to it. After the conquest of Portugal by Philip II. of Spain, it was made to endure all the horrors of the Spanish inquisition. Already in decline, Portugal, under the successors of Philip, was involved in the ruin of Spain, until finally a conspiracy brought the Duke of Braganza, as John IV., to the throne (1640), and the hope of better things for the country. John designed to abolish the inquisition entirely, but he found too strong an opposition in the priesthood, especially in the Jesuits, and he could only withdraw from it the privilege of

appropriating to itself the possessions of the condemned. Pedro II. (1706) also restricted its activity and privileges still further, and another and more decided step was taken under the government of his son, Joseph I., by Pombal, who expelled the Jesuits, and so far restricted the inquisition, that it was compelled to communicate to the arrested the accusations, the names of the accusers, and allow them an attorney; further, that it dare not execute a judgment without the approbation of the Royal Council comp. l'Administration de *M. de Pombal*: Amst., 1789). He also forbade the *Auto da Fé*. After Joseph's death and Pombal's fall, the clergy, it is true, rose to new power, but the new spirit could not be again destroyed. King John VI. (1818-1826) finally abolished the inquisition entirely, and the attempt of Don Miguel to restore it failed.

The inquisition continued several years longer in Spain than in Portugal. It found its way into Spain from France in the 13th cent. Here, especially in Aragon, it was mainly employed against the Moors and Jews. Many of these embraced Christianity, others, however, preserved the faith of their fathers secretly among themselves. This was the case especially with the Jews. The suspicion of secretly belonging to Judaism was cast, by Cardinal Pedro Gonzalez de Mendoza (1477), upon many inhabitants of Jewish descent in Seville; and, at his instigation, the inquisition was introduced throughout the united kingdom of Arragon and Castile. Pope Sixtus IV. sanctioned the introduction (1478), and gave the King and Queen the power to appoint and dismiss inquisitors, and to seize the possessions of the condemned. Thus the inquisition became a royal tribunal. The inquisitors appointed by the King and Queen (1480), the Dominican Michael de Morillo and John de St. Martino, began immediately with so great cruelty, that even the Cortes made earnest complaint, and Sixtus IV. himself condemned their proceedings (see *Sixtus IV., Epist. ad Ferdinandum et Isabellam*, in *Histoire critique de l'Inquisition d'Espagne*, par *Jean Ant. Llorente*, T. IV., p. 347). Hereupon the terrible Thomas de Torquemada was appointed General Inquisitor of Spain, who was still more cruel, fully organized the inquisition, and spread terrorism throughout the land. Its tribunals were established now in all the principal cities of Spain; its members received the most exact instructions (see *sammlung der Instruktionen des spanischen Inquisitionsgerichtes*, übersetzt von *J. D. Reuss*: Hanover, 1788), and surrounded themselves with spies (*Familiares sancti officii*). The Bishops were also subjected to this tribunal. The terrors which it spread by imprisonment, tortures, &c., not only called forth complaints from the Cortes, but gave rise also to rebellions and assassinations of the inquisitors (*Llorente*, T. I., p. 187, sq., 211, sq.); but it still prosecuted its bloody work. The suspicion of belonging to Judaism or Islamism, of protecting Jews or Moors, of practising soothsaying, magic, and blasphemy, caused an endless number of trials. Upon Torquemada's advice, all Jews, who would not become Christians, were compelled (1492) to emigrate; a similar fate befell the Moors

(1501). Torquemada, from 1483 to 1498, when he resigned his office, burned 8800 persons literally, 6500 in effigy, and punished 90,000 with various penalties. His successor, Deza, sent 1664 to the stake, burned 832 in effigy, and punished 32,456 in various ways. Under the third General Inquisitor, Francis Ximenes de Cisneros (1507-17), 2536 persons were killed, 1368 were burned in effigy, and 47,268 were punished in other ways (*Llorente*, T. IV., p. 252).

But in spite of the terrors which it spread, voices were repeatedly raised in Spain against it, especially when it developed all its power to crush out evangelical doctrines at the time of the Reformation. Hatred towards it had spread itself far through the country (*McCrie*, *History of the Reformation in Spain*), and when Charles V. ascended the throne, the Cortes of Castile, Arragon, and Catalonia endeavored to bring to pass a reformation of the tribunal (*Llorente*, T. I., p. 376, sq.) Negotiations to this end were entered into with the papal chair, and concessions were made, but they were not carried out. It directed its power now against those who openly or secretly adhered to evangelical doctrines. It published yearly an edict of denunciation, and held its chief tribunals at Seville and Valladolid. But it also directed its power against such members of its own Church as did not accept the doctrines of the Council of Trent concerning justification. But as Protestantism had been entirely suppressed in Spain before the beginning of the 17th cent., executions became rarer, and, in the 17th cent., the inquisition was active principally in suppressing books, and persecuting those who possessed or circulated forbidden books. It was first in the 18th cent. that successful measures were adopted to overthrow it. From time to time its powers were restricted, until Spain fell under the supremacy of France, when Joseph Napoleon (Dec. 4, 1808,) entirely abolished it. When Ferdinand VII. ascended the throne, he again collected the clergy around him, and immediately restored the inquisition (1814); but already in 1820 the hatred of the people was kindled against it, they destroyed the palace of the inquisition at Madrid, and the Cortes now again abolished it. The clergy labored unceasingly to re-establish it, and really succeeded in 1825-6 in Valencia. However, Ferdinand VII. died in 1833, and it was again abolished in 1834, and finally by a royal decree (1835) it was ordered that its possessions, together with those of the Jesuits and the abolished orders, should be applied to removing the public debt (*Acta hist. eccl.*, 1835, p. 25, sq.). Since then, Spain has been free of the inquisition.

In Italy it still exists, but has not developed itself here in such fearful form as in other countries. It was introduced here in the time of Gregory IX. (1233), when the Waldenses fled from Southern France to the valleys of Piedmont. It directed its power then and later against the heretical parties, but the papal schism and the political commotions greatly weakened its power, until finally, in the second half of the 16th cent., it gathered all its strength to crush Protestantism. At the advice of Cardinal John Peter Caraffa, it was introduced

throughout all Italy by Pope Paul III. to crush Protestantism. Caraffa was appointed General Inquisitor, and was so active and zealous, that many, who inclined towards or received the evangelical doctrines, were compelled to flee the country. Becoming afterwards Pope under the name Paul IV., he granted the inquisition many important privileges, and more fully developed its fearful power. It also manifested great zeal here in spying out and burning heretical books. Sixtus V. established, by the bull *Immensa*, the congregation *pro S. Inquisitione* in Rome, which was composed of the Great Inquisitor, who was always a Dominican, six Cardinals, several prelates and doctors from the Dominican and Franciscan Orders, two secretaries, and the fiscal; the Pope confirmed its decisions. The inquisition was aided with a similar arrangement in the other States of Italy (comp. *McCrie's History of the Progress and Suppression of the Reformation in Italy*: Edinb. and Lond., 1827), but its power was often crippled by conflicts with the civil power, as *ex. gr.* in the republic of Venice and Naples, where it stood under the control of the State, which secured its independence of the Pope. In Sicily it was under the General Inquisitor of Spain; here it was abolished, 1782, throughout entire Italy, however, first by Napoleon, 1808. The fall of Napoleon led to its re-establishment by Pius VII., 1814, but it did not spread far, and met with strong opposition. Gregory XVI. introduced it again into Sardinia (1833); here, and in the States of the Church, and in Tuscany, it still exists. It has lately punished the circulating of the Bible and of evangelical doctrines with imprisonment, but it stands too sharply opposed to the political and national movements of the age to recover its ancient power, and to become more than a disciplinary tribunal for the clergy.

The inquisition was brought to the transatlantic countries by Spain and Portugal, the former introducing it into America soon after its discovery, where, especially in Mexico, Cartagena, and Lima, it raged fearfully. It was taken by the Portuguese to East India, where it had its chief seat at Goa. After many changes it was abolished in Brazil and East India by John VII. of Portugal. NEUDECKER.—Beck.

Inspiration.—The Greek word for this idea, *θεόπνευστος* (2 Tim. 3: 16), denotes the divine guidance of our cognition. *Nemo vir magnus sine aliquo AFFLATU divino unquam fuit* (*Cic. pro Arch.* c. 8). The *Breath of God* is the sensuous expression for his *δύναμις*; *e. g.*, *δύναμις ἡψίστου* for *πνεῦμα ἅγιον*, Luke 1: 35; 24: 49. In this sense, also, the Classics speak of a *θεόπνευστος σοφία* (*Phocyl.*, v. 121), of *θεόπνευστοι ὄνειροι* (*PLUT.*, *de plac. philos.*, 5, 2), comp. *ὑπὸ πνεύματος ἁγίου φερόμενοι ἐλάλησαν ἅγιοι θεοῦ ἄνθρωποι* (2 Pet. 1: 21). In the neuter the word is used by *Nonnus*, *paraphr. John* 1: 27, in the sense of “*God-breathing*,” and it is applied to the Scriptures by *Origen*, *hom.* 21, in *Iren.*, T. II., *de la Rue*: *sacra volumina spiritus plenitudinem spirant*.—A psychological definition of the relation of this divinely wrought, and therefore passive cognition to the merely human, is given by *Plato* in his doctrine concerning the divine *μανία*, the *ἰνδρος ἰδρα*. This state is the germi-

nation of the divinely implanted faculty of cognition, not as yet arrived at clear consciousness (*Zeller*, *Griech. Phil.*, II., 166, 275; *Brandis*, II., 428). When it apprehends thought in the form of the beautiful, it utters itself through artists and the better poets: οὐ τέχνη ταῦτα τὰ καλὰ λέγουσι ποιήματα, ἀλλ’ ἰνδρος ὅτε καὶ παρ’ ἡμῶν (Jon. 533) Οὐ γὰρ τέχνη ταῦτα λέγουσι, ἀλλὰ θεῖα δύναμις, (*ib.* p. 534). It also gives rise to the *μαντική*, which requires a *προφήτης* as interpreter (*Timæus*, p. 72).—This Platonic theory of inspiration exercised an essential influence upon the Jewish and Christian. It was adopted by *Philo*, by whom divine and human cognition are placed, according to it, in direct opposition (*quis rerum d. h.*, T. I., 511, Mang.): ὅτε μὴ πῶς ἐπιλάβηται τὸ θεῖον, δύναται τὸ ἀνθρώπινον ὅτι δ’ ἐκείνο δύνει, τοῦτ’ ἀνίσχει καὶ ἀπατέλλει. But he does not limit this divine influence exclusively to the divine Scriptures, and does not hesitate to claim for himself an occasional *θεοληπτεῖσθαι* (*de Cherub.*, T. I., 143). The Greek Fathers also describe this inspiration as a purely passive state (*JUSTIN.*, *Cohort.*, c. 8; *ΑΘΗΝΑΓ.*, *Legat.*, c. 9). The theory of a *verbal* inspiration was accordingly entertained at an early date. *Iren.* III., 16, 2: *Potuerat dicere Matthæus: Jesu generatio sic erat, Sed prævidens Sp. S. depravatores et præmunens contra fraudulentiam eorum, per Matthæum ait: Christi generatio sic erat.* CLEMENS, *Cohort.*, T. I., 71, ed. Pott.: ἐξ ὧν γραμμάτων (he means the *ἱερὰ γράμματα*, 2 Tim. 3: 14) καὶ σφαλῶν τῶν ἱερῶν τὰς συγκειμένας γραφὰς ὁ αὐτὸς ἀκολουθῶν Ἀπόστολος θεοπνευστος καλεῖ. *Origen*, T. II., *hom.* XXI., in *Jer.*: *secundum istiusmodi expositiones decet sacras literas credere nec unum quidem apicem habere vacuum sapientia Dei*.—But these were expressions merely of the general religious impression, rather than of a fixed dogma: hence we find that among the pre-Nicene Fathers some *heathen* books, *e. g.*, the Sibylline, are regarded as inspired (*THEOPH.*, *ad Antol.*, 2, 9); and that they express views which exclude at least an equal inspiration of all the parts of the Scriptures. Concerning the origin of the Gospel of Mark, *John Presbyter* says, like Luke 1: 1-3; he was the interpreter of Peter, and wrote down carefully whatever he had heard from him, without confining himself in the sayings and deeds of Christ to a regular order (*Euseb.*, *H. E.*, 3, 39).—In like manner *Irenæus* cannot have supposed of Paul that the contents of his works were communicated to him in a purely passive condition. He wrote a work on the “peculiarities of the style of Paul,” in which he admits the ungrammatical structure of his language, and accounts for it from the *velocitas sermonum suorum et propter impetum, qui ipsi est, spiritus* (*Neander*, *Ch. Hist.*, Torrey’s transl., I., 679). Concerning *Origen*, see *Redepenning*, “*Origines*,” I., p. 261. Although *Origen* was convinced of the correctness of the Sacred Scriptures, even to the *ἰῶτα* and *κεφαλαία*, he nevertheless admits a different measure of the Spirit in Jesus and the Apostles: *hom. in Luc.*, XXIX., T. III., p. 966, ed. *de la Rue*: *eodem modo et Jesus et Paulus pleni erant Spiritu S., sed multo vas Pauli minus erat vase Jesu et tamen erat secundum mensuram suam utrumque completum*. He therefore main-

ains against the Jews that Jesus was more worthy of the faith than the prophets (c. *Cels.*, ., T. I., p. 360) and Moses (*ib.*, p. 337); in the p. to the Romans he discovers an intricate and heavy style (*ad Rom.*, X., T. IV., p. 678), and solecisms in John (*Philocal.*, T. IV., p. 93). In John, t. 10 (T. IV., p. 183), he says that, as regards the *historical* sense, there is an irreconcilable contradiction in the accounts of the last paschal journey of Jesus, as given by John and Matthew. The reason of this inconsistency was not merely the want of a systematic development of his own theory, but also the influence of the Jewish theory of inspiration. The Old Test. spoke only of an influence of the Holy Spirit upon the holy men of God—a conception which does not exclude the free activity of the speaker, and could also be interpreted to admit various degrees of inspiration. Philo himself admits *de vita Mosis*, I., III., T. II., 163, ed. Mang.) various degrees of inspiration. According to the *Recog. Clement.*, I., 68, 69, the prophets can substantiate their credibility only by their agreement with the Pentateuch. The later Jewish writers assert the same difference as Philo: KIMCHI, *Vorr. zu den Ps.*; ABARBANEL, *Vorr. z. d. grossen Proph.*, f. 3, col. 2; MORE NEVOCHIM, P. II., c. 45; *Porta Mosis*, *opp. Pock.*, I., 65. "This book," says Kimchi of the Psalms, "is not inspired by the רוח ה' but by the רוח הקדש." Prophecy comes in dreams, or also in a waking state, whilst the activity of the senses is interrupted; and the mind, withdrawn from all things of this world, either sees visions or hears a voice. The Holy Spirit is active where man finds himself indeed in his customary condition, but where the spirit of the Highest moves him, beams into him, and suggests words to him." The highest degree is assigned to Moses, who speaks with God "face to face."—In its full extent, however, the Mantico theory was applied to prophecy by Monizus, in the sense of whom Tertullian, c. *Marc.*, 22, says: *Nesciens quid diceret* (Luke 9:35). *Quomodo nesciens? utrum simplici errore, an ratione, quam defendimus in causa novæ prophetiæ, GRATIÆ ECSTASIN, i. e. AMENTIAM conveire? In spiritu enim homo constitutus, præsertim quum gloriam Dei conspiciat, vel quum per ipsum Deus loquitur, NECESSE EST EXCIDAT SENSU, tumbratus scilicet virtute divina, de quo inter os et psychicos quæstio est. Interim facile est mentiam Petri probare.* Against this heresy the direct opposite of this theory of prophecy became prevalent in the Church. CHRYS., *hom.* 9, in *ep. ad Cor.*: τὸντο γὰρ μάντειας ἰδίον, τοῖς ἐστὲν κίνηται, τοῖς ἀνάγκη ὑπομένειν, τοῖς ὠδιδῶσαι, τοῖς κλεισῶσαι, τοῖς σὺνιῶσαι, ὡς περ μαινόμενον. Ὁ δε προφήτης οὐκ οὕτως, ἀλλὰ μετὰ διανοίας νηφοῦσης αἱ σωφροσύνης καταστάσεις καὶ εἰδῶς, ἃ φέγγεται, ἡσὶν πάντα. Although with such views the human in the composition of the SS. cannot be denied, still, as regards the expressions concerning the infallibility of the Bible, the former uncertainty still continues. Augustine says on the one side (*ad Hieron.*, ep. 19): *Si aliquid in his offendero litteris, quod videatur contrarium veritati: nihil aliud quam vel mendosum esse indicem, vel interpretem non assecutum esse quod*

dictum erat, vel me minime intellexisse non ambigam. On the other side he says (*Io. tr. I.*): *Audeo dicere, forsitan nec ipse Joannes dixit, ut est, sed ut potuit, quia de Deo homo dixit. Et quidem inspiratus a Deo, sed tamen homo. Quia inspiratus, dixit aliquid: si non inspiratus esset, dixisset nihil.* *De cons. evv.*, II., 28: *Per hujusmodi evangelistarum locutiones varias, sed non contrarias, discimus nihil in cujusque verbis nos debere inspicere nisi voluntatem, cui debent verba servire, nec miseri aucupes vocum apicibus quodammodo litterarum putent ligandam esse veritatem, cum utique non in verbis tantum, sed etiam in cæteris omnibus signis animorum non sit nisi ipse animus inquirendus.* He also says that each of the evangelists had made their narrations more or less full, "*ut quisque memineral et ut cuique cordi erat*" (*de cons. evangel.*, 2, 12). Since a rigid grammatico-historical interpretation especially conflicts with a verbal inspiration, we find in Jerome, the philologist, notices of a difference of style in the biblical writers. In his *proem.* to Is. he says: *Sciendum, quod in sermone disertus sit, quippe ut vir nobilis et urbanæ elegantiae, neque habens quicquam rusticitatis admixtum; in his prologue to Jerem.: Sermone quidem apud Hebræos Esaias et Hosea videtur rusticior.* He finds solecisms in the Acts, and trivial language in Paul (*ad Gal.*, 3, 1). Chrysostom, who had declared that all contradictions in the Scriptures would be found to be mere seeming contradictions (*Opp.*, T. VII., p. 5), has nevertheless remarked of Paul (Acts 26:6): "He speaks humanly, and does not at all times enjoy grace; but he is suffered also to bring in his own thoughts" (*Opp.*, T. X., p. 364). "We should not be surprised," says Euthym. Zigabenus (*post 1118*) to Matth. 24:28, "if the evangelists have not narrated everything in the same manner; since they did not write down immediately as Christ spoke, and may also have forgotten many things."—Nor does scholasticism furnish a doctrine of inspiration, though Thomas Aq. makes a distinction between what belongs to faith principally, and what indirectly (*Summa theol.*, II. 2, qu. I., art. 6; qu. II., art. 2). As of the latter kind he regards historical notices, that Abraham had two sons, etc. At times very liberal opinions are expressed. In the 9th cent. Agobard, Archb. of Lyons, writes (*adv. Fredegisum*, cap. 12): *Quodsi ita sentitis de Prophetis et Apostolis, ut non solum sensum prædicationis et modos vel argumenta dictionum Sp. S. eis inspiraverit, sed etiam ipsa corporea verba extrinsecus in ora illorum ipse formaverit, quanta absurditas sequetur!* ABELARD says (*Sic et non*, ed. Causin, p. 11): *Constat et prophetas ipsos quandoque prophetiæ gratia caruisse, et nonnulla ex usu prophetandi, cum se spiritum PROPHETIÆ HABERE crederent, per SPIRITUM SUUM FALSA protulisse; et hoc eis ad humilitatis custodiam permissum est, ut sic videlicet verius cognoscerent, quales per Spiritum Dei et quales per suum existerent; and he adds: Quid itaque mirum, cum ipsos etiam Prophetas et Apostolos ab errore non penitus fuisse constat alienos, si in tam multiplici s. patrum scriptura nonnulla erronea prolata videntur?*—The Council of Trent gives no definition of inspiration. Hence various views con-

cerning it obtain among Rom. Cath. theologians; some, like Sanctius, Salazar, Huet, Este, etc., assert the strictest literal inspiration; others, like Anth. de Dominis, R. Simon, H. Holden, etc., teach an inspiration of the doctrinal contents merely. The Church has never decided authoritatively upon the subject.—In the Luth. symbols the theory of a verbal inspiration is taken for granted, though not expressed. *C. A.*, p. 42: *Num frustra hæc præmonuit Spiritus S.?* *Apol. Conf.*, p. 81: *Num arbitrabantur excidisse Spir. S. non animadvertenti has voces?* *Art. Smal.*, p. 333: *Petrus inquit: Prophetæ non ex voluntate humana, sed Spir. S. inspirati locuti sunt.* The Reformed symbols give more precise definitions. *Conf. Helv.*, II., c. 1: *Credimus Script. canonicas ipsum esse verbum Dei. Hodie hoc Dei verbum per prædicatores legitime vocatos annuntiatur in ecclesia.* *Cat. maj.*, p. 502: *Spiritus S. quotidie nos divini verbi prædicatione attrahit.* Fluctuating opinions like those of Origen and Augustine, we find expressed by Luther also. He speaks of the book in which there are no contradictions (*Walch*, VIII., p. 2140), and in which a single letter, ay, a very tittle, is of more account than heaven and earth (VIII., p. 2161). And yet he did not hesitate to make his well-known exceptionable expressions concerning the canon of the S. Scriptures. These, indeed, he afterwards softened; but he nevertheless still admitted imperfections and logical errors in the scriptures (*Walch*, XIV., p. 172). He allows himself to give to passages of the Old Test. a construction different from that given in the New Test. Thus, in Hebr. 2: 13, Is. 8: 17 is regarded as the language of Christ; Luther regards it as the language of the prophet merely (*Walch*, VI., p. 121). He declares Paul's argument, derived from his typical interpretation of the history of Hagar and Sarah, Gal. 4: 22, etc., without force, although it set in a clear light the matter of faith. With regard to Matth. 24, and Luke 21, on which commentators differ as to what refers to the destruction of Jerusalem, and what to the end of the world, he says: Matthew and Mark confound the two, and do not follow the order observed by Luke (*Walch*, XI., p. 2496). Other remarks of the same general purport may be found in his works. Calvin also, who, with regard to the doctrinal contents of the Bible, had said: *Quoniam non quotidiana e cælis red-duntur miracula — non alio jure plenam apud fideles auctoritatem obtinent, quam ubi statuunt e cælo fluxisse ac si voce ipsæ Dei voces illis ex-audirentur*, is very free in his judgments concerning single historical inaccuracies. In the choice of examples to illustrate complete non-resistance, Luke (6: 29) differs from Matthew (5: 40). Calvin contents himself with the remark: *Diversæ locutiones apud Matthæum et Lucam sensum non mutant.* Gen. 47: 31 is given in Heb. 11: 21, according to the Septuagint, which follows a various reading of the Heb. text.—Calvin remarks briefly: *Scimus apostolos hac in parte non adeo fuisse scrupulosos; cæterum in re ipsa parum est discriminis.* On 1 Cor. 10: 8, where Paul gives 23,000 instead of 24,000, he says: *Novum non est, ubi non est propositum minutim singula capita recensere,*

numerum, ponere qui circiter accedit.—*Bullinger* admits, with the utmost freedom, that the writers of the Scriptures had committed errors of memory (see to 1 Cor. 10: 8). *Bugenhagen* remarks that the *chronological order* of the gospel narrative is incorrect, and points out errors of the Septuagint, which had at times passed over into the New Test.—*Brenz*, also, remarks on Rom. 11: 25, that the quotation does not give the meaning of the Old Test. text—*sed sententia est eadem.*—The older doctrinal works, also, such as the *loci* of *Melancthon*, *Chemnitz*, and *Gerhard*, furnish no precise definition of inspiration. Only in 1625 Gerhard added an *exegesis uberior loci de script. s.* Even here he does not discuss the *locus de inspiratione*; but in c. 14, he defends both the integrity of the script. text and the antiquity of the vowels and accents. It was in opposition to syncretism, pietism, and indifferentism that the doctrine received in the Luth. Church its complete development, and the form in which it is found in *Calov*, *Quenstedt*, and *Hollaz*.—The course in the Ref. Church was the same. Whilst the Swiss and French theology, as also the Dutch previous to the Synod of Dort, occupied a more liberal position in respect to this doctrine, *Voetius*, in his *disp. selectæ*, T. I., when discussing: *quousque se extendat auctoritas script. s.*, defends the verbal inspiration in its strictest form. He says: Not a word is contained in the S. Scriptures, which is not in the strictest sense inspired,—even the punctuation not excepted; even what the writers knew before was made known to them anew, not indeed *quoad impressiones specierum intelligibilium, sed quoad conceptum formalem et actualem recordationem.* In direct conflict with Luke 1: 1–3, to the question: *An ordinaria studia, inquisitiones et premeditationes fuerint necessaria ad scribendum?* he answers: *Nego, Spiritus enim immediate, extraordinarie et infallibiliter movebat ad scribendum, et scribenda inspirabat et dictabat.* The controversy of Capellus with Buxtorf concerning the age of the Hebrew vowels, in connection with other doctrinal aberrations of the school at Saumur, stirs up the opposition of the Swiss Church: the result is the *Formula consensus* (1675), in which the *inspiratio* is sanctioned even *quoad verba et vocalia textus Hebraici* (see *Art. Helv. Cons. Form.*). After the middle of the 17th cent., the doctrine prevailing in the two Churches was that of a passive inspiration of the S. Scriptures, which made the writers mere “*calami spiritus s. dictantis*” (*Quenstedt, theolog. didact. polem.*, P. I., p. 55; *Heidegger, corp. theol.*, II., p. 34). Sense, words, letters, vowel-points, and punctuation, all proceeded from the Spirit of God (*Calov*, I., p. 484; *Marsius, syntagma theol.*, p. 8). Differences in mode of thought and style are mere accommodations of the Spirit (*Quenstedt*, I., 76, etc.). The question might be asked: Could the Spirit condescend to grammatical errors, barbarisms, and solecisms? Whilst some admitted, others regarded this as blasphemy. *Quenstedt* solved the difficulty by saying, that what were barbarisms to a Greek were not such in the eyes of the Church (I., p. 84): others again asserted that the New Test. language was thoroughly pure and classical (*Pfaffen, Hollaz, Georgi,*

tc.).—But this strict construction the doctrine had received in the very period in which the traditional creed had begun to totter at all joints. Milder views on inspiration had been asserted in the Luth. Church by *Calixtus*, who accepted the Romish distinction between a *revelatio* and *assistentia* or *directio divina*. *Quæ in census incurrerunt aut aliunde nota fuerunt, Deus criptoribus peculiariter non revelavit; gubernavit amen eos per suam assistentiam, ne quidquam criberent a veritate alienum* (resp. ad theol. Monument. de infallib. Pont. Rom. thes., 72 et 74). By, he limits this *revelatio* to those truths which Thomas Aquinas had designated as the proper and direct subjects of faith. Among the Arminians, *Grotius* in the *votum de pace*, and *Clericus* in the *sentiments de quelques théologiens de Hollande sur l'histoire critique du V. T. comp. par Rich. Simon*, 1685, had also limited the *inspiratio* to an *assistentia divina*. The same view was represented in England, in the Church by *Lowth*, *vindic. of the insp. of the Old and New Test.*, 1692; *Lamotte*, *inspiration of the New Test.*, 1694; *Williams*, in *Boyle's lectures*, 1695; *Clarke*, *divine authority of the holy scriptures*, 1699; and among the dissenters, by *Baxter*, *method. theol. christ.*, 1681; *Doddridge*, *dissert. on the insp. of the New Test.* *Math. Pfaff*, in his *instit. dogm. et mor.* was the first Lutheran theologian of note who advanced this opinion. He denies that all parts of the Scriptures are equally inspired: in matters of faith there is a *suggestio*, in historical matters a *directio*, and in some external and unimportant matters the writers had been left to themselves. "Generally," adds *Baumgarten* (*Glaubenslehre*, III., 35), "in the selection and arrangement of the materials, God suffered as much of the views and mode of thinking of each writer, as was at all consistent with his design."—The greater the influence of his doctrine upon exegesis, and through this upon theology generally, the more it must surprise us that the attention of the later theology has been so little directed toward it. It would have repaid the trouble to revive and examine more closely the scriptural authority for the theory of inspiration held by the ancient Church; his authority especially in passages like 2 Tim. 3:16; John 10:35; 1 Cor. 2:13. Theologians who explain these passages without a proper knowledge of the biblical *usus loquendi*, defend even now not only the entire correctness of all doctrines, but even of all the reports of facts in the Scriptures; passing over in silence or forcibly setting aside whatever opposes their view. This old theory appears in all its consequences, however, only in Prof. *Gaussen*, *sur a théopneustie*, 2d ed., 1842; a work, however, which is more the product of an enthusiastic and brilliant religious rhetoric, than of profound theological study. In Germany the facts brought to light by more recent criticism and exegesis have exerted such a force, that an equally decided defender of the old theory cannot be found. *Stier* might be regarded as such, if we should judge him from certain expressions in his exegetical works; other expressions, however, lead to a different conclusion (see *Tholuck's Com. s. Bergpr.*, 4th ed., pp. 34 and 4). Judging from their exegetical method, *Heng-*

stenberg, *Delitzsch*, and *Hofmann* seem to entertain freer views of inspiration. The latter expands the idea of inspiration even to heathen authors and poets (*Schriftbeweis*, I., 26, 27).—Among most recent theologians, *Beck* has spoken very suggestively concerning inspiration (*Syst. d. chr. Lehre*, p. 240). He, as also *Lange* (*philosoph. Dogmat.*, p. 552), opposes a mechanical separation of contents and form, of inspired and uninspired portions. "Form and contents are inseparably blended in the product of the revealing spirit." But this provides against a mechanical separation only, for it is said (p. 242): "It extends only to the mysteries of the divine kingdom, the spiritual truth, and to the external and human only so far as it is essentially related to the former." *Philippi*, the latest Luth. theologian, teaches an *inspiratio verbi*, though not an *insp. verborum*. If this distinction means anything, it must mean that with the thought the *genus dicendi* is given at the same time. But if the thought is indifferent to the words given in the various readings, may it not be asked whether the various readings are also indifferent with regard to the thought? *Aug. Tholuck* has treated the subject in a more popular manner in his article "die Inspirationslehre" in the "Deutsche Zeitschrift," 1850, No. 16.

DR. THOLUCK.—*Reinecke*.

Inspired, the, were a sect formed in Germany, about 1710, through the influence of the Camisard (see Art.) prophets *Allut* and *Marion*. Its members were mainly gathered from the separatists of north and west Germany, especially in the territory of Wetterau. Even *Knauth*, the Reformed preacher at the Halle cathedral, and *Aug. H. Francke*, were captivated by the delusion. They maintained that God bestowed immediate inspiration upon certain of their number, whom he chose as instruments of special revelations. From 1714–19, eight such instruments were raised up, mostly stocking-weavers: *Joanna Marg. Melchior*, *Mrs. Wagner*, *John Adam Gruber*, *Schwanfelder*, *Mackinet*, *Rock*, *Ursula Meyer*, and *John Charles Gleim*. These travelled in all directions, seeking to make proselytes. In 1716 they numbered several thousands, and organized themselves as "congregations of the truly inspired." They kept the *agapæ*; their first in Halle, 1714. Before sending out prophets on mission tours, they celebrated a love-feast, after eight days' preparation by fasting and prayer. At these feasts they used cakes and wine, and washed each other's feet. On July 4, 1716, in Büdingen, Gruber obtained a revelation of "twenty-four rules of true godliness and piety." Ten congregations were founded, upon these rules, in that vicinity. Each congregation had a leader and two co-elders. These held conferences, at which the general affairs of the society were acted upon. They had no separate office of teachers, but all the members, men and women, were required to take part in their public services, which consisted of singing and reading the Scriptures, and the written or printed sayings of the instruments or media; if a medium was present and received a new revelation, it was announced. In doctrine they agreed essentially with the Evangelical Church, but which, like all separatists,

they denounced, and all fellowship with which (especially in the sacraments) they strictly forbade. In other respects their practical views were those of the well-known mystics Schwenkfeld, J. Böhm, Weigel, and Huburg. — As the high excitement required by their prophetic ecstasies could not be long sustained, most of the media soon grew lukewarm, and lost their gift, so that in 1719 Rock, alone, continued to act. After his death, 1749, the congregations dwindled to such an extent, that it is surprising that the movement did not wholly die out. And yet, after an interval of 60 or 70 years, during which it lay dormant, it recently again revived, with new vigor, under the guidance of Krausert, Barbara Heinemann, and Christian Metz. — As early as 1725 a colony of the Inspired had emigrated to Germantown, Philadelphia, in the United States; and now again, on the revival of the sect, which was opposed by the government, about 800 of them emigrated to the State of New York, purchased a tract of land in Erie county, near Buffalo, where, under the sole management of Metz, they seem to be flourishing. The colony is said to number about 1500 souls. This colony has already sent two others into Canada, and within a few years past some have gone to Iowa. — Besides these communities of the Inspired, there have, from time to time, persons arisen who claimed special inspiration. To this class belong the so-called readers, or preachers in Sweden and Norway, and Irvingism in England rests on a similar basis. — (See *Ztschr. für hist. Theologie*, 1854, II., III.; 1855, I., III.)

M. GOEBEL.*

Intercession for the living (on that of the *Saints* see Art.) is prayer for others. The chief examples of it in the Old Test. are the prayers of Abraham, Gen. 18 : 23, and Moses, Ex. 32 : 32; Numb. 14 : 13, &c. Christians are enjoined to practise it by express precept, Matth. 5 : 44, and by the example of Christ, John 17 : 1, &c., and his apostles, Phil. 1 : 3; James 5 : 16. It is involved in the Lord's prayer: "Our Father," &c., "give us," &c., &c. Those most nearly related to us, are of course to be primarily remembered, but the spirit of intercession will also embrace others. It is a special duty to pray for enemies, Matth. 5 : 44; Luke 23 : 34, and for all whose circumstances demand such remembrance. And we are to intercede not only for spiritual but for temporal mercies, yet with submission, Matth. 6 : 33. The promise to prayer, John 16 : 33, applies especially to intercession, in which the suppliant remembers that he is but a part of the body of Christ, so that the joy of others is his joy, their sorrow his sorrow, 1 Cor. 12 : 26; Rom. 12 : 15. Hence it is the perfection of a life of prayer, illustrating what Paul says of charity, 1 Cor. 13 : 1, &c. The duty is based, 1 Tim. 2 : 1-6 : 1) upon the *character of God* as the Father of all men, who desires that all shall be saved; thus it is made a part of *worship*, so that, even where we cannot lay hold ourselves we may help by our prayers to have the will of God accomplished, Eph. 6 : 18, 19. 2) Upon the *mediatorial work of Jesus Christ*, in which, as members of the universal Christian priesthood, we all participate, though only in and through him, who is the

only mediator between God and man (Rom. 8 : 34; 1 John 2 : 1; Heb. 7 : 26; 1 Pet. 2 : 9). 3) Upon our *relation to society*, especially as organized into a civil government, by the will of God (Rom. 13). As Christians owe tribute, &c., to the State, so it is eminently due from them to bear it before God in prayer, and especially in times of disorder and calamity. In this way the Christian citizen best proves himself his country's friend, and may do it better service than by wise counsels or deadly arms.

KARL BECK.*

Interdict (*interdictum sc. celebrationis divini officii*) is the prohibition, for a stated period, of the offices of Religion, as a censure or penalty for offence against the Church. It is *personale* when imposed on an individual, *locale* when affecting a parish, city, territory, &c. It is therefore a sort of general excommunication (see *Bann*). The precise date of its origin cannot be fixed. Its prohibitions are met with, singly, in earlier times (e. g. c. 8, *Can. V., qu. VI.* [*Conc. Agath. a.* 506], and 10, 11 *Can. XVII., qu. IV.* [*Poenit. Rom.*], &c. Cf. Gonz. Tellez on *cap. 5, X. de consuet., I., 4 nro. 19*). These parts were combined into what constituted the real severity of the interdict, at a later period. Ivo of Chartres († 1125) calls it (*ep. 94*): *remedium insolitum, ob suam nimirum novitatem*; but it dates further back, as a decree of the Council of Limoges, 1031, shows.¹ — An interdict is *generale* or *particulare* (c. 17, *X., de reborum signif. V., 40* [*Innoc. III., a.* 1199]; c. 5, *X., de consuet., I., 4* [*Innoc. a.* 1205]; c. 10, *de sent. excomm., susp. et interd., V., 11* [*Greg. X., in Conc. gen. Ludg. a.* 1274]; c. 16, 17, *cod.* [*Bonif. VIII.*]). If an individual is put under a particular interdict, the penalty is limited to himself; if under a general interdict, public worship may be held in the congregation where he resides, but not if the interdicted person is present (FERRARIS, *s. v. interd., Art. I., nro. 40, &c.*). A local particular interdict is limited to a designated place, parish; a general one to all the churches of the interdicted diocese. Every interdict is strictly interpreted, so that one imposed on a parish, &c., does not include the

¹ Nisi de pace acquieverint, ligate omnem terram Lemovicensem publica excommunicatione: eo videlicet modo, ut nemo, nisi clericus, aut pauper mendicans, aut peregrinus adveniens, aut infans a bimatu et infra in toto Lemovicino sepeliatur, nec in alium episcopatum ad sepellendum portetur. Divinum officium per omnes ecclesias latenter agatur, et baptismus petentibus tribuatur. Circa horam tertiam signa sonent in ecclesiis omnibus, et omnes prout in faciem preces pro tribulatione et pace fundant. Poenitentia et viaticum in exitu mortis tribuatur. Altaria per omnes ecclesias, sicut in Parasceve, nudentur: et cruce et ornamenta abscondantur, quia signum luctus et tristitiae omnibus est. Ad missas tantum, quas unusquisque sacerdotum januis ecclesiarum observatis fecerit, altaria induantur, et iterum post missas nudentur. Nemo in ipsa excommunicatione uxorem ducat. Nemo alteri osculum det, nemo clericorum aut laicorum, vel habitantium vel transeuntium, in toto Lemovicino carnem comedat, neque alios cibos, quam illos, quibus in Quadragesima vesci licitum est. Nemo clericorum aut laicorum tondeatur, neque radatur, quousque districti principes, capita populorum, per omnia sancto obediant concilio (MANSI, Coll. Conciliorum T. XIX. fol. 641. Du FRESNE, *s. v. interdictum*).

clergy, and the reverse (FERRARIS, *l. c.* II., V.). It may be inflicted *a jure*, or *ab homine*. The causes of its infliction are various, but chiefly violations of eccl. immunities, persons, or such laws as have this penalty annexed. The penalty properly consists in prohibiting the administration of the sacraments, public worship, and a Christian burial; though various ameliorations have been admitted. Alex. III., 1173, allowed baptism to children, and absolution to the dying (c. 11, X., *de sponsalibus*, IV., 1; cf. c. 11, X., *de poenit. et remiss.*, V., 38; c. 24, *de sent. excomm.* in VI., V., 11), and Innocent III. confirmation and preaching (c. 43, X., *de sent. excomm.*, V., 39, a. 1208), and, with certain restrictions, general absolution (c. 11, X., *de poenit.*, V., 38, a. 1214; cf. c. 24, *de sent. excomm.* in VI.), the silent burial of the clergy (c. 11, X., *cit.* V., 38), and in the convents of the regulars the observance of the canonical hours, without singing, and the reading of a silent mass, which was, the following year, allowed to bishops (c. 25, X., *de privil.*, V., 33, a. 1215). But then those excommunicated or interdicted could not be present, the doors of the church were to be kept locked, and the bells not to be rung. These last restrictions, however, were suspended by Bonif. VIII., on Christmas, Easter, Whitsuntide, and the ascension of Mary; only the persons excommunicated were excluded, and those who had caused the interdict were not to approach the altar (c. 24, *de sent. excomm.* in VI. [V., 11]). Martin V. and Eugene IV. extended this favor to the entire octave of Corpus Christi (*Const. Ineffabile* a. 1429, and *Const. Excellent.* a. 1433, in the *Bullar. Magn.*, T. I., 308, 323), Leo X. to the octave of the festival of the Holy Conception. Other exceptions were made in favor of the Franciscans and other orders (FERRARIS, *l. c.* VI., nro. 15, &c.). The regulars, however, were otherwise to observe the interdict (c. 1, *Clem. de sent. excomm.*, V., 10, *Conc. Vienn.* 1311; *Conc. Trid. s. XXV.*, c. 12, *de regular.*).—The right of imposing an interdict belongs to the Pope, a provinc. synod, and the bishop with, or without the chapter (c. 2, X., *de his quæ fiunt a majori parte capituli*, III., 11, *Cælest.*, III., a. 1190; *Clem. I.*, *de sent. exc. cit.*, *Conc. Trid. cit.* GONZ. TELLEZ on c. 5, X., *de consuet.* nro. 4). Any confessor may remove a personal particular interdict, canonically imposed, without reservations (c. 29, X., *de sent. exc.*, V., 39, *Innoc. III.*, a. 1199); other interdicts must be removed by the persons who imposed them, their successors, delegates, or superiors (FERRARIS, *l. c.* VIII.). The Church still holds the prerogative of the interdict (*Bened. XIV.*, *de synod. dioec. lib.* X., c. 1, § III., &c.), but since the 17th cent. it has not exercised it in full. In 1606 Paul V. put the Republic of Venice under an interdict (RIEGGER, *dissert. de poenit. et poenis eccl.*, *Vienn.* 1772, § LXXVI.; SCHMIDT, *thes. jur. eccl.*, VII., 172). But particular interdicts are still used, as the *interd. ingressus in ecclesiam* (c. 48, X., *de sent. exc.*, V., 39, *Innoc. III.*, a. 1215; c. 20, *cod. in VI.*, V., 11, *Bonif. VIII.*, &c.; *Conc. Trid. s. VI.*, cap. 1, *in fin. de ref.*) and the *cessatio a divinis*, the partial suspension of sacred usages, as the ringing of bells, playing of the organ, imposed

by the Chapter on the Bishop (c. 55, X., *de ap. pelat.*, II., 28, *Innoc. III.*, a. 1213; c. 13, § 1, X., *de offic. jud. ord.*, I., 31, *Innoc. III.*, a. 1215, &c.; c. 2, *cod. in VI.* and I., 16, *Greg. X.*, a. 1274; c. 8, *cod. Bonif. VIII.*).

H. F. JACOBSON.*

Intervals (interstitia).—The Council of Sardica decreed: "*Potest per has promotiones, quæ habebant utique prolixum tempus, probari, quæ fide sit, quæ modestia, quæ gravitate et verecundia, et si dignus fuerit probatus, divino sacerdotio illustretur, quia conveniens non est, nec ratio vel disciplina patitur, ut temere et leviter ordinentur episcopus aut presbyter aut diaconus, * * * sed hi, quorum per longum tempus examinata sit vita et merita fuerint comprobata.*" Accordingly, every clergyman was required to spend a preparatory interval before passing from a lower to a higher order (cf. *Dist.* 59, c. 2). The same rule was previously observed in regard to the lower orders, whilst special eccl. functions were connected with them, only the length of the interval varied (*Dist.* 77, c. 2, 3, 9); but when their earlier character was changed, and they became mere transition grades to the higher orders, the intervals of course ceased. The Trid. Conc. vainly sought to restore the original rule (c. 17, s. 23, *De Ref.*; c. 11, *l. c.*); but it requires an interval of a (Church) year between the last lower order and the next higher one, and between each of the higher orders, "*nisi necessitas aut eccl. utilitas aliud exposeat*," and that "*duo sacri ordines non eodem die, etiam regularibus, conferantur, privilegiis ac indultis quibusvis concessis non obstantibus quibuscunque*" (c. 11, 13, 14, *l. c.*; c. 13, 15, X.; *De temp. ord.*, I., 11, c. 2, X.; *De eo qui furtiv.*, V., 30). In regard to the right of dispensation granted to bishops by Trent, c. 11, *cit.*, the *Congr. Conc.* decided that to impart the *ordines minores* and subdiaconate on the same day was punishable (*Nro. 1, ad c. 11, cit.* in the ed. of Schulte and Richter).—(Cf. THOMASSIN, *vet. et nov. eccl. discipl.*, I., 2, c. 35, 36. VAN ESPEN, *Jus eccl. univers.*, I., 1, c. 2; II., 9, c. 5. PHILLIPS, *K.-recht*, I., 648, &c.)

WASSERSCHLEBEN.*

Introduction to the Old Testament.—This branch of Christian science has been variously defined. 1) According to the most *external conception* of it, it comprehends certain antecedent and auxiliary studies, necessary to the proper understanding and appreciation of the Old Test. as a whole, and in its parts: bibl. history, archæology, geography, chronology, philology, hermeneutics, criticism, and literature (DE WETTE, KEIL, *Lehrb. d. hist.-krit. Einl. in d. kan. Schr.* d. A. T.). But this definition is exceedingly vague. To the proper, full understanding of the Holy Scriptures, a great deal of preparatory knowledge is requisite; and the limitation to *certain* studies is arbitrary. And Delitzsch (*Ztschr. f. Prot. u. Kirche*, by Thomasius and Hofmann, N. F. XXVIII., 3, p. 133, &c., 138) has shown, what de Wette and Keil admit, that according to their definition, this discipline could not be ranked as a science. It is, however, furthermore inadmissible, because the branches embraced in the so-called Introduction, are rather the *result* of a thorough study of the SS. than a preparation for it.—This view of the

subject will naturally lead us to reject the term Introduction, as an improper designation of the science. The term is first met with in *Hadrian's* (c. 5th cent.) tract *εἰσαγωγὴ εἰς τὰς ἁγίας γραφάς*, then in *Magn. Aurel. Cassiodorus* (6th cent.), who calls his *institut. divinarum literarum*, and his *de artibus, &c., introductorii libri*. It is next found in *Santes Pagninus Lucensis* (†1541, *isagogæ ad ss. lit. lib. unus*) and in *Petr. Palladius* (*isag. in bibl. proph. et apost., Vit. 1568*). Its use became general after the publ. of the works of *Andr. Rivetus* (†1643), *isag. s. introd. generalis, &c.*, in the Reformed Church; and of those of *Joh. Gottl. Carpzov* (†1767), *introd. ad libros canon. Bibl. V. T. omnes* in the Lutheran Church. The term *Einleitung* was first used by *J. D. Michaelis* (†1791). (The name was adopted in English by *Thos. Hartwell Horne*, Cambridge: *An Introd. to the critical study and knowledge of the SS.—The "General Introd.," &c.*, by the Rom. Cath. *Joseph Dixon*, publ. Dublin, Ireland, and Baltimore, United States, whilst attempting to disparage Horne, is scarcely more than a disguised compilation of Horne's elaborate work. *)

2) This branch of Christian knowledge has also been regarded as a *critical science*. Thus *Pelt* (*theol. Encyklop.*, 1843) divides it into *Canonicity* and *Criticism*, and *Lücke*, following *Pelt*, and appealing to *Richard Simon*, *hist. critique du V. et N. T.*, makes the criticism of the canon the great business of Introduction. So *Baur* in *Baur and Zeller's theol. Jahrb.* IX., 1850, p. 463, &c. But *Lücke* has missed *R. Simon's* real aim (see below), and a criticism of the canon would require, not only an inquiry into its origin and formation, but into the history, doctrines, &c., of the books belonging to it.

3) Introduction is most correctly to be regarded as a *historical science*. This view was first advocated by *R. Simon*, who, in his *hist. critique, &c.*, narrates the history of the text, versions, and commentators. As he was the first to separate the Introd. of the Old Test. from that of the New Test., and thus do away with an unhistorical confusion of matter, so he merits the praise of having reduced this branch of study to an independent science. But until recently his views were not appreciated. *Credner*, *Einl. in d. N. T.*, Th. I., 1836, p. 2, and *Hävernick*, *Handb. d. hist.-krit. Einl. in d. A. T.*, I., 1, p. 1, adopted it, but *Hupfeld*, *Begriff u. Methode d. bibl. Einl.* 1844, became its most earnest advocate. In his view Introduction is no longer to be treated as auxiliary to dogmatics, exposition, &c., but as *the history of the Old and New Test. Scriptures*, as *Biblical literature*; and we need only adhere strictly to the idea of history, in order to secure a scientific principle, and a proper connection of the material, to the exclusion of everything foreign. *Delitzsch*, also, regards Introduction as the *history of Old Test. literature*, not only of the canonical Old Test. scriptures, but those to which they refer, and on which they historically rest.

The true idea and compass of Introduction in general, and particularly that of the Old Test., may be gathered by considering the organism of theol. sciences, with which it must be incorporated. Entire theology as a scientific exhibition of the self-consciousness of the Church in

regard to its origin, nature, and aim, includes *Biblical theol.*, which treats of the Old and New Test. as the fundamental archives of the Church, and *Ecol. theol.*, treating of its nature and aim. The former is essentially historical, the latter partly historical, partly systematic. Thus Theology is divided into bibl.-historical, ecol.-historical, and ecol.-systematic. The first of these, again, is naturally subdivided into several disciplines: 1) *the external history* of the Scriptures, their origin, collection, and preservation; 2) the doctrine of their authenticity, integrity, and credibility, involving historical inquiries. These two are *formal* branches of study. 3) *Archæology*, and 4) *bibl. theology* of the Old Test. and New Test.; these are the *material* branches of our science.—In accordance with the usual conception of Introduction, it has been divided into a *general* and a *particular* Introd., the former treating of the canon, the original languages, translations, and text of the Old Test., the latter of the name, author, age, and peculiarity of each book. *Andr. Rivetus* (l. c.) first made this division, and *Hävernick* adopts it, in spite of his declaration that Introd. is a historical science. The impropriety of this division is aggravated by giving the *general* Introd. the first place; though *Schott* has reversed this order (*isag. hist. crit. in bibl. N. T. SS., Jen.* 1830). But this division is incompatible with the historical conception of our science. *Keil* abandoned it, and has three divisions. *First*: An inquiry into the origin and genuineness, I. of the Old Test. in general, according 1) to its formation and character; 2) its language; II. of particular books, 1) the pentateuch; 2) the prophetic books, a) historical, b) prophetic proper; 3) the *hagiographa*; III. of the formation of the canon. *Second*: A critical history of the transmission of the Old Test. canon. books: I. as to its principles, a hist. sketch of the perpetuation and study of the Hebrew language; II. as to its means, 1) an account of the preservation of the original text, a) by showing the gradual changes of its outward form, b) a description of the MSS.; 2) the spread of the Old Test. by means of ancient versions, their origin, character, and history; III. as to their influence on the contents of the Old Test. SS., in a sketch of critical labors on the text a) in MSS., b) in printed editions. The *third* division treats of the canon. dignity of the Old Test., and gives a histor. statement, I. of the views of the Synagogue and Church concerning the canon, 1) as to its extent and parts, 2) its divine authority; II. the consequent hermeneutical treatment of the Old Test., 1) among the Jews, 2) in the Christian Church, with a concluding summary of the result, in regard to the authority and treatment of the Old Test.—According to our conception of the science, as a history of the general literature of the Old Test., it falls into three parts: I. the history of the origin of the separate writings of the Old Test.; II. the history of their collection into a canon; III. the history of the Old Test. canon, from its formation to the downfall of the nationality of Israel. This is substantially the division adopted by *Hupfeld* and *Delitzsch*.—The *method* to be pursued in this science is

bviously determined by its historical nature. The form adopted must be that of a *narrative*, and in the order of *periods* (not the different character of the books), so that chronological continuity may not be broken. But the scientific character of the narrative must likewise be maintained, by showing the internal connection and development of the phenomena; thus the method must also be critical. Hence the recent phrase: *historico-critical* Introd. (*Hupfeld*, l. c., p. 14, &c.). The *periods* must not be determined, alone, by political events, but by the epochs of Hebrew literature; though the political and literary interests of the Jews are closely allied. As the history of Israel is the development of the incarnation of God in Christ, the literature of Israel is the written testimony of that development. Accordingly, with *Deitzsch*, we get five periods: 1) that of Moses and the Judges; 2) that of David and Solomon; 3) that of the divided kingdoms before their downfall; 4) that of the exile; 5) that of the restoration after the exile. Introductorily to this history, it will be proper, after inquiring into the idea, name, limits, division, method, history, and literature of our science, to treat of the age, origin of Hebrew writing, as well as of the commencement of Hebrew authorship in the age of the Patriarchs.

History and Literature.—In the earliest ages of the Church there was little demand for the discussion of subjects connected with our science; the authenticity and credibility of the written sources of Christian doctrine were not then disputed. As the attacks upon Christianity were mainly directed against its doctrines, the replies were doctrinal. Even such assaults as those of Celsus upon Genesis, and of Porphyry upon Daniel, were less historical than dogmatical. The literature of our science during that period is therefore scanty. The work of *TICHONIUS* (c. 390): *regulæ septem ad investig. et inven. intelligentiam ss.* (in the *max. Bibl. PP.*, II., 49, &c.) is hermeneutical. So, chiefly, *AUGUSTINE's de doctr. christ.* II., IV. (beg. 397, fin. 426; *Opp. ed. Bened.*, III., 1, &c.; sep. publ. by *Calixt.*, Helmst. 1629, ed. 2, 1655, and c. *arr. lectt. animadv. illustr.* by *Teegius*, Lps. 1769), containing *præc. quædam tractand. ss.*, and *JEROME's libellus de opt. interpret. genere, ep.* 101, *ad Pamm.* But the prefaces to his exeget. works contain useful hints on our science. Less of this character is *HADRIAN's* (prob. 5th cent.) *ισαγωγὴ εἰς τὰς ἁγίας γραφάς*, first publ. by *D. Hösche*, Aug. Vind. 1602, 4to., then in the *Crill. sacr.* ed. Lond., VIII., 2, 11, &c., ed. Francof., VI., 10, &c., which belongs to *Grammar* and *Hermeneut.* So *EUCHERIUS* (5th cent.) *liber formularum spirit. intelligentiæ s. phrases ss. ad Veranium fil.* and *Instructt. ad Salonium fil.* II., II., publ. by *A. Schott*, Col. 1618, and in the *Bibl. PP. Col.*, V., and *max. Bibl. PP. Ludg.*, VI., 822, &c.; that of *Vincent. Lerin.*, 434, *pro cath. fidei antiq. et universit.*, &c., publ. by *Calixt.* (with *Augustine's de doctr.*), Helmst. 1629, 8vo., and *S. Baluz.*, Par. 1663, 8vo., and after. More in point is *JUNILIUS* (6th cent.), *de part. divinæ legis*, &c., in the *max. Bibl. PP.*, X., 339, &c.; *Gall. Bibl. PP.*, XII., 77, &c.; sep. issued by *Gastius*, Bas. 1546, 8vo., Par. 1556, Francof.

1603; also found in *Flacius, clavis ss. tract.*, II. Also, *M. AUREL. CASSIOD.* (6th cent.), *institt. divin. literarum*, II., in *Opp. ed. J. Garet. Rothomagn.*, 1679, Ven. 1729, fol. II., 508, &c.; sep. publ. by *J. Pamelius*, Antw. 1565, 8vo., Par. 1575, 8vo.; in the pref. he calls the work *introd. libri*. This continued the chief work during the middle ages, the only work produced during that period being *NICOL. LYRANUS*, †1340, *Postilla perpetua s. brevis comment. in universa biblia*, Antw. 1634. The revived study of the original text, and of oriental languages, simultaneously with the invention of printing, opened the way for our science. The *Reformation* especially quickened impulses in this direction, although even then some time elapsed before ev. science took vigorous hold of historical, critical investigations, questions of doctrine having claimed first attention. Hence the Romish Church took the lead, in defence of its canon.¹ The controversy between the Rom. and Prot. Church about the Bible and Tradition soon called forth a number of works from the latter.² The infidelity which sprang up in the

¹ *SANTES PAGINUS LUCENCIS*, †1541, *isag. ad ss. litt. lib. unus*, Lugd. 1536, fol., Col. 1540, fol., and *SIXTUS SENENSIS*, †1599, *biblioth. sancta ex præcip. cath. eccl. auctor. collecta*, Ven. 1666, fol. and often; publ. by *F. Hay*, L. B. 1591, 4to.; last, Naples 1742.

² *JOH. BUXTORF*, †1629, *Tiberias s. commentarius masorethicus*, Bas. 1620, enlarged and impr. ed.: *Tiberias s. comm. mas. triplex, historicus, didacticus, criticus*, recogn. et add. non paucis locupl. a *Jo. Buxtorffio* fil. ed. nov. accur. *Jo. Jac. Buxtorffio* nep., Bas. 1655, fol. and 4to.; of *LUD. CAPELLUS*, †1658, *Arcanum punctationis revelatum* ed. Thom. Erpenius L. B. 1624, 4to.; *vindicte arcana punct. rev.* in the app. to *Comment. et notæ crit.* in V. T., Amstel. 1689, fol.; *Diatriba de veris et antiquis Ebraeorum literis*, ib. 1645, 12mo.; *Critica sacra s. de variis quæ in sacris V. T. libris occurrunt lectionibus* II. VI., ed. op. *Joan. Cappelli*, Lutet., Par. 1650, fol.; new ed.: *rec. multisque animadv. auxit G. J. L. Vogel*, T. I., Hal. 1775, 8vo.; *J. G. Scharfenberg*, T. II., III., Hal. 1778 and 86; opposed by *Jo. Buxtorff* fil., †1664, *Anticritica s. vindicie veritatis hebraicæ adv. L. Cappelli criticam quam vocat sacram ejusque defensionem, quibus sacros. editionis Bibliorum hebr. autoritas, integritas et sinceritas a variis ejus strophis et sophismatis, quamplurima loca a temerariis censuris et variarum lectionum commentis vindicantur*, etc., Bas. 1653, 4to.; by *Jo. MORINUS*, †1659, *Exercitationum biblicarum de Hebraei Græcique textus sinceritate* II. duo., Par. 1669, fol. 1686; by *BRIAN WALTON*, †1661, *Prolegomena te Biblia polygl.*, Lond. 1657, fol.; especially publ.: *Br. Waltoni Angli biblicus apparatus chronologico-topographico-philologicus* (ed. *J. H. Heidegger*), Tig. 1673, fol., and *Br. Waltoni in Biblia polygl. Prolegomena. Præf. Jo. Aug. Dathe.*, Lps. 1777, 8vo.; and by *HUMPHREY. HODY*, †1706, *de Bibliorum textibus originalibus, versionibus græcis et latina vulgata* II. IV., Oxon. 1705, fol. General Introd. of this period by Protestant writers are: *ANDR. RIVETUS*, †1643, *isagoge s. introductio generalis ad Scripturam s. V. et N. T.*, etc., L. B. 1627, 4to.; *MICH. WALTHER*, †1662, *officina biblica, noviter adaperata, in qua perspicue videre licet, quæ scita cognitaque maxime sunt necessaria de scriptura s. in gen. et in spec., de libris ejus canon., apocryph., deperditis, spuris*, Lps. 1636, 4to., enlarged and impr., Viteb. 1668, 4to., 1703, fol.; *ABR. CALOV*, †1686, *criticus s. bibl. de n. Scripturæ auctoritate, canone, lingua origin., fontium puritate ac vers. præcip.*, etc., Viteb. 1643, 4to.; *JOH. HENR. HEIDEGGER*, †1698, *enchiridion biblicum ἐπερρημονικόν, lectioni sacræ, analysi generali singulorum V. et N. T. librorum, et delibato capitum argumento, præmissis quib.*

17th cent. in England and France, and thence soon spread over the Church, naturally assailed the sacred sources of the Christian Religion. Thus a series of works on both sides appeared,¹ and our science took a prominent place among theological disciplines. H. AUG. HAHN.*

Introduction to the New Testament.—Concerning the idea, plan, &c., of this science, see preceding article.

The principal works upon this subject, which have appeared since 1750, are critical monographs, and therefore do not claim notice here. Among the Church Fathers, Jerome, Chrysostom, and Eusebius did special service to this science, though in an unsystematic way. Jerome was the greatest critic among them, as his comm. and transl. show, in the prefaces to which, and in his *de viris illustr.*, much may be found in the way of a special introd. to the New Test. books. The same is true of CHRYSOSTOM'S Homilies. For higher criticism EUSEBIUS is the chief author, having furnished the tradition of the first three cent. concerning the origin and estimation of the New Test. books. Alone worthy of mention during the next period are: CASSIODORUS, *instit. divinarum litterarum*, containing remarks upon the canon, the literature, and one chapt. on the criticism of the text; JUNILIUS, *de partibus legis div.*, containing apologetic attempts to show the divine authority of the SS., divisions of the books according to the style of the diction, relative canonicity, &c., &c. The *Middle Ages* were mainly concerned for the preservation and various translations of the SS., especially under Charlemagne. The *Reformation* paid little attention to Isagogics, although the criticism of the merits of the Greek text, in comparison with the Vulgate, became important; and in higher criticism, Luther, Zwingli, and Calvin took greater liberties than were subse-

quently allowed. Among *Rom. Catholics* of the 16th cent, S. PAGNINUS *Lucensis* and SIXTUS *Senensis* are named. The former wrote *Introd. ad sacr. litteras*, a collection of what was done in the Middle Ages on the basis of Jerome, with a section upon the canon and versions. Sixtus wrote a *Biblioth. sancta ex præcip. cath. auctoribus coll.*, 1566. In b. 7 and 8 he collects and refutes objections to the genuineness of the books of the Bible. Modern Isagogics commenced, among Protestants, in the sphere of lower criticism, with inquiries into the history of the text, MSS., versions, citations, &c., included in the *apparatus critici* of edd. of the New Test. To this class belong the works of *Wallon, Fell, Mill, Wetstein, Albr. Bengel*. But *Richard Simon* (see preceding Art.) is the true founder of the science, who awakened at once a spirit of investigation and theorizing. He began with lower, but pressed also to higher criticism. He wrote: *Hist. crit. du Texte du N. T.*, 1689; *Hist. crit. des vers. du N. T.*, 1690; *Hist. crit. d. princip. comment. du N. T.*, 1693; suppl. in the *Nouv. observat. sur le texte et l. vers. du N. T.*, 1695, all in a negative tendency. This was opposed by Protestants until c. 1750. But when *Lessing* vigorously defended the right of criticism, the old barriers gave way. A transition is found in *Semler: Appar. ad liberalem N. T. interpret.*, 1767; *Vorbereit. z. theol. Hermen.*, 1760-9. He also opposed the negative tendency, as it shone forth in the *Wolfenb. fragments*, but still is thought the father of Prot. rationalism. Semler's influence appeared first in *Michaelis, Einl.*, last ed. *Eichhorn*, however, is fully on the side of modern skepticism: *Einl. ins A. T.*, 1780-3; *N. T.* 1804-20, distinguishing himself by his theory of a MS. primitive gospel. As Heyne's pupil, he regarded the SS. rather in an æsthetic than theo-

etiam ad notitiam cujusque libri de auctore, summa, seopo, chronologia, partitione etc. notis . . . inseruiens, Tig. 1681, 8vo., and often, last Jen. 1723, 8vo.; Jo. HENR. HOTTINGER, †1667, thesaurus philologicus s. clavis Scripturæ s., qua quidquid fere Orientalium, Hebræorum maxime et Arabum habent monumenta de religione ejusque variis speciebus, Judaismo, Samaritanismo, Christianismo, Muhammedanismo, Gentilismo; de Theologia et Theologis; verbo Dei ἀγάπη et ἡγάπη, variis Bibliorum exemplaribus, fontium hebræorum integritate, scripturæ accidentibus, partibus, distinctionibus, sensu et commentariis; de Targumim s. paraphrasibus chald., syriac., arab., pers., samarit., græcis et latinis; de Masora et Kabbala, de singulorum V. T. librorum canon. et apocryph. auctoritate in gen., et de lege, prophetis et prophetiis in spec. breviter reseratur, etc., Tig. 1649, 4to., ed. 3, 1696, 4to.; Jo. LEUSDEN, †1699, Philologus Ebr., Ultraj. 1656, ed. 5, 1696, 4to., and Philologus Ebraeo-mixtus, ib. 1663, ed. 4, Bas. 1739, 4to.

¹ THOS. HOBBS, †1679, *Leviathan*, Lond. 1651, fol. BENED. SPINOZA, †1677, *tract. theolog.-polit., contra dissertt. aliquot, quibus ostenditur libertat. philosophandi non tantum salva pietate et reip. pace posse concedi, sed eandem nisi cum pace reip. ipsaque tolli non posse*, Hamb. 1670, 4to. RICHARD SIMON, †1712, *Aist. critique du V. T.*, Par. 1678, 4to.; Latin, Amst. 1681, 4to., Rott. 1685, 4to. This work, properly, reduced Introd. to a science. Against these assaults: J. G. CARPZOV, †1767, *introd. ad libros canon. Bibl. V. T. omnes*, Lps. 1721, 3d ed. 1741, 4to.; this was a special Introd.; and *crit. sacra V. T.*, p. I. circa textum origin., II. c. versiones, III. c. Pseudocrit. G.

Whistoni sollicita, Lps. 1728, ed. 2, 1748, 4to.: a general Introd. But the positive character of this excellent work was distasteful to the negative spirit of that age. In this negative character we have: J. SOL. SEMLER, †1791, *Abhandl. v. freier Unters. d. Kanons*, 4 Thle., Halle, 1771-75, 8vo., and *Apparatus ad liberalem V. T. interpr.*, ib. 1773. J. GOTTFR. EICHHORN, †1827, *Einl. in d. A. T.*, 3 Thle., Lpz. 1780-3, 4th ed. 5 Thle., Gött. 1823-4. H. F. GÜTTE, *Entw. z. Einl. ins N. T. mit Berücks. d. A.*, Halle, 1787, 8vo. BÄBER, *allg. Einl., &c.*, Wien, 1794. G. L. BAUER, †1806, *Entw. e. hist. krit. Einl., &c.*, Nüremb. u. Altd., 1794, 8vo., 3d impr. ed. 1806. G. C. W. AUGUSTI, †1841, *Grundriss e. hist. krit. Einl., &c.*, Lpz. 1806, 2d ed. 1827, 8vo. L. BERTHOLDT, †1822, *hist. krit. Einl. in sämmtl. kanon. u. apokr. Schr., &c.*, Erl. 1812-19, 6 Thle., 8vo. Most completely by W. M. L. DE WETTE, †1849, *Beitr. z. Einl., &c.*, 2 Bdehen., Halle, 1806-7-12, and *Lehrb. d. hist. krit. Einl., &c.*, 1817, 6th enl. ed. 1845, 1852, 8vo. *Rom. Catholics*: J. JAHN, †1816, *Einl. in d. göttl. Bb. d. A. B.*, Wien, 1793, 8vo., 2d ed. wholly revised, 1802-3, 2 Thle. in 3 vols.; Latin, ib. 1805, 2d ed. 1815; revised by ACKERMAN 1825. J. G. HERBST, †1836, *hist. krit. Einl., &c.*, Krlsr. u. Freib. 1840-2, 8vo. J. M. AUG. SCHOLZ, *Einl., &c.*, Köln, Lpz. 1845-8, 8vo. By theol. of the Evangelical Church: J. D. MICHAELIS, †1791, *Einl., &c.*, Hamb. 1787 (incomplete). E. W. HENGSTENBERG, *Beitr. z. Einl., &c.*, 3 Bde., Berlin, 1831-9, 8vo. H. A. C. HÄVERNICK, †1845, *Hdb. d. hist. krit. Einl., &c.*, Bd. I, II, III. (completed by C. F. Keil), Erl. 1849, 8vo., 2d ed. Frankf. a. M. u. Erl. 1854. C. F. KEIL, *Lehrb. d. hist. krit. Einl., &c.*, Frankf. a. M. u. Erl. 1853.

ogical aspect. In this Herder's influence is visible, only his warm regard for Religion is lacking. But then already a reaction occurred among Prot. and Romanists. Of the former we have: "Ausführl. Untersuchung d. Gründe f. d. Aechth. u. Glaubw. d. schr. Urkunden d. Christenth.," J. Fr. Kleuker, 5 Th., 1797-1800. Of Romanists: J. L. Hug, *Introd.*, 1798-1808, 2d ed. 1826, 4th 1847, a valuable work for lower criticism. Bertholdt, *Einl.*, 6 Bde., 1812-19, also opposed Eichhorn. But of this school De Wette was unquestionably the master. In his *Einl.* in's A. T., 1817, he treated only of the history of the canon; of his *Einl.* in's N. T., the following edd. appeared: 1826, 30, 34, 42, 48. Although sceptical, his strongest opponents acknowledge his merit for precision, clearness, comprehensiveness, and completeness. Bleek: *Beitr. zur Evangelienkrit.*, 1846, occupies the same ground, only is more accurate and considerate, and holds a more intermediate place among present critics. Against De Wette we have Guericke's *Beitr. z. hist. krit. Einl.*, 1828-31; *Einl.* in's N. T., 1843, 2d ed. 1854, remodelled after Reuss. The same positive position, in a more popular form, is taken by OLSHAUSEN and HOTO V. GERLACH, by the former in his *Aechth. ämmtl. Bücher d. N. T. für gebildete Leser*, &c., 1832; by the latter in his *introd. prefaces* to his N. T., 2 Bde., 2 Ausg. 1840, 4 Aufl. 1852. In special *Introd.*: SCHOTT, *Isag. hist. crit. in libros N. T. sacros*, 1830, and NEUDECKER, *Lehrb. . hist.-krit. Einl.* in's N. T., 1840. Both are valuable in material. CREDNER, *Beitr.*, &c., 1832, *Einl.* in's N. T., 1836, carries out De Wette's hints, with original inquiries into the sources, but is strongly sceptical, especially in his N. T. nach Zweck, Ursprung, Inhalt, &c., 841-3-7. SCHLEIERMACHER's Lectures on the V. T. *Einl.*, in the summer of 1829, and winter of 1831-2 (publ. in Wolde's ed. of his works, Hött. 1845), display great freshness and critical talent, but are more acute than cautious. In regard to material, De Wette's manual forms the basis. The lectures furnish a good view of the state of the science prior to Strauss, 1835, and the new Tübingen school, which pushed negative criticism to an extreme never dreamed of before. The numerous rejoinders to this movement are named in the later edd. of De Wette, Reuss, and Guericke. To Baur's school belong Schwegler, *l. nachapost. Zeitalter*, 1846; Baur, *d. Einl.* in's V. T. als theol. Wissensch., &c., Tüb. Jahrb. 1850, IV., 1851, I., II., III. In opposition to his tendency, EBRARD's *wissensch. Kritik d. ev. Gesch.*, ed. 1, 1841-2, ed. 2, 1850, is especially comprehensive; LECHLER, *Apost. u. nachapost. Zeitalter*, 1851. For historical exhibitions of the subject during the apost. period, cf. Neander, Thiersch, Lange, P. Schaff, &c., *Ch. Histories*. We must not omit THIRSCH, *Vers. z. Herstellung d. hist. Standp. f. d. Krit. d. N. T. Schr.*, 1845 (to which Baur rejoined: *Der Kritiker u. l. Fanatiker*); and Otto R. Hertwig's *Tabellen* in's *Einl.* in's N. T., 1849. J. G. MÜLLER.*

Investiture, and the disputes concerning it.—Investiture is defined by Godfrey, Abbot of Vendome, to be a *sacramentum*, i. e. *sacrum signum*, *quo princeps eccl., Episcopus scilicet, a ceteris hominibus secernitur pariter atque dignoscitur et*

quo super chr. gregem cura ei tribuitur (*Tract. de ordinat. Episc. et Invest. Laicor. in Melch. Goldasti Apolog. pro Henr. IV.—adv. Greg. VII. P. criminationes, Hannov. 1611, p. 262*). The right of confirming the Bishop in his office, and of conferring its benefices, pertained, even in the earliest Frankish empire, to the King. Both were performed by the King giving the Bishop a ring (as a symbol of his close union with the congregation), or a staff (as a symbol of his dignity and pastoral duties). This transfer of the symbols was connected with the political principle that all Church possessions were *beneficia*; hence bishops were liable to military service (*Eichhorn, deutsche Staats-u. Rechtsgesch.*, Gött. 1834, I., 202, 505, 516; *Sugenheim, Staatsleben im Mittelalt.*, Berl. 1839, I., 315). The presentation of the symbols involved the formal transfer of the office, and *investment* with it. In the earliest times either the ring or staff were used, not both. Clovis I. (508) used the ring; Clovis II. (623), Lewis the German, Arnulf, and even Otto I., the staff; whilst Henry II., and Conrad II., gave the ring first as a pledge that they would confer the staff. Subsequently, investiture was performed with both, and was then completed with the sceptre (*Mosheim, Instit. hist. eccl.*; *PLANCK, Gesch. d. christl. kirchl. Gesellschaftsverf.*, III., 462). But when bishops, since Charlemagne, had to take a feudal oath at investiture, this acquired the significance of an *enseoffment*. Bishops were often deposed by kings, when the feudal relation ceased, and the bishops had to restore the insignia of *enseoffment*, with their benefices, to the kings. This prerogative of the temporal powers was early abused for mercenary purposes, which the Church denounced as *simony*, and the German emperors Henry I., Otto I. (at the synod of Ingelheim, 948), Conrad II., Henry III., strongly opposed the evil, whilst Clem. II. also began to resist *simony*. Still, during the minority of Henry IV. the abuse was fearfully practised by the regents. Then Greg. VII. (see Art.) became Pope, who regarded the political right of investiture as hostile to the interests of the Church. First of all he denounced Philip of France for its exercise, and called upon the bishops of the kingdom to resist it with all severity, even using spiritual penalties to enforce its abrogation (*Greg. Epist. Lib.*, II., ep. 5, *ad Episc. Franc. a.* 1074). At a synod in Rome, 1075, he put five counsellors of Henry IV. under the ban for *simony*, and enacted that thereafter no temporal prince should be allowed to invest with a spiritual office. But as Philip of France and William of England, and others, disregarded this prohibition, Gregory was glad that they did not disturb him, and he directed all his energies against Henry.—Forthwith the strife concerning investiture yielded to that between two rival Popes. Gregory's party nominated Victor III., and after his early death Urban II.; the Emperor, Clem. III. Urban maintained Gregory's measures; in 1090 (*Concil. Melfitan.*, can. 11, in MANSI, p. 723, sq.) he decreed: *nullum jus laicis in clericos esse volumus et censemus*; at the Council of Clermont, 1095 (*Mansi*, 816, &c.), he took up the investiture controversy anew. In can. 15, of said

Council, it was forbidden to accept an eocl. office from a layman; can. 16 extended this especially to kings and other princes; can. 17 forbade bishops and priests to bind themselves feudally to a king or layman; can. 18 threatened those who persisted in neglecting these prohibitions, with deposition. But Urban found it impossible to carry out these measures. He died 1099. A crusade drove his rival from Rome, and Paschal II. assumed the chair. He held the same views as his predecessors, but lacked their firmness. In England and France he moved cautiously; but in Germany, which was politically distracted, he was very bold. As Henry earnestly strove to maintain the rights of his throne, Paschal seemed to yield somewhat (*Mansi*, 1003). But when Henry died, 1106, heart-broken at the rebellion of his sons, Paschal proclaimed that the Church had been liberated by the death of him who had usurped its prerogatives (*Mansi*, 1209). The laws of investiture were now renewed at the Council of Troyes, at Benevento (1108), and the Lat. Council (1110). Meanwhile Henry V., encouraged by the example of England and France, strongly opposed these laws, retained the right of investiture, regarded the revival of the laws as a hostile measure, invaded Italy, and so terrified Paschal that he consented to a compromise (Feb. 9, 1111). This the bishops denounced. Henry then pressed on and took the Pope and cardinals captive. Paschal opened new negotiations; a second compact was entered into (Apr. 8, 1111), which by oath guaranteed the right of investiture to Henry; in further confirmation, Paschal imparted the host to Henry, when he crowned him. He then returned to Germany. But now the hierarchical party opposed the compact. At a synod in Rome, Paschal acknowledged his error, but said he only, not the Church, was bound. A new Lateran Council (1112, *Mansi*, XXI., 49, &c.) annulled the compact, placed Henry under a ban, which Paschal confirmed and ordered his legates to publish. Henry at once invaded Italy again, took Rome, and made Paschal flee; he died in exile, 1118. The Romish party elected Gelas. II. († 1119) and then Calixtus II., who forthwith offered Henry new terms of peace. Both agreed to yield the right of investiture, to return all property to the previous owner, and in cases of difference the Church's claims should be decided by canonical, the State's by temporal judges (*Mansi*, 244). Soon, however, such differences arose that Calixtus, at a Synod of Rheims (1119), placed Henry under the ban (*Mansi*, 250). Political disturbances rendered it expedient for Henry to yield, and thus originated the Concordat (see Art.) of Worms (Sept., 1122), confirmed by the Lat. Council of 1123 (*Mansi*, 273, 77, 88). It decreed that the election of German bishops and abbots should take place in the presence of the Emperor, or his commissary, without simony, freely from among the clergy; that the person so chosen should, within six months, receive the imperial fief through the *sceptre*, and that then he should render that service to the crown to which it had claims. In a disputed election the Emperor should sustain the just party by advice

of the Archb. and Bishops. If the Emperor felt aggrieved, the Pope was to interfere. Here the Emperor was allowed to invest with the sceptre, but yielded to the Pope investiture with the ring and staff, together with canonical election, free consecration, restored all attached possessions of the Church, and promised to restore such as, during the period of controversy, had fallen into other hands, and to render the Church all needful aid in matters of complaint. Before consecration the person elected had to take the oath of fealty. Lothaire III., 1125, modified this so that only a general oath of allegiance was required. Thus the aversion of the hierarchical party to the Worms Concordat was moderated. **NEUDECKER.***

Ionis was, originally and strictly, that long, narrow strip of land along the *Ægean* Sea, opposite Greece, which formed the commencement of Asia Minor. It stretched from Phocæa to Miletus, and was early inhabited by Greeks (Ionians), who soon distinguished themselves by culture and commerce. They were the first Greeks who became acquainted with the Israelites. Twelve cities, (including Miletus and Ephesus), to which Smyrna was subsequently joined, formed a political and commercial league; but they could not withstand Persian and Roman aggressions. The Jews called these and all other Greeks, *Javan* (Gen. 10:2; Is. 66:19; Dan. 8:21), and sons of the Javanites (Joel 3:6; Zech. 9:13). The Greek form of the name occurs only in 1 Macc. 8:8. The LXX. erroneously have it India. Strabo, 14. 632; Pliny, 5, 31; and Mela, 1, 17, still mention Ionis as a distinct country, although the cities were then, for the most part, attached to other provinces. Hence Ptol. 5, 2, reckons it, politically, with *Asia propria*. The population of Ionis consisted partly of Jews, who probably were first taken thither as captives (Joel 3:11, German version; Jos. Antt. 16, 2, 3).

VAHINGER.*

Ireland.—The aborigines of Ireland descended, according to the native tradition, from oriental Scythians, who immigrated thither, by way of Spain. On Tertullian's authority, Christianity is supposed to have been planted there in the 2d cent. Before the 4th cent. missionaries went from Ireland, and in the 4th cent. churches and schools existed at Beglir in Leinster. Jerome says Celestius, a pupil of Pelagius, was the son of Irish Christians. The country was christianized by Eastern missionaries, hence its opposition to the customs of the Romish Church. Palladius, the first Romish priest sent thither, was repulsed (430) and went to Scotland. In 432 St. Patrick, who had been a slave in Ireland, went thither from Gaul, but without holding any connection with Rome. By his zeal Christianity spread over the whole country, and so many monasteries (see *Columba*) were founded that it was called the island of saints. The zeal which made him the Apostle of Ireland, led his pupils to become missionaries to Germany.—Concerning the attempt of Rome to introduce the observance of Easter, see *Caldes*.—The happy condition of the Irish Church was disturbed in the 9th cent., by the Norman invasion; MSS. and monasteries were burned,

nd churches overthrown. This invasion produced internal feuds, and a state of anarchy which operated disastrously upon the Church and clergy. At this period still, the complaints of Rome refer to peculiar usages, the marriage of the clergy, baptism without chrism, and a native liturgy; but in 1152 the Irish Church became subject to the Pope. Perhaps this was the only means of saving it. In 1155 Hadrian V. authorized Henry II. of England to subdue Ireland, Henry promising to maintain the Pope's rights there. A council at Cashel, 1172, arranged the Irish Church after the Romish order. Until then confession, saints' images, chrism at baptism, the mass, indulgences, and choir-service, are said to have been unknown, whilst the Lord's Supper was administered in both kinds, and the marriage of the clergy allowed. Under the Plantagenets the clergy sustained no high character; bishops were warriors, and were guilty of public and private sins; the monks, also, became mendicants, oppressing both the clergy and the laity. When Henry VIII. endeavored to exercise his eccl. supremacy over Ireland, his measures were violently resisted, especially the attempt to appoint only such priests as spoke English. George Brown, appointed Bishop of Dublin, could, with all his zeal, accomplish but little. Under Edward VI., the English prayer-book was introduced, but not without opposition; the injunction to conduct worship in English seems not to have been obeyed. Mary speedily uprooted the little Protestantism planted there; the people were not ripe for a Reformation, the priesthood was not degraded as in other countries; and many Protestant clergymen sent thither were adventurers, whose heart was not in their work. The violent measures which these used, instead of Christian persuasion, only excited hostility. The act of uniformity, 1560, required the Book of Prayer to be used by all the Irish clergy, and again in the English language; afterwards the Irish language was allowed. In 1602 the Irish New Test. of Wm. Daniel appeared; in 1665 the entire Bible. From Elizabeth's time Rome began openly and secretly to oppose Prot. in Ireland; in this some Irish nobles and the inferior clergy aided, especially the Jesuits of Douay. Insurrections were encouraged against the English government, which compelled attendance upon its worship by a fine of 12d.; Romish worship was prohibited. Thus a strong papal party arose, which acquired power under James II., restored Romish worship, and expelled evangelical clergymen; this movement was suppressed by force. Under Charles I. the government sought to improve the wretched condition of the Anglican Church in Ireland. At the convocation of 1634, the 39 Articles were adopted, and the 104 Articles of the Irish Church of 1615, containing the rejected Lambeth Art., retained. The constitution of the Irish Church was established by Branchall, Bishop of Londonderry, in 100 canons, which inclined to more freedom than the 141 canons of the Anglican Church. Papists were not disturbed in their private worship; their clergy returned and laid the basis for a general up-rising. Puritans from Scotland also settled in

the country and gained adherents. Towards the close of 1641 the insurrection broke out, in which from 40-50,000 Protestants (some say only 6000) were murdered. Under Charles II. an attempt was made to revive the Episcopal Church in Ireland, which had fallen into decay under the republic. In 1665 the *Act of Uniformity* was renewed, and the *Corporation Act* added, which required all Church and civil officers to take the oath of allegiance, and at least once a year take the sacrament in the State Church. In 1672 the *Test Act* was passed, requiring of officers a declaration against Transubstantiation. Under James II. the papists flourished, and many Protestants left the country to escape peril of life and property. The Toleration Act of 1689 was not extended to Ireland until 1719; but Romanists were still excluded from all offices, and even exterminating laws were passed, as that, 1694, forbidding any but a Protestant education, and fining any papist who would teach school in £20. Under Anne the Presbyterians of North Ireland received an annuity from the State; their congregations were then in a wretched condition. The relation of the different Churches to each other and to the State continued unchanged until 1782, when Romanists obtained larger rights of property; in 1780 Prot. Dissenters were released from the Test Act. In 1795 a Rom. Cath. Theol. Sem. was established at Maynooth. In 1801, at the union of the Irish and English parliaments, both Churches were proclaimed as the United Church of England and Ireland. The Rom. Cath. have more recently been released of many penalties, and tolerated, if not fully recognized. In 1790 there were 43 Domin. monasteries in Ireland. The question of Rom. Cath. emancipation, raised in 1805, was not settled till 1829; then all offices became accessible to them excepting the Lord Chancellorship and Lieutenant Governorship. The Romish bishops, moreover, are not ex-officio members of Parliament, and can wear their official robes only in their own churches; all processions, also, outside of Romish churches, are forbidden. Their relations to Rome, and the choice of bishops, are free. The chief burden still oppressing them, is that of the tithes. Since 1838 these are levied upon real estate.

[For the present statistics of the Rom. Cath. Church of Ireland, we refer to the Metropolitan Cath. Almanac, annually published by Lucas, Brothers, Baltimore.*¹]

The Rom. Cath. bishops derive their income from their respective parishes, the cathedricum (a tax upon the priests' income), and the dispensation fees. When a bishop is to be chosen, the diocesan clergy, with the approbation of the other bishops of the province, propose three

¹ In 1839 the population, divided among the several Confessions, was:

Province.	Episcop.	Rom. Cath.	Presbyt.	Other Prot.	Total.
Armagh...	617,722	1,955,123	638,073	15,823	3,126,741
Dublin.....	177,930	1,063,681	2,517	8,162	1,247,290
Cashel.....	111,813	2,220,340	966	2,454	2,335,573
Tuam	44,599	1,188,568	800	369	1,234,336
	852,064	6,427,712	642,356	21,808	7,943,940

But by the census of 1851, the whole population has been reduced to 6,515,794.

candidates. Bishops have no separate chapter, but each one has a vicar-general as assistant.—The Episcopal Church of Ireland is at present under two Archb., that of Armagh, who is primate of the kingdom, and that of Dublin. There are the Bishops of Meath, Kildare*, Clogher*, Elphin (Kilmore), Leighlin and Ferns, Dromore*, Down and Connor*, Derry, Cork*, Limerick, Cashel, Killaloe, and Tuam (those marked * are to be discontinued). The Bishops of Meath and Kildare have precedence; the rest rank according to the date of their consecration. There are, besides, 139 dignitaries, 178 prebendaries, 9 deans, 1456 parishes, 833 vicarages. The revenue of the bishops is £128,808, giving £7000 to each; the deans and chapters £85,635; the clergy £520,063, about £370 for each one, and for a vicar £68. Of the clergy, 465 have an income of £30–200; 386 of £200–400; 281 of £400–600; 148 of £600–800; 74 of £800–1000; 48 of £1000–1200; 23 of \$1200–1500; 20 of £1500–2000; 10 of £2000–2600; 1 of £2800. As a partial equalization of these incomes a tax of 10–15 per cent. is levied on all above £200, and appropriated in aid of feebler parishes and the church-erection fund. Many parishes are united, and often the curate receives the income, whilst the actual duties of the parish are performed by a vicar for a pitiful compensation. The crown holds 293 presentations, the bishops 1470, Trinity College 21. The Presbyterians of Ireland are mostly of Scotch descent, and lately have shown a strong tendency towards Unitarianism. Their clergymen are voluntarily supported by the congregations, but also receive an annual royal grant. They have 452 churches, 1 synod, 5 presbyteries, and 200 congregations. The Seceders have 100 congregations. The Methodists, Quakers, Baptists, &c., have about 400 societies.—(See *Beaumont*, Ireland, in a social, political, and religious aspect. *Collier*, History of Ireland. *Rheinwald's Repertorium*, V., 237; VIII., 98; IX., 62; XIII., 263; XXX., 88; XXXVII., H. 1).

KLOSE.*

Irenæus, as *Eusebius* has well observed (*Eccl. H.*, 5, 24), is justly entitled to his name, the *peaceful*, for although he occupies a prominent place among the polemic writers of Christian antiquity, the only work of his extant being controversial (*l. V. adv. hæc.*) he was yet filled with the mild spirit of love, and did not seek strife for its own sake. Of the circumstances of his early life we know but little. Only this much is certain: he was of Greek parentage and a native of Asia Minor, being born about the year 140. Smyrna is supposed to have been his birth-place, from certain allusions in his letter to Florinus, where reference is made to the venerable Polycarp, under whose teachings he had sat when a boy (See *Euseb. h. e.*, 5, 20). He had evidently received an excellent theological training in this school, and was well acquainted with Greek literature, especially the works of Plato and Homer, as appears from his writings. From Asia Minor he removed to Gaul. Whether Polycarp induced him to take this step is not known, but we find him, at the
 " — of the Great Persecution, a presbyter in
 " — um (Lyons) and regarded as a man of

lofty zeal for the gospel of Jesus Christ by the martyrs (confessors) of that place, who sent him with a letter concerning the Montanist controversies to Eleutherus, Bishop of Rome. Soon after (178) he himself was chosen Bishop of Lugdunum and Vienne, in the place of Photinus, who suffered martyrdom along with many of his people. How he filled the office is gathered partly from the fact, that, according to Gregory of Tours, almost the whole city was converted to Christianity by the power of his preaching, and partly from the wide-spread influence, which, according to Eusebius, he acquired over the churches of Gaul. Indeed, the fame of this mild and wise bishop extended far beyond these limits. The more the Church of Jesus Christ was imperilled by the persecution of heathen rulers, and false, anti-Christian speculation, the more earnestly did Irenæus stand up in her defence and endeavor to promote her inward unity and peace. A dispute, which arose between the churches of the East and West, in regard to the time of celebrating the festival of Easter, and threatened a great schism, gave him an opportunity to show his irenic disposition. Whilst the Christians of Asia Minor and Palestine held to a close agreement with the original Jewish festival whose place it took, those of the West, to whom the main point was the celebration of the death and resurrection of Christ on Friday and Sunday, believed that these days should be observed not only every year, but every week. The oral discussion between Polycarp and the Roman Bishop Anicetus, as well as their written explanations, led to no satisfactory result, yet they parted in peace and things remained in this state, until *Victor*, Bishop of Rome, toward the close of the 2d cent., in his zeal for uniformity, proposed to exclude the opposite party from the communion of the Church. Irenæus now appeared as a mediator, and his efforts were crowned with such success that both parties peacefully followed their traditional customs, until the meeting of the Synod of Nice (325). — Of the practical activity of Irenæus nothing more is known. After filling the office of bishop for 24 years, he suffered martyrdom along with many of his people, under Septimus Severus, in 202. — The great service rendered by Irenæus to Christianity in his own and succeeding times, was the powerful resistance he made against the seductive heresies, which, taking their rise even in the days of the apostles (*Acts 20: 30; 1 John 2: 19, et al.*), began to spread at the close of the 1st cent., and in the course of the 2d acquired an immense influence in the Christian Church. There were *Gnosticism*, — which in its transcendental dreams passed beyond all bounds of human knowledge, and, drawing largely from the various systems of heathen philosophy, particularly those of Plato, Aristotle and the Stoics, refused belief in the real historical development of the kingdom of God, and rejected the scriptural hope of its completion in a glorified form, — a *Judaistic* tendency, which either, with vulgar shallowness, regarded Christianity, deprived of its divine contents, as a mere continuation and appendage of Judaism (common Ebionitism), or, in a theosophic form (*Clementines*), as only a repetition of it on a higher and wider

scale,—and *Montanism*, which, in its reaction against Gnostic errors, ran out into visionary millenarian schemes and a fanatical rage for martyrdom.—All these were opposed by Irenæus with firmness and vigor. Against the Gnostic *pride of knowledge* he asserted the rights of *faith*; not as though knowledge were to be despised, or ignorance esteemed above wisdom, but because all true knowledge of divine things must have its root in humble, childlike faith. The fundamental principle of his theology is, that God can only be known through God. Of His own free will He has made himself known in the *revelation* of the Eternal Logos. The knowledge of Him obtained from His works could not preserve men from idolatry, hence the Incarnation of His Son. This revelation has been transmitted orally and in writing. The written word is contained in the *Holy Scriptures*, which consist of the writings of the prophets and the apostles, and are the source of our knowledge of the truth and the measure of doctrine. What is dark in them is understood from what is clear. But for a full and certain understanding of their contents, general and particular, is required a living apprehension of the *sum of their doctrines*, as it has been handed down from the apostles in the bosom of the Church, which “is the pillar and ground of the truth.” This *paradosis* (tradition) is everywhere the same, and agreement with it is the warrant of true interpretation, whilst it in turn is confirmed by the SS., so that *Scripture and Tradition in this mutual relation* afford a certain test for truth and a sure basis for the development of doctrine. Thus Irenæus held up in the face of Gnostic subjectivism, a firm, objective rule, but his theory in no wise accords with the Romish traditionalism of after times, which set up dogmatic and disciplinary tenets beside and above the SS. He regarded the *Holy Spirit* as He lives and moves in the Church, the only true channel and organ of his activity, as the infallible interpreter of what had flowed from his own inspiration.

For a fuller exhibition of the *theological principles* of Irenæus, see *Böhringer's* “Kirchengesch. in Biographien,” Bd. I.; Comp. *Neander*, Ch. Hist.; *Möhler*, Patrologie; as well as his work on the Unity of the Church; and, lastly, *Ritter*, “Geschichte der christlich. Philosophie,” Bd. I., p. 345, ss.—Connected with his view of the relation between the Church and the Holy Spirit, *Twisten* (Dogm. I.) adds his exposition of the difference between the Roman Catholic and Protestant stand-points. His doctrine of the Church, her nature and her attributes *Rothe* has treated in a masterly manner in his “Anfäng. d. chr. Kirche;” his doctrine of Tradition and Scripture, *Jacobi* in Th. I. of his work: “d. kirchl. Lehre v. d. Trad. u. h. Schrift;” comp. *Sack*, *Nitzsch*, *Lücke*, “Sendschreiben an Delbrück,” 1826; his doctrine of Tradition and of the Nature of Man, *Wolf* in *Rudelbach-Guericke's* Zeitschr. f. d. gesammte luther. Theol. u. Kirche, 1842, 4to.; his doctrine of the Holy Ghost, *Kahn*, die Lehre v. h. G., I. Th., 1847. His doctrine of the Trinity is briefly set forth in *Meier's* Gesch. d. Trinitätsl., I. Th., p. 71,—more fully in *Baur's* Gesch. d. Trin.-Lehre, Th.

I.; his doctrine of Redemption in the Gesch. d. L. v. d. Versöhnung, by the same author; his Christology in connection with his theology as a whole in *Dorner's* “Entwicklungsgesch. der L. v. d. Person Christi,” p. 465, ss.; his doctrine of the Eucharist in *Ebrard's* “das Dogma, v. heil. Abendmahl u. seine Gesch.” See also *Duncker*, “des heilig. Ir. Christologie im Zusammenhange mit dessen theol. u. anthropol. Grund-lehren,” 1843.

KLING.—Porter.

Irenics is a term used to designate measures, or the science, which seek to reconcile conflicts in the sphere of Religion and the Church. The schisms between the Greek and Romish, and Romish and Protestant churches, furnished special occasions for such conciliatory efforts.—As the form of doctrine, Christian life, and its proper theory, would have to pass through various phases, before a special science covering this ground, could be formed, *Irenics* is of modern date, and but partially developed. That much material for it is furnished in the New Test., by the Apologists, and the numerous eccl. writers, especially mystics and ascetics, cannot be questioned. After the Reformation, also, it frequently accompanied polemics (see Art.). *ERASMUS* (*de amabili ecclesie concordia*), *GEORGE WICEL*, *H. CASSANDER*, *FR. JUNIUS*, must here be named with *MELANCHTHON*, *M. BUCER*, and others. Against one of these lovers of concord, *DAVID PARÆUS* († 1615), *L. HUTTER* wrote his *Irenicum vere Christianum* (ed. 2, Rost., 1619).—*Hugo Grotius* († 1645), of the Reformed Church, and *G. Calixtus* († 1656) of the Lutheran Church, with their followers, did much to further harmony. But the crafty Jesuits, and others, interrupted these efforts; they were derided as Babelism, Samaritanism, neutralism, syncretism, &c. Still new advocates of peace arose: *John Fabricius* († 1729), of the school of Calixtus, and, still more prominently, *John Duræus* (1630–78), of Scotland (*Irenicorum tractatum Prodromus*, Amstelod., 1662, 8vo., a sort of *theory* of Irenics (see *Union*).—Proposals of peace also issued from the Romish Church, especially through the Spaniard *Christopher Roja de Spinola*, but without avail. After the revival of practical piety under *Spener*, a large number of works for and against union appeared, and finally led to a union of the Lutheran and Reformed Churches in Prussia. This properly furnished the prerequisites of Irenics as a distinct discipline. (For the literature, see *J. C. Köcker* († 1772, *Biblioth. theol. irenicæ*: Jen., 1764; *Winer's* Handb. d. theol. Literaturg. I., 356–60).—Among works aiming rather at union and peace in a practical way, than at furnishing scientific treatises, must be named *G. J. PLANCK's* († 1833), *MARHEINEKE's* († 1845), *J. A. Stark's* *Theoduls Gastmahl* (7. a. 1828, 8vo.), *Ch. F. Böhme*, chr. Henotikon: Halle, 1827; *Dan. v. Cölln*, Ideen u. d. innern Zusammenh. v. Glaubenseinigung u. G.-reinigung, &c.: Lpz., 1823.—When *Marheineke*, following *Planck*, treated symbolical theology as a comparative exhibition of the various confessional systems, a section was added upon attempts at union which formed a valuable contribution to the scientific character of Irenics. *Möhler's* symbolics breathes a similar spirit,

though with strong partisan feelings; Leopold Schmid's *Geist d. Katholic. &c.*: Giessen, 1848, is more liberal. On the contrary, such works as *Staudenmaier's* († 1856) *Zum rel. Frieden d. Zukunft*: Freiburg, in B. 1846, 2 Bde., 8vo., only serve to inflame bitter controversy. But since *Schleiermacher's* *Polemik u. Apologetik*, considerable progress has been made in Irenica, as especially appears from the third part of *J. P. Lange's* dogmatics (Heidelb., 1852; cf. his *Philosoph. Dogm.*, 1849, § 20, and *pract. Dogm.*, § 5). He divides *Irenica* into *elementary* (the exhibition of the tendency of truth and of the means of grace) and *concrete* (the exhibition of the operations of this tendency: missionary, *confessional*, *social* irenica; cf. § 128).—Going back to fundamentals is the true way to peace, so that bitter controversies may even promote the main object. Sin, however, will ever place obstacles in the way of perfect union, until the complete triumph of the kingdom of God has removed them. For this we must prepare ourselves by holding fast to the saying of *Meldenius*: *in necessariis unitas, in non necessariis libertas, in utrisque caritas*. (Cf. Dr. Fr. Lücke u. d. *Altar dieses Friedensspruches*: Götting., 1850. *Dans* in *Erach u. Gruber Encykl.*, *Irenik*, II., 23, 1844). L. PELT.*

Irregularity—is the lack of canonical qualifications necessary to the acquisition and exercise of an eccl. order. The qualifications which the person seeking ordination must possess, are canonically determined, i. e., by *canones* or *regulae* gradually framed and adopted by the Church. They are primarily based on 1 Tim. 3: 1, &c.; 5: 22; and Tit. 1: 6, &c.; and, after the idea of a Levitical priesthood was transferred to the clergy, on the regulations of the Old Test., mystically explained. They ultimately resolve themselves into these two, that the candidate rest under no disgrace on account of crime, and that he has no defect rendering him unfit for the office. Innoc. III. in c. 14, X. de *purgat. canon.* (V., 33) a. 1207, distinguishes *nota delicti* from *nota defectus impediens ad sacros ordines promovendum*, and later canonists have followed this division. Earlier canon law uses various terms and definitions to designate such impediments, but since Innoc. III. *irregularitas* has been permanently adopted (c. 33, X. de *testibus* [II., 20] a. 1203).—The Greek Church has adhered, in general, to the principles adopted prior to the 6th cent. (cf. *Canon. Apost. Conc. Nicaenar.* a. 314, c. 9 (c. 11, dist. XXXIV.) *Conc. Nicen. e. a., Trullan.* a. 682, c. 21). The Evangel. Church has followed later regulations, so far as they harmonized with her principles; but all her confessions and constitutions refer constantly to the Scripture passages cited above.

I. Irregularitas delicti. "A bishop must be blameless" (1 Tim. 3: 2), and eccl. discipline gradually defined what faults constituted irregularity in this respect. Originally were such as required public repentance, in the 9th century every *del. maior* was *excommunicatus*. The rule followed was that in *juris*, and VI. (V., 12): *Infamia patet dignitatum* (cf. c. 2, *Cod. de iur. lat.* XII., 1, *Constant.*). The laws designate various offences, even though

secret (*del. occultus*), as heresy, apostasy, schism, simony, rebaptism, surreptitious consecration, ordination regardless of the hierarchical grades, &c. (See THOMASSIN, *vel. et nova eccl. discipl.* P. II., l. I., c. LVI-XV. FERRARIUS, *bibl. canon. sine irregul.* Art. I., nr. 11. LASPETZ, in *Erach and Gruber, Encykl.*, Art. *Ordinal.*, p. 37, &c.) Whilst the Greek Church has, essentially, adhered to these causes, the Evangelical Church, naturally, dropped many of them.—The Romish Church escaped the disadvantageous consequences of offences by means of dispensations (*Conc. Trid.* s. 24, c. 6, *de ref. orb.*; s. 14, c. 7, *de ref.*) The Greek Church adheres to the ancient rigid rules (*Thomassin*, l. c., c. 60, § 12). In the Evangelical Church a dispensation cannot be granted, unless the congregation to whom a candidate is assigned, assents to his ordination (*Moser, Allg. K.-blatt für d. ev. Deutschl.* 1855, p. 411, 474, &c.).

II. Irregul. defectus. The *irregul. del.*, already, occasions a defect; but it may also spring from special causes. 1) *Def. aetatis*. The rules on this point have varied. The present law of the Rom. Church requires the candidate to be seven years old, for the lower orders, when the tonsure may be conferred (c. 4, *de tempor. ord.* in VI. [I., 9] *Bonif. VIII.*; *Conc. Trid.* s. 23, c. 4, *de ref.*); for the subdiaconate 22 years, for deacons 23, for presbyters 25, for bishops 30 (*Conc. Trid.* s. 23, c. 12, *de ref.*). But the Pope may dispense from these rules.—In the Greek Church they require for deacons 20 years, for presb. 30 (*Nov. Justin.* 137, c. 1; *Conc. Trull.* c. 12). In the Evang. Church 25 years has usually been regarded as the canon. age; in Saxony 21; dispensations are allowed. The Anglican Church has fixed 23 for deacons, 24 for presb., and 30 for bishops.—2) *Def. natalium (legitimorum)*. Illegitimacy was no bar in the ancient Church (c. 8, *dist. 24 Hieronymus*), but was made such since the 2d cent., though not rigidly (*Conc. Meldenar.* a. 845 [in c. 17, *can. I.*, q. VII.], and *Recepta de discipl. eccl.*, l. I., c. 416, &c.). Special reference was had to the children of ordained clergymen (*Conc. Pictav.* a. 1078 (c. 1, X. de *filiiis presb. ordinand.* vel non, I., 17), *Claramont.* a. 1025 (cf. c. 14, *dist. 56, Urban II.*) and others; see especially *dist. 56, Tit. X.*, l. 17, *Lib. VI.*, l. 11, *Conc. Trid.* s. 25, c. 15, *de ref.*), and the law was justified by appeal to Deut. 23: 2 (cf. c. 10, § 6, X. de *renunc.* I., 9, Innoc. III., a. 1206). But this defect might be removed, a) by legitimization (c. 6, X., *qui filii sint legit.* IV., 17, *Alex. III.*); b) by entering a monastery or foundation of regular canons (c. 11, *dist. 56, Urban II.*, and c. 1, X. de *fil. presbyt. cit.*). This rule, abolished by Sixtus V., was restored by Greg. XV. But such persons cannot become presb. by dispensation (c. 1 de *fil. presbyt. ordinand.* vel non, I., 17, Innoc. III., a. 1206, cf. c. 20, 25, X. de *elect.* [I., 6]). The Evangel. Churches do not recognize this defect.—3) *Def. corporis*, based on Leviticus, *dist. 24, Justin.* l. VII., c. 2. *Canon. de iur. lat.* XII., 1, *Constant.* Later every *del. maior* was *excommunicatus*, and every *del. minor* was *excommunicatus* for 33, c. 1, *de iur. lat.* XII., 1, *Constant.*

that the dumb, deaf, blind (*Con. Apost.* 77, c. 6, *X. de cler. agrotante, &c.*, III., 6), those having but one eye, especially if the left was wanting, (*oculus canonicus*, because in reading mass the missal lay on that side), the lame, epileptics, lepers, those who had castrated themselves, and hermaphrodites. In most cases, a dispensation might be granted (*FERRARIS, bibl. canon. s. v. irregularitas, Art. I., nro. 12*). The Greek Church adhered to the original principle, and its application was maintained by the Evang. Church. 4) *Def. animæ*, the deranged, idiots, &c. (c. 2-5, *dist.* 33). 5) *Def. scientiæ*, based on Jer. 1:9; Hosea 4:6; Mal. 2:7, &c. (*dist.* 36-38, &c.; *Novella*, V., VI., c. 4, &c.; *Conc. Trid. s. 23, c. 4, 11, 13, 14, de ref.: s. 22, c. 2, de ref.*) No dispensations were allowed, only the Pope might permit the order to be conferred, provided its duties were not assumed until this defect was remedied. The Evang. Church always insisted on proper attainments, and subjected the candidates to two or three examinations. 6) *Def. fidei*—based on 1 Tim. 3:6; 5:22. Persons were not to be ordained immediately after conversion (*Canon. Apost.* 79; *Conc. Nic.* 325, c. 2 [c. 1, *dist.* 47]; *Greg. a. 599, c. 2, eod.*), especially not *clerici*. The earlier strictness against the children and grandchildren of heretics was subsequently abated, and the disability of newly converted persons, who gave proof of their faith, was abolished, still neophytes could not at once obtain higher orders. The Evang. Church had rules against granting orders to proselytes. 7) *Def. perfectæ lenitatis*, applicable to those who had violated the rule: *eccl. non sinit sanguinem*; hence to all who shed blood in war, (*Conc. Tolet. I., a. 400, c. 8 [c. 4, dist. 51], Innoc. I., a. 404 [c. 1, eod.] c. 24, X. de homic. [V., 12] Hon. III.*), to prosecutors, witnesses, notaries, judges, and executioners, in cases of capital punishment (*Conc. Tolet. IV., a. 633, c. 31; XI., a. 675, c. 6, &c.*); also to surgeons. 8) *Def. sacramenti (matrimonii)*, based on 1 Tim. 3:2, 12; Tit. 1:6, and applied to second marriages, (*bigamia successiva*), and to a clergyman's marrying a widow or a deflowered virgin (*big. interpretiva*), living with an adulteress, or marrying after a vow of celibacy (*big. similitudinaria*), thus causing an irregularity *non propter sacram. def., sed propter affectum intentionis cum opere subsequuto* (*Innoc. III. in c. 4, 7, X. de big. non ord.*). The Greek Church observes the same rules, whilst the Evang. Church finds no fault with second marriages, or marrying a widow (see Rom. 7:2, 3; 1 Cor. 7:39). 9) *Def. famæ* (1 Tim. 3:7). To this apply all the causes of *irreg. delicti* (see above), concerning other causes, see *FERRARIS, l. c.* 10) *Def. libertatis*. Slaves and bondsmen must have the consent of their masters (*Can. Apost. c. 82, c. 1, 2, 4, seq. 12, 21, dist. 54, c. 37, Can. 17, qu. IV. Tit. X. de servis non ord. I., 18*); when ordained thus they become free; if ordained without their master's knowledge, they may be reclaimed within a year (*Nov. Just. 123, c. 17, Auth. Si servus* (after c. 37), *Cod. de pisc. et cler. I., 3*). German Canon law maintains this principle. In like manner those in civil service were to obtain release before entering the clergy; persons having accounts to

settle were first to adjust them; married persons to obtain the consent of their wives, who were then to take a vow of chastity or to enter a monastery. Greek law allows presbyters to marry, but before any one can be consecrated a bishop, his wife must enter a monastery. Children must have their parent's consent until their puberty (14th year).—(See THOMASSIN, *l. c. P. II., l. I., c. 62-92. PHILLIPS, K.-recht, I., § 46-53*). H. F. JACOBSON.*

Irving, Irvingites.—Irvingism arose upon the soil of Anglican Christendom. Its origin is closely connected with a more general movement of Christian life, which has taken place in England since the beginning of the present century. To the man after whom it is named it owes its first impulse, though not its general character.—The increased religious activity which, occasioned by the political convulsions near the close of the last century, took place in English and Scotch Protestantism, followed a predominantly practical direction. The work of Christianizing the entire popular life was carried on with the utmost zeal. Bible and missionary societies were very active. The condition of the external world being anything but satisfactory, thousands manifested an impatient longing for a richer effusion of the Spirit of God and for the complete establishment of the kingdom of God through the second advent of Christ. This was then, and is now, characteristic of the religious revival of England and Scotland, so far as parts of the current have not been led into the High Church channel. Prayer-meetings were general among the different Protestant denominations. Haldane Stewart, in a special work, exhorted Christians by prayer-meetings to achieve a new pentecost. Hence even before Irvingism was known, this "apocalyptic tendency" was in existence, and is still cherished by large numbers of the clergy and laity.—Edward Irving was born Aug. 15, 1792, at Annan, county of Dumfries, Scotland; and was piously educated by his parents. Though not very successful in youth in acquiring knowledge, he had a special talent for mathematics. Having devoted himself to theology, he gathered a rich store of knowledge in the general sciences and in the theology of his country; though there are no indications to show that his researches in theology were either original or systematic. An honest, warm, and ardent religious disposition no one has ventured to deny to him. Whenever he had occasion to speak, this inward disposition poured itself forth in a rich and at times excessive imagination, and in very forcible and apt language. His personal appearance, tall, handsome, and full of vivacity, added to the impression. Chalmers learned to value very highly his character and eloquence, and in 1819 received him as his assistant at Glasgow. But he did not attract any attention until 1822, when a Scotch congregation called him as their pastor.—His popularity as preacher in London, especially among the higher and highest classes, was extraordinary. His aim was to call to repentance,—to obedience unto the commandments and practical precepts of the sacred Scriptures; and he taught that the people could be elevated above their depraved condition only by

the ordinances and organization appointed in the word of God. His sermons and writings were attractive from their natural freshness, forcible originality and exuberant language; but no less on account of the ease with which he could move in the different spheres of life, especially in the political and higher spheres. In this point he was perhaps somewhat too self-complacent. His exuberance becomes at times too profuse. But a more important point is, how he viewed at that time already the chief elements of Christianity. Along with the pungent, direct, sincere, powerful, and at times stormy exhortations and warnings which were constantly pouring from his lips, he was wanting in a profound, calm and simple view both into the state which Christianity premises, viz.: an original sinful nature which still cleaves to man; and into the deep and complete, although more concealed, gifts of atoning, silently and slowly, yet surely sanctifying, and perfecting grace. As regards the former, he aimed rather "to convince man of his high dignity and likeness unto God, in order to base upon it admonitions to lead a life corresponding with this high origin: as regards the other, he referred far less to the grace of sanctification which we already possess, than to the Ruler and Judge who shall come again. To this his mind was enthusiastically and impatiently directed; and he warned all not to be deceived by the calm which precedes the approaching storm, and admonished to observe the signs of the times in the secret, raging, anti-Christian efforts of the revolutionaries, in the citizen-kingship, and in the ever-increasing power of the popular voice; and to be prepared for the great crisis in Church and State, and for the storm which was to burst upon the whole world. — A theoretical interest seems never to have led him to profounder doctrinal investigations. Predestination he eviscerates without entering more closely upon the doctrine. But though his mind was totally unqualified for forming clear and well-defined doctrinal conclusions, he was, nevertheless, by a supposed practical religious interest, led to attack one of the leading doctrines of Christianity; for after 1827 he denied the "*sinlessness of Christ*:" i. e., for the sake of representing the human nature of Christ as a real one and in all things like our own, he asserts that like ours it was possessed of inward sinful inclinations, only Christ never yielded to them. As to the practical religious interest by which he was led to this, he was undoubtedly thoroughly sincere: of what advantage, he says, is a God-man to us, who has not become really like us, and whom we cannot therefore really follow? But it is certain also that, following up his premises blindly and with a degree of fanaticism, he had no regard to the necessity of an atonement by a pure Christ, before we can follow him: and that on account of those premises he was also utterly ignorant of what belongs to the communication of a new moral life. For we also miss in him the true idea of regeneration as a new creation from above: not a new person is created; not even something essentially new is conceived into the old person; regeneration is merely "the maintenance of the old substance in its

present condition by the operation of the invisible Godhead." (From Irving's work: *On the human nature of Christ* in HOHL's *Bruchst. u. d. Leb. Irv.*). Christ himself, he asserts, was thus regenerated; only that in his case this operation upon his fallen flesh took place at the very beginning, and that he consequently from the beginning triumphed over the lusts of this flesh: "From the first moment he found himself in the condition of a regenerated man," and the Spirit of God dwelling in him with measure "thus made his regeneration effectual to the perfection of his faith in his sanctity and to the complete subjection of the desires of fallen humanity." He became holy by the same means as the regenerated Christians: only on this condition can he be called the "head of regeneration." Of course, Irving must then make a difference between the operation of the Spirit which takes place in Christians, and that which took place in Christ, in order that the latter may not become a mere outward pattern. Upon Christ the Spirit operates directly, but upon us through Christ (in his later work: "The Church as furnished with holiness and power;" transl. in THEOL. *liter. Anzeig.* 1848, p. 256.). — The want of doctrinal precision in these theories is evident: e. g., in the fact that he makes no difference between natural infirmity and natural propensities, and between sinfulness and sinful propensities: if "the bodily propensities require daily their natural food;" the want of the things required to satisfy these furnishes already an inward enticement to sin (see HOHL, pp. 90, 91). But Irving is only the more violently positive, and anathematizes every one who in spite of him teaches that Christ had taken upon himself the unfallen nature of Adam. — This confirms what has already been said concerning the earlier character of his preaching and doctrine; and it also furnishes us with the premises of his views of Christian perfection, which he soon after proclaimed. In order that Christ might be an example to us, his nature had to be sinful: but consequently, also, his entire example must be repeated in us: hence we, also, must perform miracles and works like him (HOHL, p. 157, etc.). The excessive egoism with which Irving formerly already anathematized his opponents, is the same as that with which he adhered to his subsequent views, and required their adoption by others. — Irving took part in a society of men which had been formed for social prayer and the examination and verification of Scripture prophecies, especially of the Apocalypse. There were more than 40 members, mostly clergymen, who met, from Nov. 1826, at the country-seat of Drummond, the banker. Some of these, however, separated from it on account of Irving's Christological views. In 1830 the news arrived from Scotland that at port Glasgow and other places, the prayers for the outpouring of the Spirit had been heard, and that the gift of speaking in tongues and of prophecy had been renewed. The news was joyfully received, especially by Irving; and he had scarcely begun to prepare his adherents to expect similar outpourings, when similar phenomena manifested themselves in social meetings held at first at his

ouse, and after Oct. 5, 1831, in his oburch in legent square. "Strange and unintelligible ounds," says Hohl, "were uttered with such a orce of voice and emphasis, that fear and terror eized me." Neighbors in Regent square de- scribed these sounds to the author as so fearful, hat some of those who heard them fainted. At imes also there were intelligible expressions, nd sometimes speeches of the length of 2 or 3 ours. There were calls to repentance, of judg- ment upon England and its church, which had ecome a Babel, and testimonies in favor of rving, the faithful shepherd. The speakers, eprived of self-control and of clear conscious- ness, were seized with violent muscular contor- ions; this was especially the case with females. —Irving no longer doubted the divine origin of hese phenomena, and he was most zealous in rringing down the Spirit more generally by incessant prayers, preaching, warning, and en- ouraging. But being accused of having vio- ated the doctrine and form of worship of the Scotch church by permitting and even exciting hese so-called prophesyings, and being found guilty by the Presbytery of London, he had in 1832 to vacate his church. A congregation of his own followed him to a new chapel. He now, also, declared the Protestant churches as Babel, as he had formerly only the Roman (he had earnestly protested against Catholic emancipa- ion). Through his own agency the Church of Christ was to be restored conformably to the will of the Lord, with a free exercise of spiritual gifts and the government prescribed by the Lord in the Scriptures. He himself received the apocalyptic title of angel. His adherents soon became so numerous, that in a short time even congregations could be formed in London, he models of the future perfect and universal church, and themselves foreshadowed in the even churches of the Apocalypse. But Irving's career was at an end. In March, 1833, he was cited before the Presbytery of Annan, which had been ordered by the General Assembly to investigate his case. The charge against him had reference to his doctrine concerning the person of Christ. Irving appeared; but not to defend himself or calmly to substantiate his views, but loudly to threaten with the vengeance of God. The Presbytery found him guilty, and deposed him from the ministry of the Scotch Church. Deeply suffering, he once more in the fall of 1834 visited his old home, where he died on the night of the 6th of December. He is described at this time as sadly changed; his face haggard, his beard white, his eyes filled with a wild fire, though still with a certain attractiveness. The most important of his former friends, men like Chalmers, still loved and respected him; though they had to lament him as a man who had fallen into grievous error. — The leading peculiarities of Irvingism are: 1, the outpouring of the Spirit and his free manifestation among the members of the Church; 2, the number and nature of ecclesiastical offices. The former, which might have degenerated into a wild spiritualism, clothed itself, remarkably enough, in a stiff formalism of office, which in course of time made the second the leading peculiarity. — It is not known how far Irving

took part in the establishment of these offices, nor how far in the part he took he acted independently or was influenced by others. We first hear of the appointment of two *apostles*, the first of them a certain Cardale; they had been designated as such by the prophetic spirit as early as 1832. The Spirit next impelled the first apostle to impart by the laying on of hands the office of *evangelist* to one of a number of young men who preached in the streets to the people. This first apostle, moreover, inspired by the Spirit, drew up the complete order of a separate Church. But during the lifetime of Irving only four other apostles had been called; nor are they the leading persons, but Irving himself. The number of twelve was not completed until after his death, when for the first time official, not personal, supremacy becomes a fact. With a surprising rapidity the so-called Apostolical Church, now thoroughly organized, extended itself. In 1835 the office bearers held their first council in London; the continent was divided among the apostles, and they went out to their fields, not indeed as heralds preaching from the housetops, but more as secret spies. In the larger cities of England, Scotland, and Ireland, other congregations had been formed at an early date; the number of prophets had arisen to 100: a number of tracts were written for the dissemination of Irvingism, carefully, however, as yet concealing its peculiarities. Its doctrines and demands were unfolded more boldly in an address to all the clerical and secular heads of Christendom. — The ultimate cause of the movement is the longing for deliverance from the present weakness and degeneracy of Christendom, and to attain to a speedy perfection in the kingdom of Christ, which he is to establish at his second coming. That this perfection is at hand is proven by the sayings of the prophetic spirit, and the new outpouring of the Spirit. But the cause of the sad condition of the Church is, that she lost the highest and most important offices instituted by Christ; offices with which the proper government of the Church, the continuance of the Spirit and illumination necessarily ceased, viz.: the offices of apostles and prophets, to which two offices, those of evangelists and pastors, must be added. Through these *four offices* Christendom would have been led, according to Eph. 4: 11–13, towards a speedy perfection. But the Church was not faithful, did not sufficiently strive after perfection, became languid in her prayers for the second advent of Christ, and at last forgot them altogether. In punishment of which the apostleship became extinct, and there existed no longer a Divinely appointed organ to maintain and represent the unity of the Church, and to be the channel of the Spirit; although God, in his mercy, in order that the Church itself might not become extinct, suffered that a certain official grace should still adhere to the episcopal laying on of hands, and that a certain grace should also still reside in the sacraments wherever they were administered by ministers ordained by bishops. The *Catholic Church* indemnified itself for the loss of the apostleship by transferring its functions to the bishops and the Pope; she represents the important truth that

the Church needs such a united organ to govern it, but substitutes a creation of its own for that appointed by God. She also exalts the prerogative of the Church to the prejudice of the direct relation of the individual Christian to God and Christ. The latter has again been justly asserted by *Protestantism*; but the reformers ought to have done this only so far as might serve to reawaken the consciousness of adoption in the hearts of believers. They on the contrary allowed rights to the individual which conflicted with the order of God; with reference to their superiors they arrogated to themselves undue official functions, when they ought to have obeyed, leaving the result to God: it was, moreover, superlative arrogance to act as if they had a mission to the entire Church. Protestantism gave rise to the excessive demand of the right of private judgment: this is the root of that revolutionary spirit, which now opposes itself to all Divine order. But before the final judgment God has again graciously visited his people by the outpouring of the Spirit and the restitution of the offices.—The *apostleship* is again instituted with its fixed number of bearers; and with them the *prophets* form the foundation of the Church. The *apostles* are the hand of the Lord; they, and they alone, possess “supreme jurisdiction and power,” and the right of the imposition of hands through which alone the Holy Spirit is really communicated. The *prophets* are the eye of the Lord, whose concealed will they reveal; but in this they do not themselves possess an infallible judgment as regards the real character and meaning of their revelations. These must be submitted to the apostles, who must examine them and then declare what is to be regarded as the doctrine and command of God. The prophets alone can call, but the apostles ordain to the different offices.—Subject to the apostles are the *evangelists* and *pastors*. The evangelists gather into the congregation: within the individual congregations the “pastors and teachers” exercise “spiritual government.”—This brings us to the congregational government. At the head of it stands the “angel or bishop,” with whom six elders form the “sevenfold eldership, the order of God for spiritual light.” Subordinate to them may be other elders as circumstances may require; this is the *priesthood* or *pastorship* of the congregation. Next in order is the *diaconship*, also ordained by apostolical imposition of hands, and the chief of which are the wardens; and, finally, sub-deacons and deaconesses. The angel, priests, and wardens are the church council. The deacons may be elected by the members; priests and angels are appointed “from above.” Deacons who desire to become priests, and priests whom the angel regards as qualified for advancement in office, are presented during the celebration of the Eucharist in presence of a prophet, and a special pause made for the revelation of the prophetic spirit. All these offices are strictly defined in all their functions according to the will of God.—This hierarchy is to be independent also as regards its temporal support; for the *tithes*, as well as the celebration of the seventh day, are a permanent command of God.—These offices

have been again restored by the Spirit; their design is to transmit the Spirit to the congregation and to govern the latter. The chief means of this transmission are *Baptism* and the *Lord's Supper*. Irvingianism boasts that it comprehends these sacraments in their truth as “real acts” of Christ, and as really “effecting what they signify.” It distinctly teaches regeneration in baptism; in the Lord's Supper we must simply believe that the bread is the body, etc. What here distinguishes Irvingism from Protestantism is, that the word finds no place as a means of grace along with the sacraments; that the real “sealing by the Holy Spirit” takes place not in baptism, but in *confirmation* by means of the apostolical imposition of hands; and that, regarding the Lord's Supper, or rather the “Eucharist,” as the chief part of Christian worship, it places the principal stress not upon the distribution of the body of Christ to the recipients, but upon the presentation of it as an offering of thanks by the hands of the priest.—The admission of children to the communion is also advocated.—Besides the two “sacraments especially necessary to salvation,” *confirmation*, *ordination*, and *extreme unction*, are also regarded as such. Private confession is recommended, absolution imparted by imposition of hands, and fasting enjoined before the reception of the latter. The *forms of worship* are also distinctly prescribed, and are regarded as essentials; in the eucharistic liturgy a large part has been taken from that of the ancient Greek Church. Besides the eucharistic offering, the public worship consists mostly in prayers. The use of hymns is wanting almost entirely.—However profuse in matters pertaining to its offices and worship, Irvingism shows little interest in those doctrines which are generally regarded as most important. It does not prosecute further the *Christology* advanced by Irving, but stops with the vague statement that we need a Christ who is really like us. The doctrine of *justification* is carefully avoided even when the corruption of the Romish Church and the peculiarities of Protestantism are discussed: so also the questions concerning freedom and grace. This indeed is quite natural, since less importance is attached to the atonement and the new creation of the will, than to the perfection of sanctification and the gifts of the Spirit.—Assured that, on account of their offices, the Spirit abides with them, they await the second advent of Christ and of his kingdom. Their views on this point are chiliastic; the kingdom of Christ is preceded by the resurrection of the just, and the latter by the full manifestation of Antichrist. At the coming of Christ those believers who are living will be lifted up into the air to meet their Lord. But before this coming a great testimony, a “work of preparation,” must take place.—All this is nothing new: but it is new, that this lifting up of the saints is to take place before the full manifestation of Antichrist, whose persecution the “Apostolical” Church is in this way to escape; and that this testimony is Irvingism, by the offices of which the preparation is to be effected.—Being called upon for the evidence of its peculiar doctrines and demands, Irvingism at first re-

ferred to its miracles. Subsequently it answered, that the "truth itself" was its own principal evidence: that from the labors and works of the apostles we ought to come to the same conclusion as did the first Apostles with reference to Paul (Gal. 2: 7-8). But what that is specifically apostolical did the labors of these men manifest? And what that is really new did they reveal, except the doctrine of the offices? The latter is evident to the spiritually-minded from the Scriptures themselves. The Old Test. types, especially those of the tabernacle, are the principal evidences. Much weight is attached to the word "till" in Eph. 4: 13., to prove that the four offices (4: 11) ought to have continued until the Church was perfected. The fundamental question whether the labors of the Apostles, for which no episcopacy can be substituted, are not really continued in their words, is nowhere touched upon: but it would of course be denied, since not the preaching of the living word, but government and the imposition of hands are regarded as specifically apostolical functions.—Irvingism has made some, though no considerable advance in Germany. The year 1848 was especially favorable to its designs. Berlin and Basle are their principal centres, and W. J. Thiersch is their most important convert. Congregations are found in East Prussia (at Memel, and especially at Königsberg), Posen, Pomerania (in and around Neustettin), Silesia (at Liegnitz), and also in Saxony (Burg).—Around Marburg there is a tendency to Irvingism among the peasants. It is especially remarkable that missionaries labored with some success in the diocese of Augsburg, among mystically inclined Catholics and even priests. In England the "Apostolical congregations" seem, from all accounts, to be declining. It seems that at no time they numbered more than 1000 members. In America, Prof. Schaff ("Amerika," Berl., 1854) knows of but two congregations in the State of New York. In Germany, also, they have evidently passed their culmination.—We must yet mention that after its fundamental views had been fixed, there were no further doctrinal alterations. Fanatical excesses of the laity were restrained by official discipline.—Works of Irvingites: especially important the above "*Address to the heads of Christendom*:" English works in *Rheinwald. Acta hist. eccl.*, 1837, pp. 793-867." The Liturgy and order of public worship for the Apostolical Church. Thiersch, *die Kirche im apost. Zeitalter*, etc., 1852; Böhm, *Schatten u. Licht in d. gegenw. Zust. d. Kirche*, 1855.—Concerning Irving and Irvingism: M. Hohl, *Bruchst. aus d. Leb. u. l. Schrift. Irvings*, 1839; W. Wilks, *Ed. Irving*, and eccles. and liter. biography, Lond., 1854.

JULIUS KÖSTLIN. — Reinecke.¹

Isaac, the son which Sarah bare Abraham in their old age. His name is derived from the laughter (Gen. 17: 17; 18: 12) of Sarah at the announcement of his birth, and the joy (21: 6) occasioned by his birth; though it doubtless

has allusion, also, to the cheerful, happy temper of this patriarch. This agrees, too, with his character, which was more inclined to quiet enjoyment, than energetic activity. Hence he seems to have confined his abodes to Lahai-roi (25: 11), Gerar, and Mamre. He was led to Gerar by a famine (26: 1), and long remained there, until a desire to be near the sepulchres of his parents impelled him to move to Mamre, where he dwelt until his death (35: 27). His love of a permanent abode, fully harmonizes with the tender quiet nature exhibited in his history. In youth we see him wholly submissive to the will of God (22: 7, 10). The same passive temper is displayed in his marriage with Rebecca, with whom he lived in happy wedlock until death. Following, as an independent chief, in the footsteps of his father, he won general respect rather by his peacableness and concessions than by any vigorous course of conduct (Gen. 26). Still he maintained his dignity, so that the Philistine king counted it an honor to be in league with him. His wealth, also, greatly increased. The points of resemblance between his history and that of Abraham, might easily occur in the circumstances. In his conduct towards his sons, his leading traits of character appear; his pliancy, however, led to a family discord (Gen. 27). Still he exhibits a consciousness that his calling was to preserve the theocracy introduced by Abraham (Gen. 27; Hebr. 11: 18, 20). He attained an age of 180 years, though from his 130-40th year, his sight failed and he suffered from other infirmities. As progenitor of the Edomites and Israelites, he formed the bond of that closer relationship which both nations sustained to each other, and which, despite the constant jealousy of Edom, ultimately led to a sort of amalgamation of both.—If the life of Isaac is not as eventful as that of Abraham and Jacob, it produces a more beneficial impression, in view of his calm fidelity to the spiritual trust committed to him.—The modern attempts to treat these narratives as myths, are in conflict with their matter-of-fact style, and the evident progress they exhibit in the mode of life. We find Isaac living in a more costly style than Abraham (Gen. 21: 29, &c., and 26: 30; 27: 4, 9, 25; 14: 18, and 18: 7, 8). Esau, likewise, has various costly garments.

VAHINGER.*

Isaiah. The prophet, who, under the name of יְרֵמְיָהּ, in the LXX. Ἰσαίας, opens the series of the so-called Great Prophets, has ever been regarded as eminently worthy of the title, ὁ προφήτης ὁ μέγας (Jes. Sirach. 48, 22), indeed, the greatest of all, προφήτων μέγιστος (Euseb. demonstr. evang. 2, 4), who have seen visions and spoken by the inspiration of the Holy Spirit. Both Christians and Jews agree in awarding him this exalted rank. It rests, however, on the supposition that he was the sole author of the comprehensive work which bears his name. But the "higher criticism" of modern times, begun by Semler and carried forward by Eichhorn, has determined otherwise, and assigned a large portion of it to another source. This affects particularly the last division (chaps. 40-66), which

¹ The quotations from the works of Irving or of Irvingites, in the above article, are translated from German translations, the originals not being at hand for reference. — Translator.

foretells the deliverance of Israel from the Babylonian exile by *Cyrus*. The reasons for the opinion are derived from internal evidence. Yet, even admitting two authors, one known and the other unknown, the majority of critics give the highest place to the former.—As regards the person and private life of *Isaiah*, who, according to the title of the canonical book, was called the son of *Amoz*, and prophesied under *Uzziah*, *Jotham*, *Ahaz* and *Hezekiah*, Kings of Judah, we know but little. The time and place of his birth are not recorded. The first we learn of him, is his consecration to the prophetic office in the year in which King *Uzziah* died (c. 6: 1). Jerusalem was the theatre of his activity, but whether he was born there cannot be certainly determined. He calls himself *Isaiah* (20: 3) and refers to the consolation, which lies in this name, "Salvation of God," (8: 18)—a name borne at an earlier period by a son of the chief musician *Jeduthun* (1 Chron. 25: 3, 15), and by one of King *David*'s treasurers (1 Chron. 26: 25); it is also found in the times of the captivity, in the list of those who returned from Babylon with *Ezra* (Ezra 8: 7, 19; Neh. 11: 7). In the latter passage it occurs in the abbreviated form, *יִשְׁעִי*, which the Rabbins have used in the title of the present book. Of the father of the prophet we know nothing, save that he was called *Amoz* (c. 1: 1; 2: 1; 20: 2), which became *Ἀμὸς* in the LXX., and stands both for *יְדֻתָּן* and *דָּוִד*, the Shepherd-prophet; the two have been confounded by several of the Church-Fathers. According to a Jewish tradition, which arose probably from a similarity in sound, *Amoz* is said to have been a brother of King *Amashiah*. Concerning *Isaiah* himself nothing more is told us except that he was married (8: 3), and had two sons, to whom he gave prophetic names (7: 3; 8: 3, 18), *Shear-Jashub* and *Maher-shalhash-baz*. *Immanuel* (7: 16; 8: 8), whom many expositors also count, does not belong to the number (comp. *Umbreit*, Comm. c. 7, and Stud. u. Krit. 1856, No. 3). Among the various legends respecting our prophet, found in Jewish writers and the Christian Fathers, such as that he was the tutor of Prince *Hezekiah*, and appointed by him royal annalist, and the like, that appears the most important, which makes him die the death of a martyr under *Manasseh*. It first occurs in the Gemara to the Mishna (tract. Gebamoth IV.), and has been faithfully transmitted by the later Rabbins. The King is said to have condemned him, because he asserted, in contradiction with Ex. 33: 20, that he had seen the Lord sitting upon a throne, high and lifted up, and made use of other rash expressions; but just at the moment, when he had uttered the name of God, the prophet was devoured by a cedar, which opened of its own accord; whereupon, the king commanded the tree to be sawn in pieces, and when the saw reached his mouth he gave up the ghost (see the literature on this subject in *Gesenius* I., p. 11). From the husk of this legend, which forms the basis of the remarkable pseudepigraphic work, the *ἀναβασις* *Ἰσαίου*, we might feel inclined to extract the kernel, that the prophet

was executed under that king, who cruelly shed much innocent blood in Jerusalem (2 Kings 21: 16), could we account for the entire silence of the historic record.—The superscription, even if it cannot as a whole be referred with certainty to *Isaiah* himself, contains at least the most ancient evidence concerning the duration of his prophetic office, which extends only through the reign of King *Hezekiah*, and was most active in the 14th year of that reign, when *Sennacherib* marched from Assyria to Jerusalem, besieged the city and was obliged to retire in utter disgrace and defeat (c. 36). But still it might be that the prophet lived and labored beyond the time of *Hezekiah*, and *Gesenius* especially has endeavored to show that the Burden of Egypt (c. 19) can historically belong to our prophet, if it be transferred to the beginning of the reign of *Manasseh*, when, counting from *Uzziah*, he would have lived more than 80 and labored more than 60 years.—In the arrangement of the prophecies there seems to be a good deal of confusion and obscurity, but the whole may be divided simply into four books: ch. 1–12; 13–23; 24–35, with the addition of the historical portion, 36–39; 40–66. The first book, which contains evidently the original collection, was most probably arranged by *Isaiah* himself, and corresponds with at least the first half of the superscription. Both in this and the two following may be discovered marks of an order, in part chronological and in part by subjects, the latter predominating. The last book belongs throughout to a single age and a single author, for "all that it contains flows finished and complete from a central-point, and we admire the dialectic skill of the prophet." (See *Umbreit's* Comm.). The latest attempt at tracing out the plan and course of these prophecies (c. 40–66) has been made by *Rüetschi*, in the Theol. Stud. u. Krit., 1854, No. 2. — An excellent history of the interpretation of *Isaiah* has been given by *Gesenius* in his Commentary, 1821, Pt. I., p. 56, sq. For the later literature on the subject consult *Kiel*, "Lehrb. d. hist. krit. Einl. in d. kan. Schriften des A. T., p. 234." — On the pseudepigraphic work, *Ἀναβασις* *Ἰσαίου*, see Pseudepig. des A. und Apocr. d. N. Test.

UMBREIT.—Porter.

Ishbosheth.—(LXX. *Ἰσβοσθετ*, *Joe. Ἰσβοσθετ*), a son of Saul, the only one who survived the battle of Gilboah. Abner, his relative and commander-in-chief, made him king, to keep the sceptre of Israel in Saul's house. He was a weak man. Though forty years old when Saul perished, he lacked courage to seize the throne, and when he became king, he was entirely in Abner's hands. In him the Bible shows that the divine right of legitimacy is unavailing, unless combined with personal strength. The impotence of *Ishbosheth*, the king's son, is contrasted with the divine heroism of *David*, *Jesse's* son. *David* did not violently overthrow Saul's dynasty; it perished through its own weakness. In 2 Sam. 2–4, *Ishbosheth* is named only to show his insignificance. This his name¹ already indicates.—When Ab-

¹ It is noteworthy that Saul's son is called *מְגִיבָה* and Jonathan's *Mephibosheth*. In 1 Chron. 9: 39, *Ishbosheth* is called *Esh-baal*. The opinion that this

er took Saul's concubine I. reproved him. This the only instance in which he showed independence. Abner, offended, gave a severe answer, which completely terrified the king. Immediately Abner joined David. But David refused to act until Michal would be restored to him; for he loved her, and through her established his relationship to the royal house. I. readily yielded to Abner's demand for her restoration to David.—When I. heard of Abner's death his hands were feeble." The power and authority of his sceptre were gone. Two of his captains took advantage of the general alarm, and to secure, as they thought, David's favor, assassinated Ishbosheth on his bed, and took his head to David. David justly rewarded their iniquity. CASSEL.*

Ishmael (Gen. 16; 21: 9-21; 25: 12-18), the son of Abraham by Hagar (see Art.).—He ranks with Isaac, as Lot with Abraham, and Esau with Jacob. He was born in Abraham's 6th year. After 14 years Isaac was born, and the jealousy which previously existed between the mothers, kindled between their sons. Ishmael persecuted Isaac (Gal. 4: 29). Sent with his mother into the desert, he was rescued from perishing by an angel, and assured that he should become a great nation. Under the blessing of God he grew up in the wilderness of Paran, became an archer, and, by his mother's advice, married an Egyptian woman. His twelve sons became princes of as many tribes, in the Arabian desert, between Egypt and Assyria. He died 137 years old.—The Ishmaelites thus became the second main element in the population of the Semitic, Joktan Arabs (Gen. 10: 25-30) who mainly dwelt further South, and occupied the chief portion of the Arabian peninsula. Arabic writers, also, distinguished the Ishmaelites as immigrants, *Arabes facti, adscititii* (see *Arabia*). The Israelites, led by their geographical position, to frequent intercourse with these Arab. Ishmaelites, designated all Arabians, Ishmaelites (Gen. 37: 25, 27, &c.; Judges 8: 24, 26. See *Joseph*). It is worthy of notice that in Genesis (16, 21) so much stress is laid upon the promise of a numerous posterity to Ishmael. The Ishmaelites occupy an intermediate position between Israel and the heathen, like that of Lot's descendants, the Moabites and Ammonites; and Esau's, the Edomites; a position which often becomes singularly prominent in prophecies against strange nations (Amos 1, 2; Is. 21, &c.), and which has found its great historical development in Mohammedanism.—Paul (Gal. 4: 22) employs the relation of Hagar and Ishmael to Sarah and

was the original name is properly rejected by Ewald, because it is not true that the brothers and son of Jonathan were devoted to Baal. But Ewald's opinion that Baal need not designate the heathen God, must also be set aside. There is another explanation. *נֶחֱשׁ* occurs only in these two names, and obviously refers to their fate. It not only means *shame* but *abasement, humiliation* (cf. Ps. 35: 26; 132: 18). In Chron. the term is taken as identical, in the prophets, with Baal, and this word is used to exhibit the disgrace of the royal house in a milder form; for at that time the term Baal was no longer one of so much reproach, as the worship of Baal was no longer feared. But *נֶחֱשׁ* continued to have a reproachful sense.

Isaac, to represent, allegorically, the antithesis between the law and gospel. — (For the literature, see under *Jacob*). AUBERLEN.*

Isidore of Pelusium, born c. 340, in Alexandria (*Ephr. Antiochen. in Phot. cod. 288*) was an older cotemporary of Cyrill the Patr. The Gregory to whom Isidore wrote an epistle (I., 125) may have been Gregory of Nyssa. It is not certain, either, that he was a pupil of Chrysostom, whom he resembled in spirit, and greatly revered (I., 152, 156, 310; II., 42; IV., 424; V., 32). He lived, as presbyter and abbot, in a monastery at Pelusium (FACUNDUS HERM. *def. trium. capit. II., c. 4*. MANSI, V., 731, &c.). His numerous epistles exhibit him an earnest, intelligent, pious, respected man. He enjoyed the highest influence in the time of Theodosius the younger (*Evagr. I., 15*). How long he lived is doubtful. Epp. I., 310, 311, to Cyrill and Theod. are of the year 431; another (I., 324) belongs to the next year. Beyond that we have no evidence. He represented the Greek monasticism of his age in its noblest form, and found in seclusion, poverty, and abstinence, the best means of cultivating true discipleship (I., 63, &c.). But the excellence of monasticism consisted, in his view, not in outward self-denial, but in earnest spiritual discipline. He saw its perils, too, and exhorted to labor.—It was natural that he should share the growing depreciation of heathen literature and science; still he admits that a wise Christian may draw honey even thence.—As a monk he practised what he required, and became noted for piety, so that even his garments were thought holy, a superstition which he reproved. Though living secluded, the cares of the whole Church lay on his heart. In his relation to Cyrill, he appears to great advantage; his counsels of moderation in Cyrill's controversy with Nestorius, contrasting with Cyrill's passion and ambition. He cherished high views of the dignity of the priesthood, and in many letters earnestly admonished negligent clergymen of their duty. He severely reproached Eusebius, Bishop of Pelusium, and some of his clergy, for their mercenary practices, and deplored the offence which inconsistent ministers occasioned to persons of weak minds.—In theology Isidore does not belong to the great party leaders. He firmly adhered to the orthodoxy then established in the Greek Church, zealously withstanding all heresies. He dwelt mainly on the doctrines of sin, liberty, grace, pretty much in the sense of Chrysostom. In exegesis he occupies a more important place; many of his letters contain answers to exegetical questions (hence the title of his works: *Is. de interpret. div. script. epp.*) Earnestly does he urge the study of the SS. as a means of grace. True, the need of much study is our reproach; to Noah, Abraham, Job, God spoke face to face; the Apostles received not the written but spiritual testimony of the Holy Ghost. The expounder of the SS. must take not single words and phrases, but the connection, and faithfully explain them. Still Isidore himself often indulged in what we consider arbitrary allegory.—The Paris edition of his works contains 2000 epistles, though some have been divided, and others duplicated. The number

given by Suida (9000), and by Nicephorus (10,000), is doubtless an exaggeration.—I. mentions a treatise by himself, *Πρὸς Ἑλλήνας*, in which Divine Providence is argued, and the vanity of heathen soothsaying exposed (II., 137, 228). The opinion that this is the same as that named, III., 253 (α λογίδιον περὶ τῆς σιμαμένης), is not sustained; this *λογίδιον* is probably found in III., 154.—Editions: the first three books, Paris, 1585, fol. These with the 4th book enlarged by C. RITTERSHUSIUS, *Heidelb. offic. Commel.* 1605, fol. The 5th book by the Jesuit, ANDR. SCHOTT, Antw., 1623, 8vo. (Francf., 1629, fol.). A complete but faulty edition, Paris, 1638, fol. in *Morel*. (*Max. Bibl. VV.*, PP., Tom. VII.) *Isidor. Collationes*, started by Card. Barberini, edited by P. Possevinus, Rom., 1670; used in the edition of the Lat. transl. Venet., 1745, *Roncon*.—(Upon Isidore: TILLEMONT, *Mém. t. XV.* DU PIN, *t. IV.*, 3, sqq. HEUMANN, *diss. de I. Pelus.* &c., Gott. 1737, also in his *primitiæ Gött. acad.*—H. A. NIEMEYER, *de Is. Pel. vita, &c.*, Hal., 1826. Cf. also *Acta Sanctor.* 4 Febr.).

W. MÖLLER.*

Isidore of Seville, the most noted writer of his time, was born at Carthage, in the latter half of the 6th cent. He had two brothers who both became bishops, the one of Seville, the other of Carthage. He succeeded the former in 600, or 601, and presided over the synods of Seville (619) and Toledo (633). When he found his death approaching, he divided his possessions among the poor, had himself carried into the church, where he prayed aloud for the pardon of his sins, and exhorted the people to love and unity. Four days after he died, April 4, 636. Isidore's learning embraced the literature of his time. As a theological writer he exerted special influence by his *de eccles. officiis libri duo*, and *Sententiarum libri tres* (extracts from Gregory M., Augustine, &c.). In his *Hist. de regibus Gothorum, Wandalorum, et Suevorum*, he follows Gregory's principles, and condemns the forcible means used to convert the Jews in Spain. The seed of literature he scattered long yielded fruit in Spain. The *Collectio Canonum et Epistolarum decretalium* bearing his name, is a later work. The most complete edition of his works is by *Faustin Arevali*: Rom., 1797–1803, 7 vols., 4to.—(See DUPIN bibl., V., 11, &c.)

TH. PRESSEL.*

Issachar (= *bought with a price*, or *he brings a reward*) was Jacob's fifth son by Leah (Gen. 30 : 16, &c.). The tribe which descended from him was divided into four families (Gen. 46 : 13), and subsequently subdivided (1 Chron. 7 : 1, &c.). At the departure from Egypt it numbered 54,400 men able to bear arms; at the second census, 64,300; and in David's time, 87,000 valiant men (Numb. 1 : 29 ; 26 : 23, &c.; 1 Chron. 7 : 5). Hence in population it ranked next to Judah. In the march through the wilderness, Issachar, with Zebulun, was attached to Judah, and encamped East of the tabernacle (Numb. 2 : 3, 5). At the division of Canaan Issachar had the fourth lot, but its boundaries are not accurately defined. Its 16 cities, of which four belonged to the Levites (Josh. 21 : 28, &c.), lay between the tribes of Asher and Zebulun, on the N., Manasseh on the W. and S., and Jordan

on the O. On the W. its territory stretched almost to the Mediterranean. Within its borders lay cities belonging to other tribes (Josh. 17 : 11 ; 19 : 17, &c.). It was, on the whole, a fertile, desirable district. In the N. was Tabor, in its centre Gilboa, in the W. Carmel; thence spread out the extensive and beautiful valley of Jezreel, watered by the Kishon, in which lay the cities of Nain, Endor, Jezreel, &c. (Jos., *Ant.* 5, 1, 22).—Jacob's blessing (Gen. 49 : 14, &c., & Deut. 33 : 18) plainly indicates that this tribe content with its rich pasture-grounds, would purchase the undisturbed possession of its domain of the adjacent commercial Phœnicians by becoming a carrier of their wares, and paying them tribute. Its territory was crossed by the caravan route from Phœnicia to Arabia Petra (Ezek. 27 : 21; *Strabo* 16, 4, 21, p. 779; *Mover's Phœn.* II., 1, p. 309, &c.; *Ritter, Ersk.* XVI., p. 17, 19). The tribe was not lacking however, in martial valor, as the song of Deborah proves (Judges 5 : 15, &c.). Tola, one of the judges, also sprung from this tribe (Judges 10 : 1, &c.), and 200 heads of the tribe, with their brethren joined David at Hebron to make him king (1 Chron. 12 : 32), and were commended for their political discretion.—(See *Reland, Palest.*; *Lengerke, Kanaan I.*, 312, 471, 599, 675; *Ewald, Gesch. Isr. I.*, 416; II., 293, 296, 304, 323). RÜRSCHL.*

Italy, Ecclesiastical—Statistical.—It is difficult to trace the spread of Christianity in Italy, since paganism here died gradually, and Christianity was established more by a change of religious forms, than on account of a deeply felt want of religious renewal on the part of its fading people. Long after the emperors had elevated Christianity as the established religion, traces of paganism show themselves; and the monks of the 6th cent. seem first to have succeeded in changing the pagan customs of the inhabitants of the villages into Christian ones. During the whole of the 4th cent. we meet with pagan temples in the most important cities. When Christianity was established at Florence, it was stipulated that the sacred statue of Mars should not be injured. In Lower Italy pagan worship existed as late as the 6th century. Christian life in Italy having been so weak, it is not surprising that this country did not aid much in the spread of Christianity in the West. Subsequently the ecclesiastical history of Italy is almost entirely identified with that of the papacy. Since the suppression of the Reformation, all religious movements have been crushed out until the most recent times. At present, a part of the Italian people manifests a desire to rest contented no longer with the ceremonies of the Church, but to achieve religious independence. In the following lines we shall give an account of the ecclesiastical condition of the different Italian States.—a. The *Grand Duchy of Tuscany* consists of 4 archbishoprics with a population of 1,730,000. The archbishopric of Florence embraces 10 bishoprics, with 1767 parishes. That of Siena, 8 bishoprics, with 363 parishes. That of Pisa, 4 bishoprics, with 325 parishes. The archbishopric of Lucca contains, besides its own episcopal See with 273 parishes, only the suffraganate of Massa, in

loden. Besides cathedrals there are 54 collegiate churches. The secular clergy number 9,000. There are at present 96 monasteries with 2500 monks, and 69 nunneries with 4000 nuns. In Lucca alone, there are 12 monasteries with 391 monks, and 11 nunneries with 453 nuns; the secular clergy number 1054. In 1836 the Protestants at Florence and Livorno numbered 1153, viz.: 521 Lutherans and Reformed, and 632 Anglicans. At Livorno the Protestant church of the Dutch-German society has existed since 1607; the Anglicans have a house of worship at Livorno and Florence. At the same places there are about 200 Greeks with a chapel. The united Armenians number about 100. There are about 300 Protestants at Pisa, and 30-50 at Siena. The only burial-ground of the Protestants is at Livorno.—When Leopold I. was still Grand Duke, a reformation of the Church was undertaken in Tuscany similar to that in Austria, and headed by Ricci, Bishop of Pistoja. Although the National Synod in 1787, and subsequently the Pope, opposed this supremacy of the State, a part of the reforms have, nevertheless, continued to the present. The tithes were abolished, the priests obtained a fixed salary, and applications for dispensations from the Pope were seldom allowed. In 1782, the Inquisition and the court of the papal nuncio were abolished, and the regular clergy made subject to the diocesan bishops. These regulations were sanctioned by the Pope in the concordat of 1815, so that now the election of bishops and canons is also dependent upon the Grand Duke, and neither a papal bull nor decree of the general of an order can be published without his consent. In Tuscany, especially at Florence, the religious fraternities for the care of the sick and dying are doing an excellent work. Of monastics, the begging friars, especially the Capuchins, have the greatest influence among the people. But the participation of the monks in the game of Lotto, furnishes a pernicious example to the people. The literary education of the monks is limited. At Florence there are 172 churches, among which the cathedral of St. Maria del Fiore is known as a masterpiece of architecture. At Pisa, where there are 80 churches, the cemetery of *Campo Santo* is wholly covered with sacred earth from Jerusalem, which a fleet of crusaders brought hither. Amid the Appenines is situated the celebrated monastery of Camaldoli, to which numerous pilgrimages are still performed. The Abbey of Valambrosa is situated in the same region. The Florentines are not at present distinguished above other Italians in a literary point of view.—b. The *Duchy of Parma*, in 1842, had a population of 486,000. It is divided into the bishoprics of Parma, with 323 parishes; Piacenza, 362; and Borgo San Donnino, a suffraganate of Rome, with 54 parishes; besides these there are 9 parishes which belong to the Sardinian Bishop of Bobbio, and 5 which belong to the Sardinian Bishop of Brugnato-Sarzana. In the bishopric of Parma the secular clergy number 1005; in Piacenza 1160; in Borgo San Donnino 208. In 1834 there were 6 nunneries with 245 nuns, which were mostly occupied in teaching; and 14 monasteries with 411 monks.

Church and State are related as in Tuscany.—c. The *Duchy of Modena* contains 400,000 inhabitants, all Catholics. It is divided into 5 bishoprics with 653 parishes. Besides these, 17 parishes belong to the Bishop of Parma, 48 to the Bishop of Lucca, and 31 to the Abbey of Nonantola, which belongs to the Archbishop of Modena. There are 14 monasteries and 10 nunneries. Church and State are related as in Tuscany. The Pope consenting, the priests can be tried in criminal cases by a lay tribunal.—d. The Republic of *St. Marino* contains 8000 inhabitants. Its bishoprics are Montefeltre, with 6 parishes, and Rimini with 2. The secular clergy number 45. The 3 monasteries of the Minorites, Capuchins and Servite, number 23 monks; the nunnery of the Clarissæ, 28 nuns.—e. The *Lombard-Venetian Kingdom* is divided into the archbishoprics of Milan and Venice. To Milan belong 8 suffraganates. There are 2303 parishes, 9706 priests, 33 monasteries with 194 monks and 885 nuns. In the city of Milan, among its 79 churches, the cathedral deserves special mention. The ritual used is the Ambrosian. There is no Protestant congregation in Milan, though there is a Reformed one in Bergamo. The archbishopric of Venice is subject to the patriarch of Venice, who holds also the title of Primate of Dalmatia. The city contains 110 churches and chapels, the most noted of which are, St. Marks, the Gemini, St. Giovanni, and St. Paolo. The disposition of the people is Roman Catholic, since this is the faith of the Fathers. Images of saints and the Madonna are found at all the street corners. Before them, lamps are lighted at night, and the lower class bow to them. To the patriarch are subject 10 episcopal Sees. The parishes number 1615; the clergy 7459; the monasteries 43, with 692 monks and 490 nuns. There are 2 non-Catholic parishes with 11 clergymen. At Venice the Protestants enjoy the free exercise of their religion. The greater number are Lutherans, mostly from Suabia. On the small island of St. Lazaro, the Armenians possess the celebrated Mechetarite monastery, the monks of which follow the rule of St. Anthony. Pupils are sent hither from all countries to educate them as priests of the United Armenians.—f. The *Kingdom of Sardinia*. Here, especially in Piedmont, least in Savoy, there is among the population a strong anti-Roman tendency, which is encouraged by the government. Protestant periodicals and books are not only widely circulated, but at Turin a Protestant newspaper is even published, whilst ultramontane papers meet with little favor. The government is in other respects also superior to those of the other States. The population numbers 4,700,000, of which 550,000 belong to the island of Sardinia. It is ecclesiastically divided as follows: I. The Mainland. 1. The archbishopric of Chambery, with 6 episcopal Sees and above 613 parishes. 2. The archbishopric of Turin, with 11 episcopal Sees and 1013 parishes. 3. The archbishopric of Vercelli, with 6 episcopal Sees and 869 parishes. 4. The archbishopric of Genoa, with 7 episcopal Sees and 603 parishes. In Piedmont, 5 episcopal Sees, with 541 parishes, belong to the archbishopric of Genoa. On the Island are:

1, the archbishopric of Cagliari, with 3 episcopal Sees in 147 parishes. 2, The archbishopric of Oristagno, with 73 parishes, but no suffraganates. 3, The archbishopric of Sassari, with 6 episcopal Sees in 171 parishes. Besides the cathedrals there are 74 collegiate churches. There are 63 theological seminaries, and an academy for the higher theological sciences, at Superga, near Turin. There are 30 abbeys, 460 monasteries, and 144 nunneries. These monastic institutions possess real estate valued at 30 millions of francs; but the real estate has lately been secularized by the government, which measure has helped no little to produce dissatisfaction at Rome. — Even in Sardinia, only the Waldenses are tolerated according to the constitution of 1848; but a Protestant congregation has recently been formed at Turin, whose church was dedicated in 1853. At Genoa, there is a Protestant Swiss congregation. At Annecy, Protestant worship is held every fortnight. At San Mauro, Favale, and Casale, also, Protestant congregations are said to have been formed. The Waldenses, numbering 20,000, live in the valleys of Pérouse, St. Martin, and Luserne. They are formed into 15 parishes. Since 1848 they have been placed on a civil equality with the other Sardinians. Before that time they had to endure much persecution, and owe their existence to Prussian, English, and Dutch mediation. They are intimately related to the Swiss, and belong in doctrine, church government and worship, to the Reformed Church. In 1855 the Synod, the highest ecclesiastical authority among the Waldenses, adopted a new constitution. For a long time these congregations were religiously dead; but at present they give signs of reanimation, and may become a great blessing to Italy. — The constitution of 1848 settles the relation of Church and State. On the mainland the king alone has the right of appointing archbishops, bishops, abbots, and priors: on the island this right is so modified that those appointed, the archbishops of Cagliari and Sassari alone excepted, must be native Sardinians. The other ecclesiastical offices are filled partly by the bishops, and partly by the Pope. The relation of the State to the Pope rests upon the concordat of 1742, as modified in 1817. According to this no papal bull can be published without the king's permission. In 1841 the Pope consented that under certain limitations the clergy were subject to the secular tribunals. — *g. The Kingdom of the two Sicilies.* In 1844 the Kingdom of Naples contained a population of 6,351,000, and Sicily of 2,016,000. Naples stood formerly as a papal fief in intimate relation to the papal chair; its king, according to the bull of Urban VI., 1099, was, with respect to the Sicilian monarchy, *legatus natus* of the Pope, exercises papal authority, and possesses therefore in the disposition of ecclesiastical affairs, a more liberal authority than other princes. The *Tribunal della monarchia* decides primarily in all cases of persons who are directly subject to the Pope, and can set aside the decisions of bishops and archbishops. From the reign of Philip II. the judge of the monarchy as representative of the king, was a clergyman; before that time the king himself decided in all

cases. As vassal of the Pope he had formerly to send to Rome a white charger, bearing a certain sum of money. This sign of homage was yielded, however, for Naples only. After 1759 it was wholly omitted, since which time the Pope annually, on Maundy Thursday, protests against the omission. The people are wholly devoted to the Roman Church, and delight in the pomp of religious festivities. Their disposition is kind, but their ignorance profound. The only Church is the Roman Catholic; even the 80,000 Arnauts in Calabria, have united with the Latin Church and acknowledge the supremacy of the Pope, though they receive the Lord's Supper under both kinds, allow their clergy to marry, and still use the Greek in their worship. At the papal court all this is ignored. In 1839 the Protestants numbered 830; at Naples resides the chaplain of the Prussian embassy, as also a French one; the few Protestants at Palermo and Messina form no congregations and have no minister. Since 1818 the Kingdom of Naples is divided into 20 archbishoprics, and 73 bishoprics, viz.: Naples, with the suffraganates of Aversa, Ischia, Nola Pozzuoli; the united archbishopric of Acerenza and Matera, with the suffraganates of the united bishopric of Anglona and Tursi, Tricarico, and Venosa; Amalfi; Bari, with the suffraganates of the united bishopric of Nuvo and Vitonto, Coversani; Brindisi; Capua, with the suffraganates of the united bishopric of Aquino, Pontecorvo and Sora, the united bishopric of Calvi and Teano, Caserta, Isernia, Sessa; Chieta, with the bishopric of Aquila; Conza, with the suffraganates: the united bishopric of St. Angelo de Lombardi and Bisaccia, Lacedogna, Muro, Campagna; Cosenza; Lanciano; Manfredonia; Otranto, with the suffraganates: Gallipoli, Lecce, Ugento; Reggio, with the suffraganates: Bova, Cassano, Catanzaro, Cotrone, Gerace, Nicastro, the united bishopric of Nicotera and Tropeja, Oppido; Rossano; Salerno, with the suffraganates: Capaccio, the united bishopric of Marsico, Nuoro and Potenza, Nusco, Policastro; Santa Severina, with the bishopric of Cariati; Sorrento, with the bishopric of Castellamare; Taranto, with the suffraganates: Castellaneta, Oria; Trani, with the bishoprics of Bisceglia and Andrea. The suffraganates of the archbishop of Benevento, belonging to the Church-State, are: Ariano, the united bishopric of Ascoli and Cerignola, Avellino, Bojano, Bovino, Larino, Lucera, Termoli. Exempt bishoprics are: the united bishopric of Cava and Sarno, Gaëta, the united bishopric of Gravina and Monte Peloso, the united bishopric of St. Marco and Visignano, Marsi, the united bishopric of Melfi and Napolla, Mileto, Molfetta, Monopoli, Nardo, the united bishopric of Penne and Atri, Teramo, Trivento, the united bishopric of Valle and Sulmona. In 1824 there were 368 abbots, 3,700 priests, 27,612 lower clergy, 8,455 monks, 8,155 nuns; in 1841 there were 31,870 secular priests, 12,558 monks, 10,361 nuns; in 1842 there were 32,360 secular priests, 12,741 monks, 10,066 nuns. — The island of Sicily is divided into 3 archbishoprics. The archbishop of Palermo, who is the primate of the kingdom, has a See of 45 parishes. His suffraganates are: Girgenti, with 73 parishes,

and Mazara with 33. The archbishop of Messina has the suffraganates of Cefalu, Lipari, Patti, Vicosia. The archbishop of Montereale has the suffraganates of Caltagirone, Catania with 47 parishes, Piazza, Syracuse with 65 parishes. The monasteries are estimated at 658, with 1,806 priests, 893 novices, 1,950 lay brethren, and 942 Terzini. There are 5,000 nuns. The richest monasteries are those of the Benedictines, Olivetans, and Theatines. In the province of Messina there are 15 Basilian monasteries, which arose when Sicily yet belonged to the patriarchate of Constantinople. The monasteries are responsible to no one in the administration of their estates; whence the income of but few of them is known. At the head of the nunneries is an abbess, elected for three years. The priests and monks are allowed to be present at the carnival operas and shows, but not the nuns. The latter are allowed to view them from the closed balconies of houses, which have a subterranean connection with the nunneries. The rules in many nunneries are very rigorous; in others, the nuns have summer vacations which they can spend in the country. The most celebrated monastery in the Kingdom of Naples, as that of Monte-Cassino, whose wealth, however, has been very much reduced. The abbot is elected for 6 years; after his term expires he becomes again a common monk. The most celebrated monastery in Sicily is that of St. Rosalie, near Palermo. The saint once delivered this city from the plague. In Sicily spiritual dramas often take the place of the sermon. The order in the churches is by no means good; wealthy ladies have chairs brought to the churches by their servants, whilst the poorer ones sit upon the floor, not unfrequently nursing their infants. The boys romp noisily through the church. Images of saints are used as advertisements and signs. Ships, wagons, and shops have their particular images. The lemonade venders use the image of Christ at the well of Samaria, or of Moses smiting the rock. The image of St. Anthony is suspended by drivers at the foreheads of their horses. The most esteemed festival of the Neapolitans is that of St. Januarius, whose blood becomes liquid biennially in April and September. The festival is celebrated during 8 days with much noise and pomp. In Sicily a similar festival is that of St. Rosalie, also celebrated during 8 days, and with much glitter and display. The priests are covered with gold. Music, dancing, singing, the ringing of bells and thunder of cannons combine to make such festivals as noisy as possible.—The relations between Church and State have been settled by the concordat of 1818. According to this the king appoints the bishops, and the Pope confirms them. The abbeys which are not under royal patronage are filled by the Pope, but only with subjects of the king. Appointments to parishes are made from January to June by the Pope, from July to December by the bishops. In the churches of which the king is patron, the bishop inducts the presentee if he has found him qualified. The bishops are required to swear allegiance to the king; but they are not generally interfered with in the administration of their Sees; and they have also a

right of appeal to the Pope, except in secular matters, when a permission from the king is necessary to such an appeal. The clergy generally live in moderate circumstances, and are not found in cafés as often as the clergy in other parts of Italy. Nor are they as often found in the higher families and societies, since their influence is dreaded. In the villages there is generally one priest to about 1000 persons; in the smaller towns three to 1000, and in the large cities five to the same number.

See F. W. SCHUBERT, *Handb. d. allgem. Staatskunde*, Bd. I., Thl. 4.: Königsberg, 1839. FLECK, *wissenschaftl. Reise nach It.*, Bd. 1. 2.: Lpz., 1835. RHEINWALD's *Repertorium*. STRICKER, *Ober- u. Mittel-Italien*, 1847. BECHER, *Statistische Uebersicht d. Bevölkerung d. österr. Monarchie*: Stuttg. u. Tübing., 1841. Gelzer, *Prot. Briefe aus Süd-Frankreich u. Italien*, 1852. Gelzer, *Prot. Monatsblätter*, 1855, Bd. 5, p. 136 u. 266. I. F. NEIGEBAUER, *die Insel Sardinien*, 1853. I. F. NEIGEBAUER, *Sicilien, dessen polit. Entwick. u. jetz. Zust.*: Lpg., 1848. HÖNINGHAUS, *Gegenw. Bestand d. R. Cath. Kirche*: Aschaffenh., 1836. (ALFRED REUMONT), *Röm. Briefe v. einem Florentiner*, Bd. 1.2.: Lpg., 1840.

KLOSE. — Reinecke.

Italy, Reformation in. Italy was not left unaffected by the general desire for a reformation of the Church, which showed itself throughout all Western Christendom. In the 15th cent. Savonarola had preached the necessity of a religious new creation. But a peculiar conjuncture of favorable and adverse circumstances, which balanced each other, produced here a peculiar course of the reformatory movements. The hopeless condition of the Church was necessarily more evident in the immediate proximity of the Papal court than at a greater distance; especially amid scenes of daring crime enacted upon the Papal chair by men like Sixtus IV., Innocent VIII., and Alexander VI.; and of total worldliness by Julius II., and Leo X. The political confusion of the country, so much divided and subject to foreign influence, withdrew the attention of the Popes almost entirely from their spiritual calling, and directed it almost exclusively to their security and aggrandizement as secular princes. The corruption prevailing in the higher regions of the Church was general among the clergy of all ranks. The religious and polite literature of the age furnish the most abundant evidence of this. The monasteries were scenes of extreme licentiousness. The highest dignities of the Church were given to relatives or the lowest favorites, or sold to the highest bidder: the lower parishes were often in the hands of the most ignorant and debased monks, because they served for the smallest hire. At the same time, indeed, a new spiritual life had arisen, which, through an enthusiastic admiration of the ancient classics, art and sciences, arrived at a high degree of refinement; but there was no general popular cultivation, and hence it favored only exceptionally the revival of religion: the people continued in the deepest ignorance and superstition, and at best in the mere outward sanctity of Roman formalism. The higher ranks had surrendered to open infidelity or indiffer-

entism. Humanism sought a substitute for the despised barbarism of the traditional scholasticism in the study of ancient philosophy; but with the study of ancient literature not only its language and beauties were appropriated, but also its Pagan ideas, which often led to free-thinking, skepticism and total estrangement from the life of Christianity. This was the tone which passed from Florence to the elegant court of Leo X., where, among the nearest associates of the Pope, Bembo, afterwards Cardinal, did not hesitate to say that he had never spent time to less advantage than in reading the Bible: and denounced to his friend, Sadoleto, Privy Secretary of the Pope, the study of it as folly: *non enim decent gravem errorem tales ineptiae*. Erasmus writes concerning Rome: "theology is studied only from love of gain, and the superstition of the populace is employed for the enrichment of their superiors." He had with his own ears heard how Christ and the Apostles were openly blasphemed there. The materialism and skepticism of the contemporary Italian Humanists is evident from the manner in which the immortality of the soul, freedom and Providence are discussed by the Aristotelian P. Pomponazzo of Bologna. As regards morals, Luther tells us, that several Cardinals were pointed out to him as saints, because they were guilty only of commerce with women; for the greatest vices were general and unblushing. To this pass had Christianity come in the land of the Popes! But, notwithstanding this, the Papacy was still firmly rooted, since it was intimately interwoven with the interests of Italy. The latter was placed through Rome at the head of the nations; and the money which flowed into the Papal treasury from all Christendom, enriched the whole country. Only through the skill and weight of the Roman tactics could Italy hope to maintain its independence against the power of France and of the House of Hapsburg. The power of the Papal court, and the clergy and ceremonies, dazzled those who delighted in outward pomp, and satisfied the meagre religious wants of the majority, who lived in deep ignorance and sensuality.—But there were not wanting those also, who deeply felt the magnitude of the evil and desired its removal; and the study of the sciences, fostered by Humanism, found a more earnest channel in some men, and led them from a barren and effete scholasticism to the investigation of the pure fountain of Christianity. Add to this the new impulse given by the reformatory movements in Germany and Switzerland, which took a strong hold upon many minds. Amid the various unfavorable circumstances of the country and people, however, these phenomena were mostly limited to a few among the cultivated and higher ranks. Nor did the divided state of the country secure sufficient prominence and political influence to any single person, to enable him to protect the Reformation against the overwhelming power of the hierarchy, and to afford it a centre of operation. Thus it happened that the Reformation here nowhere became the matter of a firmly united number; but only of isolated men, around whom were gathered the few who thought like them, but

who had soon to yield to an unsparing persecution. The reformatory movements were most extensive between 1530–42, after which Catholicism exerted all its power to suppress them.—That even at the Roman court itself the necessity for a better state had begun to be felt, appears from a fact to which Ranke first directed attention. During the pontificate of Leo X., about 80 pious and learned men, affected by the corruption of the Church and the decline of religion, united at Rome into an Oratory of Divine Love, in order to awaken a more earnest religious spirit. They were men, some of whom subsequently, in the highest Church offices and in ways widely deviating, sought to renovate and rescue the Church and Christianity: but they all alike admitted the necessity of a Reformation. Among them was *Cajetan*, of Thiene, the founder of the Order of the Theatines, and afterwards canonized; *Caraffa*, who as Cardinal and Pope sought the safety of the Church in the exercise of strict discipline, and that of the hierarchy in the establishment of a new inquisition; and the noble Venetian, *Contarini*, who even as Cardinal admitted the necessity of leading back the doctrine of the Church to the Scriptures (see Art.). It seems also that he afterwards became the centre of a new circle at Venice, in which a number of distinguished and deeply pious men met for the purpose of spiritual studies and conversation. Here, of course, there was already a more intimate contact with Wittenberg. But these men, even if they agreed with the German Reformers in their views of dead works, the corruption of the Church, and salvation by faith in Christ alone, nevertheless condemned their separation from the Church and that unity, which was necessarily based upon an hierarchical organization. To this circle belonged *Reg. Pole*, of England. *Marcant. Flaminio*, *Jac. Nardi* and *Bruccioli* of Florence, *Luigi Pruli*, a patrician of Venice, and perhaps, also *Angelo Buonarici*, all alike engaged in reformatory movements. Although Pole had left his country on account of his defence of the Papal primacy against the encroachments of Henry VIII., he, nevertheless, even as Cardinal, showed his deep attachment to the Protestant doctrine of justification; but he thought that he could rest contented with the inward conviction, and was not prevented by it from laboring zealously against the Reformation. It was, perhaps, his influence, also, which led his warm friend, the excellent, though ductile Flaminio, to occupy a similar position. Flaminio was, indeed, opposed to some of the Protestant doctrines, especially that of the Lord's Supper; but in other respects he was one of the most zealous advocates of a Reformation in Italy, and on the most important points of the faith he expresses himself in his works in a thoroughly evangelical manner. But of these men Bruccioli labored most thoroughly in the sense of Protestantism; and he was, perhaps, more than all the others, attracted to the system, although he never separated from the Church. He had not only the courage to advocate the right of every Christian to possess the Word of God as the only rule of faith, but he also undertook to translate the Scriptures into the Italian (1530–32), and to accompany

with short annotations. The many editions of this work within a few years show the extent of its circulation, and the prevalent desire for religious information direct from the pure fountain.—It is not venturing too much to say that his inward evangelical tendency, which, however, did not separate from the dominant Church, counted everywhere numerous adherents among the educated classes of Italy, if they were not wholly estranged from religion. Many prominent examples might yet be mentioned, but a few of the most important and best authenticated must suffice. Men like the Bishop *Foscarari* of Modena, *San Felice* of Cava, and Cardinal *J. Morone*, even suffered persecution on account of it. *Grimani*, patr. of Aquileja, escaped a similar fortune only by the powerful influence of Venice. *Folengo*, a pious benedictine of Monte Casino, endured all kinds of annoyances on account of his comments on the Psalms and the Catholic epistles, in which he had unequivocally expressed his leaning towards the Protestant doctrine of justification and his opposition to many of the most important institutions of the Church, such as fasting, mechanical exercises of devotion, confession, frequent masses, and the sanctity of the outward priesthood. In a similar spirit the excellent *Fregoso*, Cardinal and Archb. of Salerno, directed his work on Prayer against the unevangelical and superstitious devotional formalism of the Church; for which reason, however, it was soon placed upon the Index. Several works of Luther, translated into the Italian, were even published under his name and eagerly read; for the zeal of the friends of the Reformation had recourse even to such means, in order to escape the Papal prohibitions and the violent measures of the inquisition, which sought in every way to oppose a barrier to the spread of the Reformation from Germany and Switzerland.—On account of the extensive intercourse of these countries, especially with Upper Italy, the reformatory works of Luther had, at an early date, already found their way hither, and had been eagerly sought after. At the beginning of 1519 Frobenius, of Basle, informed Luther of the large sale of them in Italy, and of the favor with which they met there. The Bull of Leo against them could not prevent their continued sale. Venice especially seems to have been an entrepot for them. At the Diet of Nuremberg, in 1524, the Legate Campeggio complained of the number of Luther's books which were read there. In 1540 Melanchthon speaks of the large transportations of books from the Fair at Frankfurt to Italy, in spite of the Papal edicts.—It was well known now how great the danger of infection was, even to those who were most intimately connected with the interests of Rome. The advisers of Paul III. warned him, that even the fathers of the Council, which was to convene, might be seduced to the Lutheran heresy, if the books of the heretics were put into their hands. Only detached portions, accompanied with a refutation, were to be laid before them for consideration, or rather condemnation. But the adherents of the new ideas sought the more to defeat these measures of caution, and to cir-

culate Italian translations of Protestant works. The *Loci Theol.* of Melanchthon and his Commentary on Matthew, Bucer's Comment. on the Psalms, and several works of Zwingli, were circulated under fictitious names. Luther's Catechism and Explanation of the Lord's Prayer and Calvin's Institutes and Catechism were published anonymously.—The attendance of German students at the Universities of Bologna and Padua contributed also to the spread of the new doctrines. Less calculated to gain friends for the Reformation was the missionary zeal of the German and Swiss mercenaries who entered Italy in 1526. It is known how, after the taking of Rome, they publicly manifested their hatred and contempt of the Papacy. But on account of the difference of language and the oppression exercised alike on friend and foe, their religious influence was necessarily very weak. In the misery of the times, however, which they helped to increase, public opinion saw a visitation of God on account of the extreme corruption of the Church and hierarchy; and therefore lent a more ready ear to those who preached the necessity of a Reformation.—Protestantism seems to have gained a firm footing, and decided adherents, first at Venice, on account of its active commerce with Germany, its more independent position, with reference to the Papacy, and the early and constant sale of the works of the Reformers. As early as 1520, Luther received tidings from Venice of the great want which was felt of advancing the evangelical cause in the favorable soil of Italy by preachers and writings. In 1528 he received no less joyful news of the advance of the Word of God there. No little may have been contributed to this result by the refugees who gathered here for safety from all parts of Italy. At Venice the friends of the gospel watched with the deepest interest the course of the Diet of Augsburg (1530); for they had heard the most unsatisfactory reports of the negotiations which Melanchthon, too anxious to maintain peace, was carrying on with the Legate Campeggio, and they feared the worst from his submissive compliance, for the good cause and its adherents. In their name L. P. Roselli wrote a letter to Melanchthon, urging him to persevere to the last. Such was the spirit which animated the Evangelicals at Venice, and which they manifested at a later date. Even priests were found among them. We mention only *Baldo Lupetino*, and *M. Flacius Illyricus*, the subsequent champion of Lutheranism. Through such men, who generally sought a personal acquaintance with the Reformers, the Venetians continued in constant intercourse with Wittenberg. In 1539 Melanchthon wrote a letter to them which affords us an interesting view of the condition of the Evangelical cause among them. The letter seems to have been occasioned by his anxiety on account of the spread of the book of Servetus against the Trinity. But it shows also an apparent apologetical design, and with the utmost Melanchthonian caution represents the Reformation as a removal merely of a few external abuses, and a restoration of the ancient and pure Catholicity. The author, perhaps, hoped in this way to secure for his co-religionists the

protection and favors of the leaders of the Republic, and, at the same time, to nip the bud of a dangerous tendency among them.—But also in most of the cities of the Venetian territory the Protestants were spreading; such was the case especially at *Vicenza* and *Treviso*, for the government seems nowhere to have disturbed them. One person alone, a German, who too openly manifested his zeal for the Lutheran heresy in the Diocese of *Vicenza*, was surrendered to the spiritual tribunal (1535). Only after 1542 a heavy persecution burst upon the Venetian Protestants at the instigation of Rome. However numerous they were, they had nevertheless not yet been organized into compact congregations; they had always been compelled to cover themselves in the deepest secrecy; and they were not only without a common pastor and teacher, but dissensions had also crept in among them. The man, who, on account of position and energy formed a centre of union, was *Balthasar Altieri*, who for some time resided here as secretary of the English ambassador. In the present distress he wrote to Luther, requesting him to secure the intervention of the German Protestant princes with the Senate, that the Protestants might be allowed the free exercise of their consciences, at least until a Council should decide on matters of religion. He also invoked Luther's authority to lay aside the dissensions of the Venetian Protestants. For, on account of the commerce of Venice with Switzerland, as well as with Germany, the two tendencies of Protestantism came here almost unavoidably into contact, and thus hither also the unfortunate sacramental controversies found their way. Bucer, in his untiring conciliatory zeal, had already endeavored to reconcile the conflicting views among the Italians; but he could accomplish nothing. Luther's authority was invoked to settle the dispute. But his answer was not calculated to fulfil this expectation; he openly and strongly expressed his suspicion of every compromise, and his invincible repugnance to the Swiss; and he even warned against the writings of Bucer. Melancthon deeply lamented the spirit of these letters, from which he expected no good results. For the Italians, naturally inclined to speculation, were at any rate not easily quieted; and were at this time occupied with various difficult questions besides that of the Lord's Supper. It is not improbable that in the territory of Venice, especially at *Vicenza*, secret associations were beginning to form, which occupied themselves with such questions of speculative theology, especially that of the Trinity; whence, subsequently, proceeded that Antitrinitarian tendency, through which soon after the Italian Protestants fell into ill repute far and wide.—About 1542 the principles of Protestantism were disseminated in *Istria*, another portion of the Venetian domain, by *Vergerio*, B. of Capo d'Istria, and made rapid though soon interrupted progress. He had spent much time in Germany, had been active in the interests of Rome against Protestantism, and had taken part in the colloquy at Worms in 1540; but was suddenly gained for the new ideas by the study of

Luth. books, which he had undertaken to refute. The first whom he gained for the new ideas, was his brother, the Bishop of Pola. The two now labored in common, and with much success, to evangelize their dioceses, until, in 1545, the Inquisition interfered, and *Vergerio* (see Art.) was forced to flight.—Next, after Venice, *Ferrara* became a rallying-point for the friends of the gospel among the educated classes. It was *Renata*, wife of Hercules II., Duke of Este, and daughter of Louis XII. of France, who attracted them thither. Having been instructed in the reformatory doctrines by Margaret of Navarre, she, in 1527, brought them with her to Ferrara. A number of men was soon gathered at her court who shared the religious opinions of this excellent and highly educated lady. They were partly scholars who found employment in the University or at the court, mostly adherents of the moderate Church tendency; partly also refugees who had to forsake their homes on account of their decided Protestantism. Among the latter were several Frenchmen; *Clément Marot*, the poet and versifier of the Psalms; *Calvin* himself, who, in 1536, sojourned here for several months; and *Hubert Langnet*, distinguished in the history of the French Reformation. Among the Italians were the moderate *Flaminio* and *Calcinai*, the friend of Contarini and Pole; the more decided *Peter Martyr Vermigli*, *Agnus Palearius* and *Celio Sec. Curione*; the latter of whom gained for Protestantism *Peregrino Morata*, the tutor of the brothers of the Duke.—From hence, perhaps, the Reformatory impulses also reached *Modena*, which also belonged to the dominions of the Duke of Este. Already, in 1530, a Papal rescript commanded the inquisitors of this and the Ferrarese diocese to watch the heretical infection among the monks. But the movement did not become a public one until, in 1540, when the learned Sicilian, *Paolo Ricci*, arrived at Modena, and begun to gather a congregation. Ladies of high rank, especially a Countess *Rangone*, protected the new doctrine. The letters (from 1540–44) of Cardinal Morone, who was Bishop of Modena and Papal Legate in Germany, complain bitterly of the progress of Protestantism in his diocese, and that from all sides he had to hear that Modena had become Lutheran. But here, also, the sacramental controversies sowed dissension, and Bucer tried, in a letter to the Protestants of Modena and Bologna, to affect a reconciliation (1541). For in *Bologna*, whose University was attended by many Germans, the doctrines of the Reformation had also gained many earnest friends. Eminent among them was *Gior. Mollio*, a minorite, who acted for some time as preacher and professor. The presence of John v. Planitz, the Saxon ambassador, gave an opportunity to the Protestants of this city, in an address to him, to express their regard for the German princes, who had restored the gospel in their own country, and labored for its triumph in other countries, even to the Papal States. They urged him to labor in favor of a general council, from which they hoped the removal of the yoke of Antichrist and the freedom of Christians to follow their convictions. They prayed him that he should obtain for them permission

from the Emperor, for the present, at least, to use the Bible, without, on that account, being regarded as heretics. Other cities of the Papal States, such as *Faenza* and *Imola*, were also affected by the Protestant movement. Even in Rome itself there were many who secretly favored Luther.—The influence of the new spirit reached as far as the remote *Naples*. The German soldiers, who came hither in 1527, are said to have sattered the first seeds of the Reformation; and the soil was so well prepared, that an imperial edict of 1536 sought by the severest penalties to prevent the Luth. infection. But in the same year the Emperor himself sent to Naples the man, whose silent labors opened many of the noblest minds to the light of the gospel. *Juan Valdez* (see Art.) arrived from Germany as Secretary and Viceroy. Office, education, mind and character secured an immense influence for the labors of this pious man. An unobtrusive circle, composed however of the most eminent persons, gathered around him for mutual edification and the revival of a living, inward, Biblical Christianity. Among them were Count *G. Caraccioli* (see Art.) nephew of Paul IV.; *P. Carnesecchi*, Roman Protonotarius; *G. Gonzaga*, Duchess of Trajetto; *Vitt. Colonna*, the widow of Pescara, the victor at Pavia; and *Isab. Manrica*, the noble confessor. Valdez died already in 1540; but he continued to labor through two men, who, though before already inclined to the gospel, were brought by him to a full decision—viz.: *Pietro Martyr Vermigli* and *Bernard. Ochino* (s. Antitrin.) sent to Naples as prior of his order, and gained for the gospel by the reading of several works of Bucer and Zwingli, Martyr labored in a way similar to Valdez, especially by lectures on the Pauline Epistles, to which not only his monks, but also the most considerable of the clergy and laity, crowded. It happened at the same time, that Ochino, a Capuchin friar, then enjoying a general and enthusiastic admiration, who had been twice elected general of his order, and had been the confessor of Paul III., and was the most celebrated preacher of Italy at that time, was called in 1536, and again in 1539, to preach the Lent Sermons at Naples. Through the reading of the Scriptures he also had come to a knowledge of the only foundation of salvation in faith; but he had been advanced in his knowledge by Valdez, and he now with his powerful eloquence proclaimed to large crowds of people the doctrine of justification. Although none of these men as yet thought of separating from the Church, their course nevertheless excited suspicion. Cajetan soon took notice of it. Martyr was called upon to justify himself; but the interposition of several cardinals, especially of Contarini, averted for the time the danger which threatened him. Soon after, having now labored at Naples for nearly three years, he was transferred as prior to *Lucca*, where he found a new sphere for his evangelical efforts, and gained new friends for the Reformation both among the monks and laity. But new charges against him induced him to separate openly from the Papacy, and to seek safety abroad. He was accompanied by his three intimate friends, *P. Lacinio*, afterwards

professor at Strasburg, *Th. Trebellio*, and *G. Terenziano*. Eighteen of his pupils shortly followed him; among whom were *C. Martinengo*, who died at Geneva as minister of the Italian congregation; *Em. Tremellio*, afterwards Professor of Hebrew at Sedan; and *Jer. Zanchi*, whose name is illustrious among the most learned theologians of Germany. At Florence Martyr met Ochino, whom he induced also to leave his position and home in favor of freedom of conscience. The learned *Cel. Sec. Curione* for a time supplied the place of Martyr at Lucca, and labored at other places also to advance the Reformation, until he also had to seek safety in Switzerland.—Hence an extensive Protestant movement was spreading through all Italy. Many saw that a Reformation could not be expected from the Church and hierarchy, and therefore withdrew from it—some quietly, others with open opposition and a close union with the German and Swiss Reformers. Many, however, still hoped for a Reformation from within, either through a general council, or by any other concessions. The evangelical tendency, which was favored even by many eminent men among the clergy, attained at last to such importance, that Paul III. himself was not altogether free from its influence. He called several of the most prominent of those men into the Cardinal's college; Contarini first, then Sadolet, Pole and Fregoso, but also Caraffa, the hierarchical zealot. To prepare the way for a council, he formed these men, with several other prelates, into a congregation to elaborate a scheme of a reformation. It is of no little significance that in this scheme (*Consilium de emendanda Ecclesia*, 1537) the assertion of flatterers, that the power of the Pope was unlimited, is designated as the source of those abuses, which had brought the Church to the verge of destruction. The Pope seemed not averse to a real reformation of his court. Steps were also taken for negotiations with the Protestants. Contarini, accompanied by Bishop Morone, was sent in 1541 as legate to the colloquy at Ratisbon. Among the four doctrinal points on which an agreement had been reached with Melancthon and Bucer, was also the essential one of justification. But here already the extreme opposites showed themselves: Luther was suspicious, and Caraffa took great offence at the formulas agreed upon; political machinations were also set in motion, and strict directions were sent to the legate, which made every compromise, especially on the questions of the Primacy and the Constitution of the Church, an impossibility. Thus Contarini had to return without effecting his purpose. The strict Roman party now gained a decided ascendancy with the Pope. The salvation of the Church was now to be reached in the complete restoration of mediæval Catholicism with all its consequences, and all its enemies were to be crushed by thorough measures of violence.—The first measure was the erection of a general supreme inquisitorial tribunal at Rome, which was to decide in matters of faith, with unlimited power over life and death, and with unsparing rigor against every one, without regard to person or position. On July 21, 1542, was published the bull instituting

the new congregation of the holy office, consisting of six cardinals, with Caraffa at their head. They could everywhere delegate priests with an equal power: the secular arm was everywhere required to yield ready assistance. The Pope alone had the power to pardon. Tuscany, Milan, and Naples soon admitted the new Roman institution; all the Italian States furnished the necessary assistance; even Venice itself could not refuse it, only that here secular assessors took part in the examinations of the tribunal. Even literature fell under the scrutiny of the Inquisition: after 1543 no book could be printed without its license, and soon catalogues of prohibited books made their appearance. At last, in 1545, the Council of Trent assembled; but, as an obedient tool of the papacy, and under the direction of papal legates, merely to define the Romish system as distinguished from the Protestant, and to reject also every approximation towards the latter. Thus even the moderate tendency which had endeavored, on the ground of the scriptural doctrine of justification, to effect a reformation in doctrine and church government, became untenable. — A general persecution now brought on the decisive moment for Protestantism in Italy, and a thorough sifting of the hitherto confused elements took place. Compact congregations had almost nowhere been organized, however promising the prospects at various places. The associations of the friends of the gospel had no connecting bond, found no sympathy among the ignorant and oppressed populace, nowhere the protection of the governors. Being mostly of the higher and cultivated classes, their position and relations weighed heavily with many of them. There was besides all this a great variety of views, the germs of dissension and of aberrations in important points of doctrine. All this sufficiently explains the issue of the hopeless conflict of the scarcely awakened new life with the overwhelming power of hatred and bloody persecution on the part of a hierarchy, which was daunted by no means to secure its authority. The weaker were intimidated into recantation; the bolder were driven to an open rupture with the papacy. Many saved themselves by flight; many sealed their confession with imprisonment and at the stake. — Rome itself was the chief director of this persecution, which extended over the whole of Italy. The Protestants at Naples, Ferrara, and Lucca were scattered. Their lot was imprisonment, exile, execution, and at last voluntary expatriation. All Italy trembled. The prisons of the Inquisition at Rome were filled from every direction. The persecutions became even more severe when Caraffa, in his 79th year, became Pope as Paul IV. (1555). His great aim was to purge and restore the Church; and to this end, the extirpation of dissenters became his most eager desire. He did not spare the highest; even the chiefs of the moderate party experienced his persecutions. Cardinal Morone was shut up in the castle of St. Angelo until the death of the Pope; Foscari, bishop of Modena, and San Felice, bishop of Cava, were imprisoned; and Cardinal Pole was summoned from England to defend himself. — Under Pius IV., also, the persecuting zeal of the Inquisition did not abate, though the Pope him-

self found little pleasure in it. But its bloody activity received a new increase of energy when the zealous Dominican Ghislieri, the faithful aid of Caraffa, and superior of the Inquisition, was elected Pope as Pius V. (1566). He, who had charged the troops which he had sent against the French Huguenots that they should at once kill every heretic who might fall into their hands, knew no mercy. "*Romæ quotidie aliquot comburuntur, suffocantur, decollantur.*" writes T. Eglin, "*omnes carceres et custodiæ sunt impletae, adeo ut indices de novis carceribus extruendis laboretur.*" From all quarters of Italy victims had to be sent to Rome; among the most distinguished of which we may mention *Pietro Carnesecchi*, formerly apostolical protonotarius, and *Antonio dei Pagliarici* (see Art.). — The numerous Protestants of Venice also felt the effects of the papal persecutions, although the republic admitted the Inquisition not without resistance and under various restrictions. In 1546, Paul III. warned against the spread of heresy, and many found themselves under the necessity of voluntary expatriation, whilst some recanted, and others were incarcerated for life. In the cities of the Venetian territory the persecution was especially active, for Ghislieri was Inquisitor thereat that time. But after 1557 some protection was afforded to those who were sojourning there for literary or commercial purposes. This perhaps encouraged the native Protestants to call a pastor and secretly to organize themselves into a congregation. This brought on the decisive stroke. They were betrayed and imprisoned, and the Senate now also suffered the death penalty to be executed upon them. The horrid extirpation of the small Waldensian congregations which had existed at *St. Pisto* and *Montalto* in Calabria since the end of the 14th cent., forms one of the most gloomy episodes in the gloomy history of Protestantism in Italy. So also the Protestant congregations which had been formed in the *Vellin* and in *Locarno*, met the same fate as the Reformation in Italy (See Art. *Switzerl. Ref. in.*). — Literature: D. GERDES, *Specimen Ital. Reform.*: Lugd. Bat., 1765; TH. M'CRIZ, *Hist. of the Progr. and Suppression of the Reform. in Italy*: Edin., 1827; D. ERDMANN, *die Ref. u. ihre Märtyrer in Ital.*: Berl., 1855; E. F. LEOPOLD, *üb. die Ursachen der Ref. u. deren Verfall in Ital.* (*Zeitschr. f. hist. Theol.*, 1843, II. 2.); RANKE, *die röm. Päbste*, vol. 1; F. MEYER, *die ev. Gemeinde in Locarno*, vol. 1: Zür., 1836; F. TRECHSEL, *die prot. Antitrinitarier vor Faust. Socin.*, vols. II.: Heidelb., 844.

CUNITZ. — *Reinecke.*

Iturea, one of the five provinces into which, at the time of Christ, ancient Bashan was divided. In Luke 3: 1, Philip, Herod's brother, is called tetrarch of Iturea and Trachonitis. As Jos., *Antt.* 17, 11, 4, assigns to Philip, Batanea, Trachonitis, and Auranitis, 18, 4, 6, and Trachonitis, Gaulanitis and Batanea, older writers have concluded (*Reland*, p. 106; *Welstein* I., 671; *Bachiene* II., 4, p. 276) that Iturea is identical with Batan. and Auran., or Gaulan. But this supposition is unnecessary, as Jos. might easily overlook so small a province, which he mentions but once (13, 11, 3). Classic authors reckon it with Coelosyria (in the wider sense)

and describe it as a mountainous district with many ravines and caves, whose wild inhabitants lived on plunder, but were skilful bowmen (*Strabo* XVI., p. 753, 55; *Plin.* H. N., 5, 19; *Cic.* Phil. II., 24; *Virg.* Georg. II., 488; *Lucan.* VII., 230, 514). Under Pompey they submitted to the Romans; but Iturea was first joined to the province of Syria (*Tac.* Ann. 12, 23, 1; *Dio Cass.* 59, 12). The name resembles that of Ishmael's son (*Gen.* 25 : 15; *1 Chron.* 1 : 31; 5 : 19), and is still preserved in the present province of *Dschedur* (*Merasid*, I., 277) S. W. of Damascus (*Burkhardt*, Reisen in Syrien I., 477); but the ancient Iturea may have been larger.

ARNOLD.*

Ivo, Bishop of Chartres (Carnotensis), a forerunner of Gratian in the history of jurisprudence, author of a *Pannormia* and a *decretum*. In the complete edition of his works, Paris,

1647, fol., containing 287 letters, throwing much light upon his times, 24 discourses, and brief chronicles of Frankish kings, the *Pannormia* is wanting. Of the year of his birth, and parentage nothing is known. He studied the classics and philosophy in Paris, theology under Lanfranc in Bec; in 1078 became prior of the monastery St. Quentin, which his learning as a theologian and canonist illustrated, and in 1090 bishop of Chartres. He was one of those men whose reputation promoted the interests of the papacy; but he was not servile; on the contrary he freely denounced the abuses of Rome. In the Investiture controversy, his natural moderation and gentleness led him to occupy an intermediate position. The same spirit breathes in his epistles. He died 1115. — (*Comp. Neander*, Ch. Hist.; *Hist. litt. de France* X., p. 102, VII., p. 150, &c.).

HAUBER.*

J.

Jabal appears in later Israelitish tradition as one of the three sons of Lamech, with whom the first period of history closes, whilst his three sons stand as representatives of the three classes (agricultural, educational, and military), and open a new period. Another account regards Noah as concluding the first period, and his three sons the progenitors of the several great races of mankind. The former makes Jabal the progenitor of the nomade herdsmen, his brother Jubal the father of musicians, whilst their half-brother—Zilla's son—Tubal Cain, is the inventor of articles wrought from brass and iron (*Gen.* 4 : 20, &c.; *Ewald*, Gesch. Isr., I., 320, &c. 1. Aufl.). Their precise abode cannot be ascertained.

RÜTSCHE.*

Jabbok, one of the Eastern tributaries of the Jordan. Rising among the hills of Bashan, it once formed the boundary between the Ammonites and Israelites (*Numb.* 21 : 24; *Deut.* 2 : 37; 3 : 16; *Josh.* 12 : 2; *Judges* 11 : 13, 22), and enters the Jordan nearly on the latitude of Sichem. It is the modern Wady Zerka, a small, but deep and wild mountain-channel, whose banks are overgrown with reeds and oleander. At high water there are two streams which meet, from E. N. E., and form the main current, but at a point further S. than that usually given on the charts; further N. it is said to run for some distance parallel with the Jordan, about 4 English miles from it (*Burckh.*, Reise, &c., II., 597, &c.; *Gesenius*, p. 1059, &c.). In *Burckhardt's* time it still formed the boundary between Moerad and El Belka. But it must be assumed that the present Nahr Amman, the largest stream near the Zerka, which is much longer in a N. W. course, was considered the real source of the ancient Jabbok; for Zerka proper rather divides Gad and the half tribe of Manasseh (*Reland*, Palest.; *Burck.* l. c., 612; *Seetzen* in v. Zach's Correspond. XVIII., 427; *Winer*; *Lynch's Expedition*, &c.; *Förbigr.* in Pauly's Realencykl.

IV., 1; v. *Lengerke*, Kanaan I., 43, &c.; *Ritter*, Erdk. XV., 1, p. 270; 2, p. 1035, 1040, &c.). As the interior of the region beyond the Jordan has never yet been satisfactorily explored by Europeans, the designation of the course of the stream is not certain. It is at the ford of Jabbok that the incident in *Gen.* 32 : 23, &c., is located (See Hebrew for "wrestling"). The Jabbok was formerly confounded with the *Jarmuch*, which empties into the Jordan further N., called Hieromax by Pliny (H. N. 5, 16. See *Seetzen* and *Burckh.*, l. c.).

RÜTSCHE.*

Jabin, the name of two Canaanitish kings who dwelt in Hazor, and whose sway extended over the entire valley of the Jordan. The first one named, united with other princes of Canaan, and marched with a large army against the Israelites under Joshua. His hosts were routed at Lake Merom. The cities of the vanquished rulers were then taken; Hazor, being a fortress, was destroyed, lest the enemy might recover and occupy it again (*Josh.* 19 : 36; cf. *Jos. Antt.* 5, 5, 1). Subsequently Solomon rebuilt it (*1 Kings* 9 : 15). Jabin was slain at the taking of Hazor (*Josh.* 11 and 12 : 29; cf. *Lengerke*, Kanaan I., 675, &c.; *Ewald*, Gesch. Isr. II., 1, p. 253, 1. Ausg.). — Under the Judges we meet with another Jabin in Hazor. This will not seem surprising if we consider how speedily the Canaanites revived after Joshua's rapid victories, and restored their overthrown cities. This Jabin must also have been a powerful king, for he had 900 iron chariots, which were very terrible to the Israelites, and oppressed them for 20 years, until his general, Sisera, though aided by other kings (*Judges* 5 : 19) was discomfited by Barak and Deborah (see Art.). His oppressive rule was thus utterly annihilated (*Judges* 4 : 2, &c.; *Ps.* 83 : 10; cf. *Ewald*, l. c., 378, &c.).

RÜTSCHE.*

Jablonski, Daniel Ernestus, the son of a bishop of the Bohemian Brethren's Church,

named Figulus, who changed his name into Jablonski, from Jablunka, in Silesia, the place of his birth, and a grandson of the celebrated Bishop Amos Comenius (see Art.), was born, Nov. 26, 1660, near Danzig, where his father, after manifold persecutions, had found an asylum. Assisted by the Bohemian Brethren, Jablonski studied at the school of Lissa, in Poland, and at the University of Frankfort on the Oder, devoting himself particularly to the Oriental languages. After having visited Holland and England, he became pastor of a Reformed church at Magdeburg (1683), then Rector of the school at Lissa (1686), next court-preacher at Königsberg (1690), and, finally, court-preacher at Berlin (1693). In the year 1698, the Bohemian Brethren in Poland, on the occasion of a Synod held at Lissa, elected and consecrated him one of their bishops. The University of Oxford conferred on him the degree of Doctor of Theology. At Berlin, in addition to his court-chaplaincy, he was a member of the Consistory, a Church-Counsellor, and President of the Royal Academy of Sciences. Jablonski labored as a scholar and as a churchman. In the former respect he prepared a new edition of the Hebrew Old Test., *Biblia Heb. punctis*, &c.: Berol., 1699; superintended the publication of the Talmud (1715-1721), wrote the *Historia Consensus Leucomiriensis*: Berl., 1731, &c. In the latter respect, one of the dearest wishes of his heart was to bring about a union between the Lutherans and the Reformed. But his negotiations to this end proved abortive; while those with the Archbishop of Canterbury (1711), concerning the introduction of the service of the Church of England, and, if possible, of the Episcopal system, were broken off by the death of this prelate. After a ministry of 58 years, 48 of which he spent at Berlin as court-preacher, Jablonski died, May 21, 1741, in the 81st year of his age.—His son, Paul Ernestus Jablonski, was Rector at Frankfort on the Oder, and highly esteemed on account of his learning and upright character. T. PRESSEL.—*De Schweinitz*.

Jabneh (*Jabneel*, Josh. 15: 11), mentioned as a border city of Judah, W. of Ekron, but by Jos. Antt., 5, 1, 22, assigned to Dan, was first taken from the Philistines and razed by Uzziah (2 Chron. 26: 6). Subsequently it is often called *Jamnia* (LXX., Jos. 15: 46), and mentioned as a populous city, inhabited by Jews and heathen (PHILO. opp. II., 575, *Magn.*) between Joppe and Ashdod (1 Macc. 4: 15; 5: 58; 10: 69; Judith 3: 1 (*al.* 2: 28)). After being long held by the Syrians the Highpriest Simon captured it (Jos. Antt., 13, 6, 7); then the Jews retained it (*ib.*, 13, 15, 4) until Pompey attached it to Syria (Jos. Antt., 14, 4, 4; B. J., 1, 7, 7). Afterwards it was bequeathed to Salome by her brother (Antt. 17, 11, 5). In the Jewish war Vespasian took it (B. J., 4, 8, 2). After the destruction of Jerusalem it became the seat of the Sanhedrim, and a celebrated Jewish Academy, whose history Lightfoot (opp. II., 87, &c.) wrote (cf. *Mischna Rosh haaschana*, 4, 1; Sanhedr., 11, 4). It was not located at the sea, but had its own harbor (Ptolem., 5, 16, 12) hence Pliny, H. N., 5, 13, speaks of two Jamnias, and Jos., l. c., calls it both a coast, and an interior town. The harbor

is said to have been taken by night by Judas Macc. and burned, with its boats, so that the flames were seen at Jerusalem (2 Macc. 12: 7, &c.). Jabneh lay 12 Roman miles S. W. from Diospolis, about 2½ miles N. E. from Ashdod (*Itiner. Ant.*, p. 150; *Euseb.*, Onom.) and 206 stad. from Askalon (*Strabo*, 16, p. 759). There is still a dilapidated village bearing the ancient name—Jebna—nearly 4 m. from the sea, on a small eminence on the W. side of Wady Rubin. As Jamnia became an episcopal See, and afterwards a place of Mohamm. pilgrimages, ruins of Christian and Islam periods are found in the vicinity. The Crusaders erected the fortress of Ibelin there (See *Reland*, Palest., 370, 434, &c.; v. *Raumer*, Paläst., 184; *Pauly's Realencykl.*, IV., 17; *Robinson*, Palest.; *Ritter*, Erdk., XVI., 91, 99, 101, 125, &c., 139). RÜRTSCHL.*

Jachin and Boaz, the names of the two brazen pillars which Hiram cast for Solomon, and stood in porch of the temple (1 Kings 7: 15-22). The difficulty of the passage just quoted is increased by Jer. 52: 21, &c.; 2 Chron. 3: 15-17. With all his efforts the historian failed to give for us a clear, definite description of these works of art. Hence the difference of opinion as to the significance of the names and pillars themselves, their position and object, their height and form. See *Hirt*, "d. Tempel Sal. u. Gesch. d. Bauk. bei d. Alten," I., 120, &c.; *Stieglitz*, "Gesch. d. Bauk.," § 67; *Winer*, R. W. B.; *Keil*, "d. Tempel Sal.," 1839; *Bähr*, "d. Sal. Tempel mit Berücksicht. s. Verhältn.," &c., 1848; *Kugler*, "Gesch. d. Bauk.," 1855, pp. 127-30; "Kunstgesch." 2. Aufl., 84; *Schnaase*, Exkurs, I., 264. Nearly all these authors see in these pillars traces of Etruscan, Phœnician, or Oriental art, and suppose they stood free, in front of the porch, as independent, distinct monuments, not belonging, architecturally, to the edifice; hence their peculiar, symbolical names: "he makes firm," and "in him is strength." But as the rest of the building was constructed in the spirit of the Old Test., and after the pattern of the tabernacle, it seems impossible that so prominent a place would be assigned to pillars modelled after the pattern of those in heathen Phœnician temples.—The pillars were designed to support the projecting roof of the porch (*Meyer*, "d. Temp. Sal.," 1831; "Blätter für höhere Wahrheit," I., 13; IX., 31; *Grüneisen*, im Kunstblatt, 1831, Nr. 73, &c.). Thus 1 Kings 7 is most easily explained; and *Ewald* thinks (*Gesch. d. Volkes Isr.*, III., 1, p. 28, &c.) that the fuller text of 1 Kings 7: 19-22 in the LXX., shows that a crossbeam lay on both pillars, on which the other beams of the roof rested. Hence the height of the pillars; one shaft 18 cubits high, and a chapter of 5 cubits, 23 in all, and 12 cubits in compass (1 Kings 7: 15). According to Jeremiah 52: 21, the shaft was hollow, four fingers in thickness, or, as *Ewald* explains, had hollow channels four fingers deep. The chapter was oval, terminating above in lily-leaves; the centre was encircled with a network of chain interwoven sevenfold, above and below which were four pomegranates for each point of the compass, from each of which were suspended in brazen rings or ropes, 24 pomegranates, making 200 in all. The lily was the flower of holiness,

the pomegranates a symbol of the Word of God (*Bähr, l. c.*), the chain network a symbol of the divine covenant, the brass and massiveness a symbol of stability. — (See in the *Cotta'schen Kunstblatt*, 1844, p. 97, &c.; 1848, p. 5, &c.; *Illmanns u. Umbreits Stud. u. Krit.*, 1850, H. 3, p. 421, &c.; H. 3, 614, &c.). H. MERZ.*

Jacob, son of Isaac, יַעֲקֹב, יַעֲקֹב, was the third of the Israelite patriarchs. His name he derived from the fact that in birth he held the heel of his older twin brother Esau (Gen. 25 : 26 ; Jos. 12 : 4). Fact and name — יַעֲקֹב = seize from behind, treat with cunning — were also prophetic of the character of Jacob in his spiritual character (Gen. 27 : 36) ; for Jacob was (see *Ewald, Gesch. d. Volk. Isr.*, I., pp. 350, 92) the most striking image of all the virtues and weaknesses of the people, which not in vain bears his name. It appears from the patriarchal family, also, that a sense for divine things is no hereditary gift of nature. Abraham, the hero of faith, was succeeded by Isaac, a man of quiet, gentle disposition, but not without infirmities, and, upon the whole, of little importance. Jacob, again, is of much more importance ; but his carnal nature is also much stronger. He is particularly distinguished by that shrewdness, which in everything seeks its own advantage, and which is still characteristic of the Jews. This appears from the manner in which he obtained the birthright from Esau, the blessing from Isaac, and his herds from Laban.¹ But he was the man of the election of grace — not that which refers to eternal salvation, but to a historical position in the kingdom of God — Rom. 9 : 10–13 ; hence God did not cease to strive with his perverse nature, until Jacob had been changed into Israel. From this position his entire life must be viewed, and it will divide itself into four periods : 1, his abode with his father, that of his youthful sins ; 2, his sojourn in Mesopotamia, that of his chastening ; 3, his patriarchal career in Canaan, that of his confirmation ; 4, the close of his life in Egypt. — Jacob's birth, also, like that of Isaac, is a miracle of grace, though no longer in the same degree : after a barrenness of 20 years, Rebecca, as an answer to the prayer of her husband, gave birth to twin sons, Gen. 25 : 20. In this case grace appears especially as election by race, since God set aside, even before the birth of the children, the first-born, who had a natural right on his side, in favor of the younger (v. 23). But the fulfilment of this divine counsel, of which he had no doubt heard from his mother, whose favorite he was on account of his quiet and excellent conduct (while the father, fond of venison, preferred Esau the hunter), Jacob could not in patience and faith leave unto God ; but thought it necessary to execute or at least hasten it ; first by shrewdly turning to his advantage the faintness and hunger of Esau in order to purchase the birthright of the latter for a mess of pottage ; afterwards fraudulently depriving him, at the suggestion and with the

help of his mother, of the paternal blessing, which Isaac, of course contrary to the design of God, intended to bestow upon Esau. But sin is ever followed by punishment. Instead of obtaining possession of his blessing and birthright, Jacob must avoid the vengeance of Esau, by flight into Mesopotamia ; and Rebecca, partly to dispose the father favorably to this journey, partly also to preserve to Jacob the blessing of the divine election, and to keep the patriarchal family in its purity, obtained from Isaac the command that Jacob should seek a wife among his relatives there. At the departure, Isaac, who had now become clearly conscious of Jacob's designation, blesses him ; and it is remarkable that this blessing confers upon the elect the specific gifts of the covenant and the promise ; whilst the earlier one intended for Esau (v. 27–29) moved more in the general sphere of nature (27 : 46 ; 28 : 5). — 2. Nor does God forsake his elect. On the eve of leaving the holy land and journeying to a more or less heathen country Jehovah once more reveals himself to him in his entire reality and grace, partly to guard him against apostasy from his God and designation ; partly to afford to him a powerful stay amid his approaching trials and afflictions in the faithful protection of God and his angels. This is the immediate purpose of the beautiful vision of the ladder, in which Jehovah at the same time solemnly transfers to Jacob the patriarchal promise ; and which, especially in this connection, obtains a wider and deeper meaning (see John 1 : 52), since it typifies the last purpose of the promise — the most intimate union of heaven and earth, God and man, Gen. 28 : 10–22. For Jacob himself this vision with the words spoken is the complement and ratification of the paternal blessing ; he is thereby placed formally in possession of all the rights of the covenant and the promise, and God himself promises to fulfil them faithfully and entirely. — In Mesopotamia, where he arrived in his 77th year, Jacob experiences the *jus talionis* ; since he is in various ways defrauded by Laban, and has to endure various adversities. On his arrival he becomes acquainted with Rachel at the well, conceives a love for her, and serves her father seven years for her. But instead of her Leah is brought to him, just as formerly he himself had fraudulently taken the place of Esau. After another service of seven years he obtains Rachel also. During this second septennium his children, except Benjamin, are born to him. Having experienced this pleasure, he desires to return home ; but the covetous Laban does not permit him, promises him as his wages, the speckled, spotted and brown sheep and goats. God now blesses him richly, although Laban changes his wages ten times. But even here Jacob thinks it necessary to assist the divine blessing by his own cunning, and therefore, during the period of conception, put pilled rods in the watering troughs before the flocks, and afterwards set the faces of the flocks toward the ring-streaked. His increasing wealth excites the envy of Laban and his sons ; Jacob, therefore, after a service of six years, resolves to return home, which he is also ordered to do by divine command. But

* Concerning the position from which Genesis views these facts and traits, see KURTZ, *Hist. of the Old*
 Test.

having no clear conscience towards Laban, he departed secretly with all his own; Laban pursued him, but was commanded by God not to injure him. They made a covenant with each other, and separated in peace. Gen. 29: 31—3. Jacob thus returned to Canaan; outwardly richly blessed, but inwardly, notwithstanding all the humiliations which he had experienced, not yet thoroughly purified. This purification was now to take place; for from this time he appears as the bearer of the patriarchate, though Isaac still lived for some time yet. God again gave him a token of his grace; for, on re-entering the holy land, the angels of God appeared to him as an assurance of the protection of which he felt in need of against Esau (Gen. 32). The fear of the vengeance of Esau, who was approaching with 400 men, apparently with hostile design, terrified Jacob deeply, but also became the means of his inward renewal. Thus the most important relation of his life, that to Esau, against whom his sinfulness had come to its outward expression, was now also to become the means of his repentance. In an humble, fervent prayer, which, as characteristic of this inward turning-point of his life, has been thought worthy of record (32: 10—13), he poured out his heart to Jehovah: he then sends presents to Esau (v. 14—22), put his family across the Jabbok during the night, but he himself stayed behind (v. 23—25). This nightly solitude of Jacob had its inward meaning in connection with the other events: he intended to speak out his whole soul before God, since he is overwhelmed with the sense of his sin and guilt against his brother. He felt that not only Esau, but God himself opposed him; and that he must first be reconciled with God, before he could be reconciled with Esau. God now really appeared to him in bodily form. Before this, when mere outward protection had been needed, mere angels had appeared to Jacob; now, when the inward life of faith is the point in question, God himself meets him. The angels appear as friends, but God appears to him as still an enemy whom he must yet overcome; over against the world the elect of God is secure, but as regards his own sin he must yet wrestle with God in a penitential agony. Even though Jacob did not, perhaps, at once know the man who wrestled with him, nevertheless the thoughts with which his entire soul was filled soon taught him who he was; this he also signified by the blessing which he craved, and by the name Pniel which he afterwards gave to the place. Jacob, therefore, really met God as his enemy, whose anger he has excited by his sins; he wrestled with an angry God, until he converted his anger into a blessing; for whilst he wrestled outwardly, he prayed and wept inwardly (Eph. 12: 4—5; Col. 4: 12; Rom. 15: 30). This is the key of the entire scene. Wrestling in penitence and faith, Jacob overcame the anger of God. But God disjoined Jacob's thigh, as a memorial of his crushed natural man. Jacob, however, once more received from God himself the blessing which he had formerly usurped; and the new name of *Israel*, as a sign that he had vanquished the anger of God and man (Esau). At

the break of day Jacob had become a new man: the result of the struggle was, that by the utmost effort of the soul Jacob was brought into the relation to God, which Abraham had formerly held (B. Baur, *Rel. des A. T.*, I., p. 101). Nothing in the text justifies us in referring, as is done by some, the scene to the sphere of mere internal vision; nor in dividing it into two distinct parts, making the wrestling to be an "image of the perverseness of Jacob's former life," and of the ineffectual struggle of God with his sinful nature; and his praying to be the turning-point of his renewal.—Jacob soon after discovered that Esau's anger was also overcome, for the brothers met in peace. After a short sojourn at Succoth, Jacob made his abode near Schechem (ch. 33, comp. John 4: 5, etc.). He had now to make a series of sad experiences in his family, which tried his faith, but also anew revealed to him the favor of God. The violation of his daughter by the son of the king of Schechem is followed by the horrid vengeance of Simeon and Levi (ch. 34). Being thus compelled to leave the country, Jacob, at the command of God, removed to Bethel, where he purged his household of the strange gods which they had brought from Mesopotamia (ch. 31: 19, 30, etc.), or had adopted in Canaan (34: 1, 9, 16, 29; 35: 1—8). To reward this fidelity and to prepare him for the loss of his beloved Rachel, God again appeared to him at Bethel, renewing the name of Israel, and the patriarchal promise; thereupon Jacob also renewed the name of Bethel (v. 9—15). Journeying southward, Rachel died near Ephrath, or Bethlehem, when she had given birth to Benjamin. His sorrow was increased by the violation of his concubine by his son Reuben (v. 22). Thus, at once blessed and bowed with grief, Jacob returned to his father at Hebron. Soon after Isaac died, and Jacob now became patriarch in the complete sense of the word. This event is solemnly introduced by the enumeration of Jacob's 12 sons (v. 23—9). Since Jacob was born in the 60th year of his father (25: 26), he was 120 years old at his father's death; and since Joseph was born in the 91st year of Jacob, he was already 29 years old at the death of Isaac, and was therefore already in the last year of his Egyptian captivity (*Baumgarten*, *theol. Comm. z. Pent.*, I., 298).—The partiality shown to Joseph by Jacob (37: 3, 4), was again followed by its proper punishment in the supposed death of his favorite (ch. 37). But this calamity was providentially converted into a blessing (50: 20). Joseph having attained to high honors in Egypt, not only preserved his family in time of famine, but also removed them to Egypt, where it was to grow up into a nation, and learn civilization, so that afterwards under Moses it might achieve its independence.—4. Thus Jacob spent the evening of his life in Egypt. This last era in his life is signalized by a vision, in which God sanctions his removal to Egypt, and promises his blessing (ch. 46: 1, etc.). He arrived in Egypt in his 130th year (ch. 47: 9), blessed Pharaoh to whom he was presented, and obtained from him Goshen as his abode (ch. 46: 28; 47: 12). Here the patriarch lived 19 years (ch. 47: 27, 28). When he felt his death approaching, he

caused Joseph to swear that he would bury him in the family burial-place in Canaan (47: 29-31). To reward Joseph for his great services to the family, he adopted his two eldest sons; giving a preference to Ephraim the younger, above Manasseh (ch. 48). He now prophetically blessed his twelve sons (ch. 49), describing in poetic language the character, name, past life, and future history of each. The right of primogeniture was transferred to Judah, since Reuben, Simeon, and Levi have proved themselves unworthy of it by their misdeeds. Judah was therefore made the prince among his brethren, and bearer of the promises. In this way Jacob was made worthy of bringing the Messianic promises a step further; for he predicted the reigning tribe, and a kingdom of Israel under the sceptre of Judah, which was never to end (see concerning this debated passage, the Comm. on Gen. by *Tuch*, *Knobel*, *Baumgarten*, *Delitzsch*, etc.; but especially the work of *Diestel*, *der Segen Jacobs*, the latest researches of *Hengstenberg*, *Christol. des A. T.*, 2d ed., I., p. 54-104. *Kurtz*, *Gesch. des A. B.*, I., 2d ed., p. 314-338; II., p. 546-563. *Hofmann*, *Schriftbeweis*, II., 2, p. 480).—Concerning the genuineness of the blessing of Jacob, see, besides *Diestel*, especially *Kurtz*, I., p. 331-338.—When Jacob died, Joseph caused him to be embalmed by the Egyptians, and to be buried with much pomp and lamentation in the cave of Macphelah.—Literature: *Tuch*, *Knobel*, *Ewald*, *bibl. Realwörterb.*, *Roos*, *Baumgarten*, *Delitzsch*, *Kurtz*, *Hengstenberg*, *Beitr. zur Einl. ins A. T.*, 2d and 3d vol., *Heim*, *Bibelstunden*, Tuttlingen, 1845.

AUBERLEN.—*Reinecke*.

Jacobites, is the name under which, after the middle of the 6th century, the Syrian and sometimes also the Egyptian Monophysites are known. To the Monophysites, or the Eutychianizing party, which arose about the middle of the 5th century (see Art. *Eutychianism*, *Ephesus*, *Chalcedon*, and *Monophysites*), belong the Syrian Jacobites, the Copts, Abyssinians, and Armenians. These four churches are distinct only in ecclesiastical jurisdiction and several unimportant rites, whilst they agree in all important matters of doctrine. The first three have a still closer connection with each other, since the Abyssinian or Ethiopic Church has always been dependent upon the Coptic; and since the patriarchs of the Syrian Jacobites and Copts were accustomed upon assuming their office to recognize each other by sending a confession of faith in the form of an *epistola synodica* (see *RENAUDOT*, *liturg. orient. collect.*, T. I., p. 254, 335, 432. *ASSEMANI*, *bibl. or.*, T. II., p. 126, 363, and *diss. de Monoph.* § III.). The Monophysite doctrine had been spread among the Syrians, under the auspices of the Emperors Zeno and Anastasius, especially by Xenajas, B. of Mabug, P. Fullo, and Severus, P. of Antioch. Under Justin I., on the other hand, a large number of Syrian bishops had been exiled, since they refused to adopt the resolutions of the Council of Chalcedon. During the distress some Monophysite priests, held in durance at Constantinople, found in the presbyter Jacob *Barâdai* the man who could restore their cause. He accomplished their expectation. Elevated

by them to the dignity of an oecumenical Metropolitan, he hastened from place to place through Asia Minor, clothed in beggar's garb and shrinking from no toil; and encouraged the faithful, established congregations, and appointed everywhere bishops, presbyters and deacons. At that time Maris, B. of Singar, was the only Monophysite bishop who was still in office. Through the efforts of Jacob their number again increased to nearly 100,000, whence they called themselves *Jacobites*.—Jacob was monk and presbyter in the monastery of Phasilta, near Nisibis, and, after 541, B. of Edessa (*Assem. II.*, 332). From that time until his death, in 578, are 37 years. From the mean clothing in which he passed in the service of his party through the East, he received the surname of *Barâdai*; sometimes also *Zanzalus*, (τζάντζαλος). Jacob supported Sergius, elected patriarch by the Monophysites after the death of Severus, against the Cath. patriarch, Ephraem of Amid; and after the death of Sergius he himself inducted Paul as patriarch, whilst Athanasius was the Catholic successor (see *Dionys. Telmahr. chron. in Assem. I.*, 424; also *Barhebr.*, II., 331). Of literary labors Jacob has left little or nothing. An Anaphora attributed to him has been translated into Latin by Renaudot (*Liturg. or. collect.*, T. II., p. 333). An Arabic work on the Jacobite doctrines attributed to him, which the Maronites, *Abr. Echellensis* (in *Eutych. vindic.*, P. II., p. 280, 283), and *Nairon* (*Euopolia*, p. 28, 29, 35, 41, and *diss. de Maron.*, p. 21, 38, 39) mention under the title of *Catechesis*, as also an appendix to it and a homily, have been justly denied to be his by Assemani.—It was from this Jacob that the *Jacobites* received their name. At times they are also called Severians, Dioscurians, Eutychians, and Theodosians. We are limited here to the Jacobites in the more restricted sense, viz.: the Syrian Jacobites, who dwelt in Syria proper, in Mesopotamia and Babylonia.—The distinctive doctrines and rites of the Jacobites are the same as those of the Monophysites. 1. They teach a single nature in Christ, which arose from the conjunction of the divine and human (*ex duabus naturis, non in duabus*). Hence they are often charged with docetism. But the later Jacobites, as also the Copts, Abyssinians and Armenians, say that Christ, even after the incarnation and the union of the two natures, had retained a true human as well as divine nature. They also add: "*Christum non modo ex duabus naturis compositum fuisse, sed etiam ex duabus personis*." That the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Son, is denied by Xanjas: the Syrian Church, however, remained wholly unaffected by the controversy concerning the "*filioque*." The prevalent expression among them is: *S. S. procedit a Patre et accipit a Filio*.—2. They reject the conclusions of the Council of Chalcedon, and recognize, on the other hand, the second Synod of Ephesus.—3. As teachers or saints they regard Jacob of Sarug, Jacob of Edessa, Dioscurus, Severus, P. Fullo, and Jacob Barâdai; they reject Eutyches.—4. In the Lord's Supper they made use of *leavened bread*. They differ from the Copts in mixing, like the Nestorians, some

salt and oil with the bread. The latter must also be freshly baked, *panis quotidianus*, as they call it. The Jacobite teachers also asserted that the number of wafers should always be an odd one, except the number 2, which also was allowed.—5. They always make the sign of the cross with only one finger.—6. The election of bishops and patriarchs was often made by the lot. Image and saint worship, especially that of Mary, they adopted from the Greek and Roman Churches. Some Catholic authors try to burden them with as many heresies as possible; whilst others, such as Renaudot and Assemani, treat them with great liberality.—The Patriarch of the Syrian Jacobites is styled "Patr. of Antioch," since the succession is derived from Severus Antiochus. But since the Jacobites, as being heretics, were never tolerated at Antioch by the Greeks, their patriarchs always resided in other cities and monasteries, especially at Amid (Diarbekr), until, in 1166, the monastery of St. Ananias, called Deiru-s-Sa'farâni, near the City of Mârdin, became for a long time their permanent residence. During the great schism, which lasted from 1364 to 1494, the legitimate patriarch continued to reside at Mârdin, the Ciceronian at Sîs, the "Syrian" at the monastery of Barsumas, near Malatja, and the Patr. of Tur-Abdin in the monastery of St. Jacob at Salach. After the 16th century the residence of the patriarch was mostly at Caranis, i. e., Amid. The see of the B. of Antioch adjoined at Arisch, on the boundary between Palestine and Egypt, that of the Coptic P. of Alexandria; concerning Jerusalem the two were in dispute: in later times the city possessed both a Coptic and a Syrian Jacobite patriarch. Subordinate to the patriarch was the head of the more eastern Jacobites, the *Primas Orientis*, called also the Maphrian or Fructifier, with reference to his office of ordaining bishops and confirming the patriarch by the imposition of hands. Subject to him were the Jacobites beyond the Tigris and a portion of Mesopotamia; the rest of Mesopotamia, as also Syria Proper, Phœnicia, Palestine, Cilicia, and Armenia, were subject to the patriarch. The first Maphrian, ordained by Jacob Barâdai, was Achudemes. His seat at present is Mosul, but his office has become merely titular. An election and ordination of a new patriarch may take place whenever the Maphrian, as president, and twelve bishops, to whom the votes of the other bishops must have been delegated, are assembled. A Maphrian can be elected only in the presence of the patriarch. In doubtful elections recourse is had to the lot. After 878 the patriarch elect often assumed a new name; but since the 14th cent. the name *Ignatius* became the permanent one. The patriarchs of the Syrian Jacobites are enumerated in Barhebræus' *Syr. Chronicle* and its continuation (in *Assem., bibl. or., II., 321–386*). *Assemani (bibl. or., II., diss. de Monoph. § X.)* describes the *Ordines* and induction into office. It is not uncommon to ordain a married man as deacon or presbyter, though it is not allowed to contract marriage after ordination; if this should take place, the offender is degraded to the laity. Monasticism was always highly esteemed. The most noted monasteries

are enumerated by *Assemani (T. II., diss. de Monoph., § X.)*. The monks do not belong to the clergy, though bishops are always elected from their number. The various Liturgies used by the Jacobites have been translated by *Renaudot (Lit. or. collect., T. II., 1716, 4to.)* into Latin. The first of them, both extant in the Greek and also used by the orthodox, is ascribed to James, the brother of the Lord. The *Missale Chaldaicum ad us. eccl. Maronitarum*, published at Rome, in 1592, is also Jacobite, though somewhat accommodated to the sense of the Papacy.—During its most flourishing period the Jacobite Church possessed many distinguished men. Its authors are given by *Assemani* in his *Biblioth. orientalis*. The most distinguished are *John, B. of Asia* (see Art.); *Thomas of Harkel*; *Jacob of Edessa*: patr. *Dionysius*; *John, B. of Dara*; *Mose Bar-Kipha*; *Dionysius Bar-Saltbi, B. of Amid*; *Jacob, B. of Tagrit*; and especially *Gregorius Abulfarag Barhebræus* (see Art.).—Amongst the Eastern emperors, Zeno and Anastasius alone had favored the Jacobites. Justinian's efforts to reunite them with the Church were unsuccessful. Under the later emperors, as well as under the Mahometan supremacy, the Syrian Jacobites were much persecuted, whilst their Egyptian brethren were much more favorably situated (*Assem., T. II., diss. de Monoph., § VII.*). During the age of Gregory XIII. (1572–85) their entire number in Syria, Mesopotamia, and Babylonia was reduced to 50,000, most of whom were poor inhabitants of villages. Subordinate to the patriarch were five metropolitan bishops and six bishops. In 1740 *Pococke* found in Damascus, among 20,000 Christians, only 200 Jacobites; *Buckingham*, in 1816, speaks of 2000 Jacobites among the 20,000 inhabitants of Mârdin, near which he found two Jacob. monasteries. Their number varies but little, perhaps, at the present time. In Syria, according to *Robinson*, their number is very small. Their largest congregation seems to be in the city of Sadad.—Since the 14th century various though unsuccessful efforts were made to unite them with the Rom. Church. More successful were, in the 17th cent., the labors of Achigian, who afterwards became the patriarch of the Cath. party. His successor was Peter (Ignatius XXV.); who, however, was exiled by the opposition. At a subsequent period the work was resumed, so that for a considerable time already a patriarch of the Papal Jacobites has resided at Haleb. But the Syrian Catholics at Damascus and Rasheia have only quite lately become united with Rome. On Mt. Lebanon there are several small monasteries inhabited by Roman Jacobite monks (*Robinson's Palest., vol. 3.*)

E. ROEDIGER.—*Reinecke.*

Jacob von Mies, called *Jacobellus* (Bohemian, *Jakoubet*), on account of his small stature, was one of the principal originators of the controversy which prevailed in Bohemia, in the latter half of the 14th century, respecting the reintroduction of the cup in the Lord's Supper. Little is known of his early years. Born at Misa, in Bohemia, he studied at Prague, receiving the degree of Bachelor of Arts at the same time with Hus, and then obtained the charge of a parish at Trina. Afterwards he

was called to Prague, where he was first stationed at the Church of St. Michael, but eventually became preacher in the Bethlehem Chapel. The opinions expressed by Petrus Dresdensis, induced Jacob von Mies to examine the question of the Lord's Supper, from a scriptural and ecclesiastical point of view, and he arrived at the conclusion, that the withdrawal of the cup from the laity, was contrary to the Bible, and to the custom of the early Church. In 1414 he began fearlessly to promulgate his views, by means of sermons and public disputations, and practised, in the Communion, what he taught. Many of the clergy followed his example; others, with the archbishop at their head, strongly opposed him. Hus, who was at Constance, emphatically sustained Jacobellus. The controversy was continued by publications, of which the most important, written by Jacobellus, were: *Demonstratio per testimonia scripturæ patrum atque doctorum communicationem calicis in plebe christiana esse necessariam* (in v. d. Hardt, T. III., p. 804, sqq.); and *De remanentia panis post consecrationem*, in which he positively denied the transubstantiation of the bread. In 1415 (June 15) the Council of Constance issued its *Decretum contra communionem sub utraque et contra Jacobum de Misa*. Jacobellus replied to this decree, and the controversy increased. In spite of its bitterness, he remained in his office. With the exception of the dogma of the Lord's Supper, his doctrines agreed with those of the Romish Church; and he even defended the doctrine of purgatory against the Waldenses. He died at Prague, in 1429. Comp. J. C. Martini, Diss. de J. de M., &c., Altdorf, 1753; Schröckh, Ch. Hist., Th. 33, p. 330; &c. NEUDECKER.—*De Schweinitz*.

Jacob's Well, so called because dug by Jacob on the land he bought near Sichem (Gen. 33:19; LXX. 48:22; Joshua 24:32. Cf. John 4:5, etc.). It is still pointed out under the old name (also called The well of the Samaritan by Christians). It is hewn in the rock, near the foot of Mt. Gerizim, at the opening of the valley, on the highway from Jerusalem to Galilee, about a mile and a half East of the present Nablus. Maundrell, (Journ., 62, &c.) says it is 105 feet deep; Wilson (Lands of the Bible, II., 54, etc.), more correctly, 75 feet, covered with a stone arch, and closed with one or two large stones. It contained "living" (fresh, not rain) water, but Robinson and Wilson found it dry. The spring was probably closed up or exhausted. It bears evident marks of high antiquity; near it are the ruins of an old church, which the Crusaders, already, found fallen down. Not only modern Samaritans, but a tradition reaching to the 4th cent., attest the identity of this place (Itin. Burdig., p. 276, sq. ed. Parthey; p. 587, ed. Wesseling). Jacob dug this well in a region well furnished with water, that he might have undisputed right to it (Gen. 26:19, &c.). The "Christian in Palestine," in plate 27, furnishes a view of the place.—(See Robinson, Palest.; Ritter, Erdk., XVI., 654, etc.; among older writers only Hamelsveld, bibl. Geogr., II., 396, &c.). RÜETSCHL.*

Jacobi (*Passaranti*), a Dominican, of noble parentage, in Florence. He was distinguished

in the 14th cent. as a pulpit orator, and religious author. Most noted is his "*Lo specchio di vera penitenzia*" (Flor., 1495, 1585; Ven., 1581; Flor., 1681), first written in Latin, in elegant style.—(Cf. MARFEE, *storia della litterat. ital.*, Mil., 1825, I., 229–31; *Script. Ord. Praed.*, I., 645). He died in Florence, June 15, 1357.

TH. PRESSEL.*

Jacoponi da Todi, a Franciscan of the 13th cent., distinguished by his spiritual songs. After having become Doctor of Civil Law, he was led, by the sudden death of his wife, to devote himself to a religious life. His eccentric and indecent manner of displaying his humility, by exposing himself to ridicule, made the Franciscans hesitate to receive him. But a poem on contempt of the world satisfied them of his sanity. He is regarded as the author of the "*Stabat Mater*." He died Dec. 25, 1306. (Cf. WADDING, *Annal. Min.* (Rom., 1733), V., 407, etc.; RADERI, *Viridarium Sanctorum*).

TH. PRESSEL.*

Jael, the wife of Heber, the Kenite. When Sisera, the general of Jabin, King of Hazor, was vanquished by Barak, and in his flight was invited by Jael to take refuge in her tent, to which a strange man would otherwise not have been admitted, she put him to death (Judges 4:17, &c.), as a national foe, against whom, in time of war, such treachery was thought allowable (Judges 5:24, etc. *Bertheau* on the passage. *Ewald*, *Gesch. Isr.*, II., 1, p. 267, 381 (1. Ausg.).)

RÜETSCHL.*

Jair (in the N. T., Mark 5:22, Ἰάϊρος) is called, Numb. 32:41, a son of Manasseh, who took the tent villages of Gilead, and called them Havoth-Juir. But the sons of Machir, another son of Manasseh, had previously taken Gilead itself (39, 40), and Nobah, who may likewise have belonged to the tribe of Manasseh, completed the conquest (42). From Deut. 3:14, we learn that these villages of Jair were in Bashan, and from Joshua 13:30, that they were 60 in number, and might be called cities (cf. 1 Kings 4:13; 1 Chron. 2:21–23). In 1 Chron. 2:23, we learn that this district was retaken by the Geshurites and Arameans. Hence we must presume that 30 of the cities, of which Segub held 23, were subsequently retaken. It is a matter of fact that the Judge, 2) *Jair*, who of course may have borne the same name as his ancestor (Judges 10:3, etc.), held these 30 cities, whether he obtained them by conquest or inheritance; 1 Chron. 2:23, implies the former supposition. If then, *Jair*, the Judge, or his father, took 30 of these towns from the Geshurites or Arameans, nothing is more certain than that David restored the rest to Israel (2 Sam. 8:3–6). Hence under Solomon we find 60 cities with walls and gates. Thus the whole matter is based upon plain historical facts. For it is well known that Israel lost many places taken under Moses, which were subsequently reconquered, even though such reconquests are not always explicitly stated.—3) Another *Jair* was Mordecai's father, Esther 2:5.—4) *Jairus*, a ruler of the synagogue, whose daughter Jesus restored to life (Mark 5:22; Luke 8:41; Cf. Matth. 9:18). The declaration of Jesus implies that death had not fully set in,

although, but for his intervention, it would certainly have taken place. The case shows that Jesus never took advantage of mere appearances.

Vaihinger.*

James in the New Testament. The N. T. itself knows of only two apostolical men of this name, viz.: the Apostles *James the Elder* and *James the Less*. Ecclesiastical tradition, however, as well as modern theology, have separated into two parties; one of which has divided James the Less into two, viz.: the Apostle James, the son of Alphaeus, and James the Just, the brother of the Lord; whilst the other has maintained the identity of the two. — That James, the son of Zebedee, or the Elder, and James, the son of Alphaeus, or the Less, were distinct, is evident from the catalogues of the apostles (Matth. 10:2-3; Mark 3:17, 18; Luke 6:14-15; Acts 1:13). James the Less, however (ὁ μικρός, Mark 15:40), the son of Alphaeus and Mary (Matth. 27:56; Mark 15:40), appears in evangelical and apostolical history, at the same time as a brother of the Lord (Matth. 13:55; Mark 6:3; Gal. 1:19), and leader of the Church at Jerusalem (Acts 15:21); in Josephus (*Ant.*, 20, 3, 1) as brother of the Lord with the surname δικάτωρος, and in Hegesippus (*Euseb.*, *H. E.*, II., 1) with the surname δίκαιος. This difference of name seems to suggest a difference of persons. — But the hypothesis which has really made a third James of James the Just, seems to have its origin in apocryphal and legendary interests. As regards the latter, it is known that the ancient Church was fond of multiplying the names of saints. As instances take the names of John, Mark, Epaphras, Luke, and especially Judas, Lebbeus, Thaddeus. In the duplication of James the apocryphal interest was most prominent. We know from the Clementines that the Ebionites strove to elevate the authority of James, as being the brother of the Lord, above that of all the other apostles (see the *Clement. Homil.*, and *Credner's Einleit. in das N. T.*, p. 575). Already, in the age of the apostles, the Jewish Christians called him, with emphasis, the brother of the Lord, and thrust him forward as superior in authority to the other apostles (Gal. 1:17, 2:9; v. 12). The duplication became complete through the apocryphal gospel of Peter (see *Orig. in Matth.*, T. X., 3), and the apocryphal Apostolical constitutions (II., 59, in the ed. of Ueltzen, cap. 55). On the other hand three highly important witnesses of the highest antiquity speak in favor of the identity of the apostle and J. the Just. Hegesippus evidently speaks of them as identical (*Euseb.*, *H. E.*, II., 23; comp. *Schneckenburger, Annot. ad. ep. Jac.*, p. 143): διαδέχεται δὲ τὴν ἐκκλησίαν μετὰ τῶν ἀποστόλων ὁ ἀδελφὸς τοῦ κυρίου Ἰάκωβος. Jerome, in his Catalogue, translates incorrectly, "after the apostles;" Rufinus correctly, "with the apostles." He assumed the government of the Church at Jerusalem with the apostles: i. e., he did not become sole bishop, but the co-operation of the other apostles was, from the nature of the case, understood. As bishop he is distinguished from the apostles, although he still continues one of them. — Concerning the parentage of James, Hegesippus (*H. E.*, IV., 22) speaks plainly. He says that

James the Just had been succeeded as bishop by Simeon, son of Cleopas, who was descended from the same uncle of the Lord, and that all had given this distinction to him as the second relative of the Lord. According to Hegesippus, then, James the Just is James, the son of Alphaeus. The second witness, Clemens, of Alexandria, speaks still more plainly (*Eus.*, II., 1). After his resurrection the Lord delivered the Gnosis to James the Just, to John and Peter, who communicated it to the other apostles. Clemens then says expressly: there were two named James, viz.: the Just, who was thrown from the pinnacle of the temple, and another who was beheaded. Add to this the testimony of Origen (*Comm. in Matth.*, c. 17), and of the Gospel to the Hebrews, according to which latter Christ appeared after his resurrection to James the Just, the brother of the Lord. This is no doubt the same appearance which Paul mentions (1 Cor. 15:7). Thus the matter of identity stood until Eusebius laid the foundation for the distinction. Eusebius seems frequently to hide his uncertainty beneath obscurity. He is thus obscure as regards his opinion concerning the testimony of Clemens, which he quotes, *lib.*, II., 1. But in I., 12, he evidently wishes to place the brother of the Lord among the 70 disciples. This is the subject of the chapter; and now, after he had spoken of the various appearances of Christ after his resurrection, and had lastly mentioned that to James, he adds: ἐξ δὲ καὶ οὗτος τῶν φερομένων τοῦ σωτῆρος μαθητῶν, ἀλλὰ μὴν καὶ ἀδελφῶν ἦν. — Even in this passage it is surprising that the words μαθητῶν, ἀλλὰ μὴν καὶ are found only in the Codex Regius (see the ed. of Heinichen, p. 76). More decisive is the passage in *Comm. ad Iesai* on 17:5. ROTH, *Anfänge*, I., p. 265). However, after the time of Eusebius the legendary tradition becomes more prominent. The words of Cyril of Jerus., indeed, καὶ τοῖς ἀποστόλοις, καὶ Ἰακώβῳ τῷ ταύτης τῆς ἐκκλησίας ἐπισκόπῳ, might still be interpreted in harmony with Acts 5:29: ὁ Πέτρος καὶ οἱ ἀπόστολοι. With Gregory of Nyssa (*de resur. Or.* II.) and Chrysostom (*Hom. V. in Matth.*) the distinction becomes still more decided, but neither of them has historical grounds. Gregory has no weight whatever, since he proceeds from the false premise that James the son of Alphaeus was called *major* as apostle; and that the other was no apostle, because called *minor*. Chrysostom proceeds from the ground that the brother of the Lord for a long time did not believe, but that the Apostle James believed; and hence they were different persons. Epiphanius regarded the brother of the Lord as also an apostle (see *Hæres.* 29, *contr. Nazoræos*, comp. THEILE, *Comm. in ep. Jac.*, p. 37). Jerome contradicts himself (see *Natal. Alexandri, H. E.*, IV., pars. I., p. 58). Augustine calls the B. of Jerusalem apostle also (*contra Cresconium*. Comp. *Euseb.*, by Heinichen, the note, 219). Ecclesiastical antiquity, therefore, closes with a decided difference of opinion, though not with a decided duplication of James the Less. After the Reformation the question is resumed in the interest of theology. According to Luther the author of the Epistle of James is "some good, pious man." But

also Grotius and Rich. Simon are in favor of the distinction; in more recent times, Herder, Clemens, Credner, Schaff, De Wette, Neander, Niedner, Kern, Winer, Stier, Rothe, and perhaps a large majority of recent theologians. In favor of their identity are Natal. Alexander, Baronius, Lardner, Pearson, Buddeus, Baumgarten, Semler, Gabler, Eichhorn, Pott, Hug, Bertholdt, Guericke, Schneckenburger, Meier, Steiger, Gieseler (Eccl. History), and Theile (*Comm. in Ep. Jac., Proleg.*, p. 36); so also Lange (Leb. Jesu., II., Bd., p. 140. Positive Dogmat., p. 623; *Das apost. Zeitalt.*, I., 189). The question has been especially treated by Zaccaria, Pott, Kern, Demme, Wieseler. More recently Ph. Schaff has written in favor of making a distinction (*Das Verhältn. des Jac., Brud. d. Herrn. u. Jac. Alph.*, Berl., 1842); most lately in his *Gesch. der Christl. Kirche*, I Bd., p. 311. Merckersburg, 1851. We will now give the reasons for making the distinction, in which we follow Winer. 1, James Alphei could not—"since Jesus had a brother of this name," *quod erat demonstrandum*—be called without confusion ἀδελφὸς τοῦ κυρίου, when he was a mere cousin (ἀνεψιός). The usual refutation of this reason advances two points: 1, the more extensive use of the word brother among the Hebrews for near relationship in general; 2, the expression in the Clementines, *hom. II.*, 35: Ἰακώβου τῷ λεχθέντι ἀδελφῷ τοῦ κυρίου. But it must rather be shown that James Alphei was really the brother of the Lord. According to Hegesippus (*Euseb.*, III., 11) Alpheus Cleopas (Cleopas-Alpheus, see Art.), the father of Simeon, second B. of Jerusalem, was a brother of Joseph, and hence Simeon was a cousin of Jesus. The wife of this Alpheus was Mary, who is commonly, though erroneously, regarded as a sister of the mother of Jesus; for Wieseler has shown (in the *Stud. u. Krit.*, 1840, 3, p. 648) that John 19:25, should be read: Now there stood by the cross of Jesus his mother, and his mother's sister (Salome)—Mary, the wife of Cleopas, and Mary Magdalene. The sons of Alpheus, therefore, are really only step-cousins of the Lord on the father's side. How then did they become his brothers? The general custom of the Israelites furnishes the simplest hypothesis (see John 19:26-7). Cleopas had died; Joseph, the foster-father of Jesus, was (according to Hegesippus, *Euseb.*, III., 11) his brother; he now became the foster-father of the sons of Cleopas also; and henceforth the families of Joseph and of Alpheus—the other Mary, therefore, and her sons, James and Joses, Simon and Judas, besides several daughters—formed a single family (Matth. 13:35; Mark 6:3). After Joseph had also died, the older brothers of Jesus, especially James, who very probably were older than Jesus, assumed the government of the family (Mark 3:31; John 7:3). In this way the sons of Alpheus became, according to Jewish law, the brothers of Jesus. According to Schneckenburger's hypothesis, on the other hand, the mother of Jesus removed, after the early death of Joseph, to the house of her sister, the wife of Alpheus. We must, however, even in this case, suppose an adoption to have taken place. But we know that Joseph was still

living when Jesus was twelve years old, and perhaps a considerable time thereafter. We know nothing of the kind of Alpheus (Cleopas in Luke 24:18, is evidently a different person). It is therefore most probable that both families were united in the house of Joseph.—2. "The oldest tradition regards James the brother of Jesus as not an apostle." We have seen that the scope of this tradition really proves the opposite.—3. "In the superscription of the Ep. of James the apostle calls himself only θεοῦ καὶ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ δούλος. An apostle would not have done this." And yet Paul calls himself thus in the Ep. to the Philippians, and John in the two lesser epistles calls himself merely πρεσβύτερος. The apostles often call themselves δούλος καὶ ἀπόστολος, so that it is easily seen what δούλος means above. But for James, whose apostolical office had passed over into the episcopal, it was most proper to designate his position with this single word, which denoted at once the apostle and bishop; and the more proper, since he wrote to Jewish Christians, whom he wished to warn against apostasy.—4. "John, in c. 7:5, assures us that the ἀδελφοὶ of Jesus did not believe in him (as Messiah??) at a time when James Alphei had already become an apostle. And yet, according to Mark 3:31, the brothers manifest merely such an unbelief, as that in which Mary participated. Their unbelief (John 7:3) was of the same kind as that of Peter (Matth. 16:23) and of Thomas (John 20:25); which did not reject the Messiahship of Jesus, but was merely a want of hearty confidence, resignation, and obedience, which made it difficult to the disciples, and at times even to his mother, to understand the path of suffering and obscurity which Jesus followed. His brothers wished that he should at once, and publicly in Jerusalem, unfold his work. If they had not been sincere in this, we would be forced to regard them as scoffers; but of this we have not the faintest intimation.—5. In Acts 1:13, 14, the ἀδελφοὶ τοῦ Ἰησοῦ are mentioned besides the apostles. But James *minor* is excluded from the ἀδελφοὶ by being enumerated among the apostles with the surname Ἀλφαίου." (Here belongs also John 2:12). Here we might ask: In Acts 1:14, does the expression: with the women, and Mary the mother of Jesus, exclude Mary from the women? But it must be observed, besides, that not only the three apostolical names of James, Simon, and Judas occur among the brothers, but also Joses with his sisters (according to Mark 6:3). We thus have a circle of brothers and sisters of Jesus besides the apostles, among whom also there are brothers. Winer maintains that these ought to be designated by ἄλλοις ἀδελφοῖς; but this would be necessary only, if in the catalogue of apostles the name ἀδελφοὶ were added to those particular apostles. This not being the case, Winer's correction would make all the apostles brothers of Jesus. The constant occurrence of a special circle of brothers of Jesus besides the apostles can only be explained by the fact, that the two were not identical. That the brothers of Jesus are at times mentioned specially, is easily explained from their authority among Jewish Christians. In 1 Cor. 15:5, Peter is

mentioned besides the apostles: does this exclude him from the apostles? As regards Gal. 1: 19, James is here evidently numbered among the apostles. The explanation of Neander, that the name of James had *occurred* to the apostle only *after* he had written: "Others of the apostles saw I none," is utterly untenable. That, according to *Hess*, only *ὁ υἱὸς ἀδελφοῦ* is to be referred to James, not also *τῶν ἀποστόλων*, only shows how strongly this passage favors the identity. We see how these last reasons for a third James show really the contrary. As favoring the identity we mention the following reasons; 1. *Ancient tradition.* Hegesippus, Clemens, and Origen are here in decided opposition to the fabulous apocryphal and legendary accounts. The later fathers from Eusebius onward have no weight in determining the question, independent of the fact that they partly favor the identity.— 2. *The utter untenableness of an apocryphal apostolate besides that instituted by Christ.* The later theology is persuaded, in this case, from the Clementine legends, that in the age of the apostles already, a brother of the Lord, though no apostle, could, on account of his relationship to Christ, gradually ascend to apostolical dignity; ay, even above it. For the supposed third James really appears in Gal. 2: 9, as, with Peter and John, one of the three pillars of the Jewish Christian Church. This James, with Peter and John, is evidently an apostle to the circumcision, as Paul to the Gentiles. But this James elevates not only the author of the Ep. of Jude, "the brother of James," to the apostleship; but even Simeon, his successor as B. of Jerusalem. But where in the N. T. do we find the least trace of the call of these new supernumerary apostles? If, on the other hand, we remember the emphasis with which the formal call of the twelve is stated, and often repeated; how expressly the substitution of Matthias for Iscariot is referred to a solemn act of the entire apostles' college; and how reluctantly Paul was recognized as apostle, it seems certain that in this age the claim of relationship was not sufficient to convert three non-apostolical men into apostles.¹ We may be sure also that Paul would not have forgotten to urge it against the adherents of James, who endeavored everywhere to undermine his apostolical authority, if in this they had appealed to an apostleship of a third James improvised by the bigotry of their party.— 3. *The even greater improbability that names of real apostles should be utterly extinguished by apostles introduced subsequently.* Acts, c. 1, knows only the apostles, James the Elder, and James, the son of Alphaeus. This James, we are told, it suffers to pass away without a trace remaining, whilst, perhaps in c. 12: 17, already, and certainly in c. 15, and c. 21, it introduces an entirely new James, without even intimating that he was a new one, the brother of

the Lord. That, according to De Wette, the author of the Acts had exchanged James Alphaei with the brother of the Lord, or forgotten to distinguish them, is a mere evasion, and would utterly destroy the authenticity of Luke. De Wette has also forgotten that in such a case the process of exchange must have taken place also with Simeon and Judas, the adherents of James. James Alphaei, Judas Thaddeus, and Simon, must all three have totally disappeared; whilst three others of the same name and of apostolical authority, must have arisen, viz.: James, the brother of the Lord, Judas, the brother of James, according to the Ep. of Jude, and Simeon, the brother and successor of James, according to the account of Hegesippus. Hence appears, 4. *The utter untenableness of a duplication of three names in the apostolical circle.* In the catalogue of the apostles we find the names of James Alphaei, or son of Cleopas, Lebbeus Thaddeus or Judas, and Simon Cananites or Zelotes, in close connection. In the list of the brothers of Jesus, we find, besides *Joses*, the names of James, Judas, and Simon; and we know how they were his brothers, viz.: as the sons of Cleopas. Here would be the first wonder, viz.: that three brothers of the Lord should have the same name as three of his apostles, and yet be different from them. The second wonder is that these brothers are also called James Alphaei (= Cleopas), Judas Alphaei, Simon Alphaei, without being in any way connected with the Apostle James Alphaei. But according to Mark 15: 40, the Apostle James the Less had also a brother named *Joses*: just as with the brother of Jesus. No doubt the third wonder. For now we must admit a duplication of even four names—James Alphaei the apostle, his brother *Joses*, and his companions Judas and Simon; the four brothers of the Lord—James Alphaei, no apostle, and his brothers *Joses*, Judas, and Simon. Or rather, the identity appears at every point: *Mary*, the mother of the Apostle James the Less (Alphaei), is also the mother of a *Joses*, as we find him with James the brother of the Lord. A *Joses* is brother of the Apostle James Alphaei, and *Joses* is brother of the brother of the Lord, James Alphaei. A *Cleopas* is father of the Apostle James, and a *Cleopas* is father of the brothers of the Lord. A *Simon Zelotes* is found among the apostles, and a *Simon* is cousin of the Lord—a man of apostolical authority, brother and successor of James. As regards this James, he is called simply the Less, and yet is to be divided again into a *major* and *minor*, or into a *minor* and a *minus vulgo maximus*. He is at all times James Alphaei; and yet at one time an apostle, at another time not. He enjoys at all times the most decided apostolical authority; and yet he is at one time an apostle, and at another time not. But most remarkable of all would be this: concerning James Alphaei we thus have the apostolical name without any history and labors; whilst concerning James, the brother of the Lord, we have a rich apostolical history without any trace of the apostolical name. Thus also Simon and Judas, the apostles, have totally vanished, whilst, on the other hand, the apostolical men, Judas and Simon, have unexpectedly

¹ *Stier* (Andeutungen, I., 412) and *Wieseler* (Stud. u. Krit., 1842) try to evade this improbability by supposing that James, brother of the Lord, in Gal. 1: 19, was distinct from the mere James in Gal. 2: that the latter was the Apostle Alphaeus, and the former a respected though unofficial person in the Church. This conflicts with the oldest tradition, according to which the brother of the Lord was B. of Jerusalem.

nade their appearance, the one with his epistle, and the other with his episcopate; whilst the age of the apostles has not given us the least clue to distinguish this unheard-of duplication, we mean of *names, offices, relationship, and mutual connection*. From all these reasons we conclude that there were only two of the name of James, and now pass on to consider them separately.—

I. *James the Elder, son of Zebedee*. Zebedee, the father of James and John, was a Galilean fisherman, dwelling on the shores of the sea of Genesareth, perhaps near Capernaum (Matth. 1:21-22). His wife, Salome, with several other women, accompanied the Lord, and provided for him (Mark 15:40-41; 16:1; Luke 8:3; Matth. 27:56). The father did not interfere when the sons were called by the Lord (Matth. 4:21). From her history in the Gospels, it seems highly probable that Salome was a sister of the mother of the Lord (John 19:25). It is certain that she was an enthusiastic, faithful, and self-denying adherent of Jesus; at the same time, a woman of aspiring soul, who felt her own worth in that of her excellent sons, and could ask for them the first places next to Christ, the King, in his kingdom (Matth. 20:2; Mark 10:35). Such was the family in which James and John were born. In most of the events of his life James remains united with John, though it cannot be determined with certainty whether he was also a disciple of the Baptist. Contemporaneously with John he was called to the discipleship of Jesus (Matth. 4:21). Sometime thereafter he was also with him invested with the apostleship (Matth. 10). Being always named before John, it is concluded that he was the older brother. Mark, in his catalogue, gives to him the second place, next after Peter; he is here, also, with John called Boanerges, i. e., the sons of thunder. This name has been referred to the fact narrated in Luke 9:54. This may have been the occasion; but the name was certainly not given to express reproach, just as little as Simon's surname of Peter. Surnames given by the Lord were always designations of the specific charisma, the natural apostolical endowment which was afterwards sanctified by the Holy Spirit. If John undoubtedly participated in what was censurable on the occasion of the names, as appears from Luke 9:49; James, on the other hand, participated in the character of elevation, grandeur, purity and fiery energy, which the name expressed. John seems to represent primarily the thunder, James the lightning. It is to be noted that Luke, also, in his second catalogue, Acts 1, names him next after Peter. James was early favored with the most intimate companionship of Jesus (Mark 1:29), and here he stands between Peter and John (Mark 5:37; Matth. 17:1); and in two instances, according to the best readings (8:51; 9:28), Luke places John first (c. 8:51; 9:28). Once again he appears alone with John in the same spirit, as when formerly he wished to call down fire from heaven upon the Samaritan city. The prayer of Salome appears, according to Mark 10:35, as also the prayer of the two sons of Zebedee themselves. They wished to obtain the seats of honor in the kingdom of Jesus. The request

was made at the time when the disciples were expecting the near establishment of the Messianic kingdom at Jerusalem, and were discussing who was to be the greatest among them. Happening also at a time when Jesus had foretold his humiliation and death, their boldness assumes a higher meaning. If they were not without ambition, it is nevertheless an ambition which enabled them, as his nearest companions in his kingdom, to follow him unto death. At this particular moment their request was a word of enthusiastic hope, which regarded the danger of the Lord as nothing. Whether James felt more the human side of the request, we know not; enough, the usual circle of three is enlarged unto four, since Andrew is admitted to the eschatological revelations of Christ on the Mount of Olives; but to prepare the passover, Peter and John alone are sent to Jerusalem (Luke 22:8). In Gethsemane, however, James again occupies his position among the three (Matth. 26:37). The next which we learn of him is his decapitation by Herod Agrippa (A.D. 44. WIESLER, Chronol. des apost. Zeitalt., p. 594). When his accuser saw him suffering martyrdom, he repented and confessed himself also a Christian. He was then led away with James, asked his pardon, which James imparted with a fraternal kiss, and the words: "Peace be with thee." It was no doubt his prominent position in the Church, which made James the first victim of persecution. The supposition that he was engaged chiefly in the government of the Church at Jerusalem, is substantiated not merely by his execution; but also by the fact, that he, with Peter and John, was specially distinguished by the Lord, but that the others were engaged in the more general affairs of the Church. Thus the older son of Zebedee opened the list of apostolical martyrs of Christ, whilst the younger closed it, Simon alone, perhaps, excepted. James seems to have shared the quiet nature of John: but whenever he spoke, his words were strong expressions of power. Every feature of his life is a simple, grand lineament of fire. Nothing is more certainly attested, than that he early closed his career at Jerusalem.—

II. *James the Less, the Just, the brother of the Lord, or James the son of Alphaeus*. We shall portray him as he first appears in the Gospels and Acts, is next reflected in his epistle, and is finally represented by tradition. Our earliest accounts of the brothers of Jesus we receive from John 2:12. We may conclude from this passage that there was a distinction between the circle of his brothers, and that of his disciples; although there was no doubt a spiritual relationship, one of faith, between them even at the beginning of Jesus' public career: otherwise the brothers would not have connected themselves with the disciples. Soon after, being rejected by his native town, Jesus took up his abode at Capernaum: here his brothers are enumerated, viz.: James, Joseph, Simon, and Judas. Somewhat later than this Christ called his apostles, in the catalogue of whom we find three of the same name as the three brothers who are best known to us: according to Luke (6:15), James Alphaei, Simon Zelotes, and Judas the brother of James (the same in Acts 1:13). In Matthew,

Simon is called the Cananite; and instead of Judas, he gives, next to James Alpheï, Lebbeus Thaddeus (10:3), Mark calls him simply Thaddeus. — The Acts (1:13), again, enumerate James Alpheï, Simon Jacobus (Zelotes), and Judas the brother of James, in rapid succession. He is prominent at the convention of the apostles (Acts 15). Here frequent mention is made of the apostles and presbyters (v. 4, 6, 23, 24). As he appears in this connection, we cannot suppose that he is reckoned among the presbyters: for he is the most important speaker after Peter, and his word gives the final decision, which is sent in the name of the apostles, elders, and brethren. We here become acquainted with an Apostle James, who occupies the same position as Paul and Peter; for whom the Jewish traditions have no doctrinal force whatever: and the doctrine which he helps to establish in reference to the Gentile Christians has no religious, but only an *ethical* purport, viz.: to be a bond of connection between Jews and Gentiles. But this same Apostle James is also the brother of the Lord, as appears from Gal. 2. It is now no longer possible to mistake this Apostle James and the James of Acts 20. He is James simply, the old and well-known one, having the same character, viz.: the supporter of Paul, rejoicing in the work of the latter, but also the same cautious mediator between the freedom of Pauline Christianity and the prejudices of the Jewish Christians and people in general. His advice to Paul, that he should purify himself by a Nazarite vow of the charge that he was *subverting Jewish customs* among the Jewish Christians, we cannot regard as a result of inspiration: nor was its purpose reached. At any rate, the Apostle James is not responsible for the caricature by which the legal Jewish Christians represented him to the distant churches. How early they did this, appears from Acts 15:24; and the disclaimer here given must also be applicable to subsequent times. — We have seen that the "brethren of the Lord," 1 Cor. 9:5, did not separate themselves from the circle of apostles; just as little as Cephas, who with them is specially mentioned. But the passage also shows the increasing authority which the brethren of the Lord enjoyed among the apostles. Paul indicates that at the time of his conversion the Apostle James had stood, for himself at least, very far in the background as compared with Peter (Gal. 1:19), although he designates him, from his later position, with the honorable distinction which the Jewish Christians awarded to him. But that this brother of the Lord, the most distinguished one, was an apostle in the common official sense, is shown from the text. On this condition alone could Paul adopt the language of the Jewish Christians, which designated James, with Peter and John, as a pillar of the Church (Gal. 2:9). On the occasion here spoken of James manifested his unity with Paul, by giving to him the right hand of fellowship. Hence also we are not authorized in regarding the *εὐχὴ ἀπὸ Ἰακώβου* (c. 2:12), who afterwards came to Antioch, as the heralds of a change in the views of James; but merely as legalistic Jewish Christians of the Church at Jerusalem. The last meeting of Paul with James

at Jerusalem (Acts 21), is of a later date. It happened about A. D. 60. In A. D. 62, James suffered martyrdom. His epistle he wrote no doubt near the end of his life. The fundamental idea of this epistle is: Christianity in its relation to the external O. T. law, is the law of freedom (1:25), or also the royal law of love (2:8); the law written by faith upon the heart (1:25): as inwardly, it is one with the new birth (1:18); and outwardly, one with the activity of faith (c. 2); one in itself as the truth of the commandments (2:10); in its aim, mercy (2:12); in its form and method, wisdom (3:13); in its prerequisites, humility and abnegation (c. 4); in its complete development, a patience which overcomes the world, a miraculous power of salvation (5:11). In its origin Christianity rests upon the absolute grace and free pleasure of God, upon the word of truth planted in the heart (1:21), upon the patience of Christ and the hope of his coming (5:6, 7). Sin has its root in doubt (1:6); becomes actual in evil lust, and ends in death. The main obstacle in passing from sin to redemption is fanaticism, which James portrays in all its features (c. 5). James thus stands in direct opposition to Jewish legalism, since he portrays Christianity as the fulfilment of the O. T. law. He was probably led to write his epistle by seeing how fanatical sedition was beginning to stir the nation, and bringing the Jewish churches also in great danger of apostasy. Many things in the epistle are allegorical. He is acquainted, like Paul, with the doctrine of justification by faith. Both, however, distinguish between inward reconciliation by faith through grace, and the outward proof of faith amid trials. That he clearly understands the righteousness of faith which precedes every act of faith, is evident from the distinction which he makes between Abraham as just (before God), and as justified at the forum of history. At the forum of God the believer is just by faith; at the forum of the Church by acts of faith. As regards the relation of the doctrinal type of James to that of the other apostles, it is not sufficient to find, with Neander, this doctrinal type to consist in the unity of the spirit with the other apostles: "only that this spirit had not yet elevated itself above the O. T. position to such freedom, as in the case of the other apostles, and that the thoughts were not so fully developed." James is first of all an apostle: i. e., Christianity is to him the fulfilment of Judaism as the New Testament, as the new, absolute, eternal principle of religion; and so far he occupies the same position as Paul and John. But he is moreover the apostle to the Jews: i. e., he views Christianity in its intimate connection with the old covenant as the new and perfect law of inward life, of liberty. As regards his method of expressing his thoughts, we must remember that he wrote to Jewish Christians, to whom a logical form would have been unintelligible. The purity of his Greek has been an enigma to many. James, it would seem, knew no liberty except that which had conformed itself to the standard of the law: and in this sense he calls the law the law of liberty. He represents the Christian *dogma* in the form of the Jewish *ethos*. He has

ransferred the O. T. law as such from the sphere of religion to that of *national custom*. This precisely was his work, and it was his to make the last effort to gain the Jews as a nation or Christianity.—Concerning the results of this effort, we are informed by history. That he took a delight in the Nazarite vow, appears from Acts 21. The gospel of the Hebrews also represents him in this light. Josephus (*Ant.*, XX., 1) informs us that, during the interim between the departure of Festus from Judea and the arrival of Albinus (about A. D. 62), the high priest Ananus had caused to be stoned to death, a brother of Jesus, called also Christ, by the name of James, who was reputed to be a very just man. Hegesippus (*Euseb.*, *H. E.*, II., 23), after having described James as a Nazarite, says that at the passover he was hurled by the scribes and pharisees from a pinnacle of the temple, whither he had been led by the people to declare whether Jesus was the Messiah, and afterwards stoned to death. Eusebius adds that the wisest Jews and even Josephus had regarded the subsequent destruction of Jerusalem as a judgment of God for this murder.

J. C. LANGE.—*Reinecke*.

James of Edessa (so called from the place of his labors; also *J. Orrhoënus*, Arab. *Ar-Rohāwi* = the Edessene), was one of the most noted Syrian scholars and writers, who mainly applied his learning to the furtherance of Biblical knowledge. Born near Antioch, he early entered the monastery of John Bar-Aphthonius, at Kinnesrin, learned Greek there, and closely studied the Bible. He continued his studies at Alexandria, then returned to Syria, and became B. of Edessa, in 651 (*Assem.*, *bibl. or.*, I., 426, 468; II., 335, &c.). Impatient of the disregard of order he laid down his office in 655, and spent 11 years as teacher, especially of Greek, in the monastery of Eusebona, at Teleda. Thence he withdrew to the great monastery of Teleda, and spent 9 years in correcting the Syriac version of the O. T. His successor at Edessa having died, J. was recalled to that post, but died four months afterwards, June 6, 708 (*Assem.*, *l. c.*, II., 336). Although highly esteemed by the Maronites, he was unquestionably inclined to Monophysitism. He was full master of his mother tongue, and one of the first Syrian linguists; Barhebr. says he also knew Hebrew. But he specially devoted himself to the Greek, from which he translated many books (including some liturgies) into Syriac. He was a prolific writer. Fragments of his critical ed. of the Syriac version of the O. T. have reached our time, in two Paris MSS.; this ed. seems to have been based upon a Syriac version of the LXX. (See, besides *Asseman.*, *l. c.*, *A. G. Hoffmann*, in the *Hall. Encykl.*, 2 Sect., Bd. 13, p. 165–7). E. RÖDIGER.*

James of Jüterbock (also *Jacobus Cisterciensis*, *Carthusianus*, *de Paradiso*, *de Polonia*), was one of the forerunners of the Reformation, for which his mysticism, pious earnestness, and frank rebukes of the evils of his age, involving all classes from the Pope downwards, aided to prepare the way. He was born c. 1383, became a Cistercian, of *de Paradiso*, in Poland, then went to Cracow to pursue literary studies, ob-

tained the doctorate, and subsequently became abbot of *de Paradiso*. His strict asceticism offended the members of his order, and in advanced age he left it, joined the Carthusians, and entered a monastery at Erfurt. There he taught, became prior, and died, 1465. Works: *Sermones notabiles et formales de tempore et de sanctis*; *Libelli tres de arte curandi vitia* (in *J. Wesseli, Opp.*, Amst., 1617); *Liber de veritate dicenda*; *Tract. de causis multarum passionum* (in *Pezelii Biblioth. ascet.*, VII.); *De indulgentiis*; *De negligentia Prælatorum* (*Walch. Mon. med. æv.*, II., Fasc. 1); *De septem eccl. statibus opusculum* (*Walch. l. c.*, Fasc. 2). In the last work he argues that no ecclesiastical improvement could be expected, unless the Papacy, and entire curia would be subjected to a thorough reform. "The Council, not the Pope, is the representative of the Church, to it the Pope is subject even in matters of doctrine." He granted the difficulties in the way of a reform by a Council, but urged the necessity of attempting it.—(See *TRITHEMII, Catal. illustr. virorum.*, I.; *ULLMANN, Reformatoren vor d. Ref.*, I., 229, &c.).

NEUDECKER.*

James of Nisibis (*the Great*), the teacher of *Ephraem*, and relative of Gregory Illum., was B. of Nisibis (Zoha), and took part in the Council of Nice (*Assem.*, *bibl. or.*, I., 169; III., 587). He spent his earlier years as an ascetic in the mts. of Kurdiatan; many miracles are ascribed to him (cf. *THEODORET, H. E.*, I. 2. c. 30). He is less known by his writings, than by the honor which he has enjoyed. *Abr. Ecchaelensis* (*Eutych. vindic.*, II., *index op. no.* 37) confounds him with James of Sarūg. All that remains of his pen is comprised in an epistle to the bishops of Seleucia, and 18 religious discourses. Of these Mechitar owned the MS., from which *Assem.* had a copy taken for the Vatican Library (*Assem.*, *l. c.*, I., 557, &c., 632). Card. Antonelli published an edition with a Latin translation and notes, 1756, fol.; it appeared in Venice 1765, in the collection of Armenian Fathers; the Armen. text, Constant., 1824.—(Cf. *C. F. Neumann's Gesch. d. Armen. Literat.*, p. 18, &c. *Biogr. Univers.*, art. *Jacques de Nisibe*).

E. RÖDIGER.*

James of Sarūg, a distinguished teacher and writer of the Syrian Church, born in Kurtam, on the Euphrates, 452, became presbyter 503, and in 519 B. of Batnān, in the district of Sarūg, where he died, Nov. 29, 521 (*Assem.*, *bibl. or.*, I., 290). He had the title Doctor (*Syr. Malpāna*), and is sometimes called "the flute of the Holy Spirit," "the harp of the believing Church;" also *Tibelūta* = *universal* (Doctor). He is commemorated by the Jacobites and Maronites. Although venerated by the Jacobites (who held many older orthodox teachers in honor) his theological views were in the main orthodox (*Assem.*, *l. c.*, I., 310, 326; III., 387). He was a fertile writer; 763 homilies in verse (lines of 12 syllables, hence called *Jacobite*, *Assem.*, I., 299; II., 322), expositions, an anaphora, a form of baptism, hymns, and letters, are ascribed to him. Barhebr. had 182 of his homilies (*Assem.*, II., 303). Much has been falsely ascribed to him (I., 332), some things because written in his verse. The Vatican

Library contains 5 of his circulars, 6 prose tracts, and 233 homilies. Occasionally a reproachful allusion to Nestorians occurs in them; but they mostly treat of a section or fact in Biblical history, or of some Bible person (*Assem.*, I., 304-40). They are still used in Syrian Churches, especially the expositions, at public worship. They are transl. into Arabic. Some of his hymns are found in the *Brev. ferile Syr.*, and the *Officium Domin.* (Rome, 1787). His poetic eulogy upon Simon the Stylite has been transl. into German by Zingerle, in his *Leben, &c., d. Simeon, &c., Innsbr., 1855, 8vo.* (p. 279-98). E. RÖDIGER.*

Jannes and Jambres (2 Tim. 3:8) are, according to Jewish tradition (as *Theodoret* in l. remarks), the names of the Egyptian magicians who withstood Moses and Aaron (Ex. 7:11, 22; 8:3, 15). They apparently succeeded in imitating the first two miracles of Moses, but utterly failed in the third, and acknowledged to Pharaoh that only divine power could have wrought them (Ex. 8:15). In this instance, as in that of the witch of Endor, the wonders wrought by the magicians are not to be regarded as mere frauds, but as the operations of the black arts, pointing to interferences of the secret powers of the world of darkness in the affairs of this world (Cf. Acts 16:16-19; 19:19. See *Satan*). The names of these men are, doubtless, traditional. They are mentioned in the targum of Jonathan on Ex. 7:11, and in the Talmud, where the second is called Μαμβρης (as also in a variation on 2 Tim. 3:8). The Pythagorean Numenius calls them by their usual names. *Plin.*, 30, 1, and *Apul. Apol.*, p. 94, names them as Jamnes and Jochabel. Pfeiffer attempted to show their signification from the Egyptian (*dub. vex.*, 1, 253); and Ewald seems similarly inclined (*Isr. Gesch.*, 2, 72), by explaining (as Pfeiffer does) αμβρης to be a sacred book, with which their designation as *ισογυμματαίς*, by Numenius, corresponds. In the N. T. they are correctly set forth as types of a spurious gift of miracles, and compared with those whose piety and faith are not genuine. VAHINGER.*

Janow, *Matthias of*, the most noted forerunner of Hus, was the son of a Bohemian Knight, Wenzel of Janow, who still lived in the early part of the reign of Emperor Charles IV. He was one of those Prague students who intimately attached themselves to Milicz in his last years. From Prague he went to Paris, where he spent six years, and received the degree of M. A., hence called in Bohemia *Magister Parisiensis*. His early ambition led him to visit Rome, and ask a canonry of Urban VI. He succeeded, and on Oct. 12, 1381, was admitted as Canon of St. Vitus, in the Castle of Prague. The confessional was assigned to him, and he continued at that post until his death, Nov. 30, 1394. Though he effected little by preaching, he was most faithful in his particular office, which afforded him full opportunity of discovering the evil and the good in all classes, and the spiritual wants of the people, as his writings show. These he collected under the title: *De regulis veteris et novi testamenti*, though they might more pro-

perly have been called: *Inquiries concerning true and false Christianity*. He labored at it from 1388-92. It has never been publ. in full. Some sections may be found in Dr. J. P. Jordan's "*Vorläufer d. Husitentums, &c.*," *Lpz.*, 1846. Although he nowhere recommends departure from the unity of the Church, his relationship to the Reformation appears in his constant reference of religious experience to Christ, and bases the true unity of the Church on him alone. He also advocated frequent communion: but at the remarkable Prague Provincial Synod of Oct., 1388, was compelled publicly to promise no longer to admonish the laity to daily communion. The doctrine, however, of the benefit of frequent communion, he was not required to renounce. His subsequent investigations into the early practice of the Church convinced him that originally the communion was administered in both kinds. Subsequently he deplored that he had allowed the Synod of 1388 to extort the promise from him. Towards the close of his life he became continually more conscious of the disagreement of his belief and teachings with those of the Romish Church. Hence his remarkable declaration: "All that remains for us, is to desire a Reformation by the overthrow of Antichrist himself, to lift up our heads, and see our redemption near." — (Cf. NEANDER, *Ch. Hist.* PALACKY, *Gesch. v. Böhmen.*, III., 1, p. 173-80).

TH. PRESSER.*

Jansen. Jansen's Augustine. Jansenism.

—Scarcely any other subject so thoroughly discloses the nature of modern Catholicism, and the wrong it did itself in refusing the Reformation, which the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries demanded of the Catholic Church.

As the Reformation touched the entire being of the Church, her life and her doctrines, so did Jansenism. As the writings of Augustine, next to the Epistles of Paul, gave to the faith of Luther and Calvin both matter and form, the counter-reformation necessarily contracted a secret hostility to those writings. Augustine indeed was still acknowledged, and his mighty influence on the middle age had crystallized in the doctrine of the Thomists and the Dominicans, and was so prevalent at Trent against the Semipelagian Scotists, the Franciscans, and the Jesuits, that the virtual triumph of the Jesuits was concealed under equivocations. Still the victorious party boldly followed out the inferences from the concessions thus made. The Franciscans in 1567 and 1579 obtained the condemnation of seventy-six theses of the Augustinian Bains, professor at Louvain; the Jesuit Molina, in 1588, propounded bold Semipelagianism under a new dress, and the *congregatio de auxiliis*, summoned by Clement VIII., in 1597, to settle the dispute raised by the Dominicans against it, was dissolved by Paul V. in 1607, without reaching a decision. The more thoroughly the Catholic Church became set against the Reformation, the more thoroughly Semipelagian must she become in life and doctrine by the law of nature. Thomism itself had stiffened into Scholasticism, and the writings of Augustine had at once the full power of novelty and of venerable antiquity for Düver-

gier de Hauranne, afterwards Abbot of St. Cyran, and Jansen, when these young theologians studied them together at Bayonne, in 1612.

Cornelius Jansen was born in the village of Accoy, in Leerdam, North Holland, on the 28th of October, 1585, and studied theology at Louvain, in the Spanish Netherlands, under the presidency of a friend of Baius. After spending some time with his university friend, Duvèrgier, in Bayonne, the native place of the latter, he returned to Louvain. He declined a philosophical chair in that place, from his aversion to Aristotle as the father of Scholasticism. Plato, he found, had higher ideas of God and virtue than many of the Catholic theologians. He afterwards took the presidency of the Pulcheria College, and taught theology there. His correspondence with St. Cyran from the 19th May, 1617, onward, has been preserved to us through the hatred of the Jesuits. By incessant study of the writings of Augustine he convinced himself, that the Catholic theologians of both parties had entirely forsaken the doctrine of the ancient Church. St. Cyran visited Louvain in 1621, and the two friends divided their labor for the reformation of the Church between them, Jansen taking doctrine, St. Cyran organization and life; forming intimate connections with eminent clergymen in Ireland, and with leaders of the congregation of the Oratory. In spite of suspicions of the Spanish Inquisition, he was nominated, in 1630, Royal Professor of Sacred Literature at Louvain. The two friends had thus far sought to enlist the cardinal-minister, Richelieu, in their project; but while the growing power of France was threatening Spain with the loss of her Netherlands, Jansen advised the erection of a Catholic, independent country out of the Belgian Provinces; and finding this suggestion offensive to the Spanish interests, attacked the pretensions of France in his *Mars Gallicus*, sparing neither kings nor cardinal-ministers. The work occasioned the imprisonment of St. Cyran, and obtained for Jansen (who had now played "the pedant and ass" long enough) the bishopric of Ypres in 1636. In 1627 he set about his work on Augustine in earnest, and had just finished it, when he died of the plague, on the 6th May, 1638. The title is: *Cornelii Jansenii, episcopi Iprensis, Augustinus seu doctrina Sti. Augustini de humanæ naturæ sanitate, ægritudine, medicina adversus Pelagianos et Massiliensis*, published in 1640, in 3 vols., fol.

The first volume gives a history and an exposure of the more refined Semipelagianism. The second goes on to treat of reason and authority in theology. There was too much devotion to human knowledge and heathen philosophy; it nourished the sense of human ability. Philosophy and theology had entirely different spheres; one the intellectual faculty, the other hearing and memory, revelation and tradition; and in tradition Augustine was inspired and infallible as to the doctrine of grace.—Good and evil are absolute opposites, and the first man could have had no germ of evil in him. The fall was due to freedom of will, which was positively good and divine, submitting itself to God in love, yet could be lost, because Adam might love himself

for his own perfection. Grace, which, however, was not enough to restrict his freedom, was then not a *donum superadditum*, but constitutional in him; without it the fall would have been necessary.—Original sin is not mere imputation (*reatus*), but a propagated corrupt nature; the lustful flesh polluting the soul. The unconquerable ignorance and wicked lust of the soul, which are themselves complete sins, are punishments of original sin. "Manichæism and Pelagianism put lust before sin; Augustine puts it after."—In our fallen state we have freedom indeed to abstain from particular wicked acts, but not to abstain from sinning. Yet the sinning is man's free act; since the will has put itself under bondage. The third of the five points, which the Pope condemned in Jansen's book, was the sentiment, that merit and demerit in our fallen state do not require freedom from all necessity, but only from violence and natural necessity.—The apparent virtues of those not converted by the grace of God, are really sins (a genuine Augustinian doctrine, which the Pope had already condemned in Baius, but, as Jansen presumed, only for the sake of peace at the time). The fall involves misery, as happiness consists essentially in sinlessness. (Here is a sample of the deep spirituality of Jansen's doctrine; where the Jesuits would say the Almighty could make sinners happy and saints miserable).—The third volume takes up the grace of Christ. Every good motion is divine grace. Law and preaching are only means of grace; and grace is not mere revelation, but *medicinale auxilium*. Grace now gives not only freedom of choice, as before the fall, but will and act, in the whole conduct, and in each point of it; is ever *actualis*, accomplishing its end; yet does not make man a lifeless instrument, but only takes its course through our will.—All goodness begins with faith. But this will be of no avail, unless the *donum perseverantiæ* be added.—Grace itself is not knowledge and justification, not a mere imputation (against Jesuits and Protestants), but the vital indwelling of divine love, of God himself, overcoming sinful lust. Fear does not put evil away from the heart; *Attritio* is not *contritio*. Fallen man, to be free, must be a servant, but only by his will becoming vitally one with the divine.—*Predestination* to conversion, perseverance, and salvation is a perfectly sovereign act of God; and God predestines others to evil; to whom the partial goodness granted them turns to condemnation. Where a human counsel agrees with the divine, an indifference of the human will makes the counsel virtually ungodly. All presupposes the free act of the fall, which, in Jansen's infralapsarian view, made a radical change in the condition of man.—Thus to have his fortune in God's hand, instead of his own, must certainly minister confidence to man. The reprobate are of material service to the temporal and eternal good of the elect, by exhibiting the attributes of God, and the sinfulness of man, and thus stimulating the elect to virtue. The elect are the smaller number.

The Jesuits made various efforts to prevent the printing of this work; and after its publication

the Pope issued a bull censuring it, but aiming to hush the controversy. But in 1643 Dr. H. Arnauld published his *De la fréquente communion*, based on the predestination doctrine of Augustine and Jansen; which raised a widespread and vehement controversy. See *Art. H. ARNAULD*. The Dominicans in France went against Jansen, those of Spain and Italy for him. The Sorbonne was divided; and after an earnest contest between parties throughout France, which was carried by delegates from both sides to Rome itself, the Pope, in 1653, issued the bull, *Cum occasione*, condemning five points. The Jansenists questioning the infallibility of the Pope in the matter of the fact of those points being found in Jansen's Augustine, the Pope further declared, in 1654, that they were found there, and their condemnation, as the doctrine of Jansen, must be subscribed. Hundreds of the "partizans of grace" now subscribed it under frivolous pretexts. Meantime Arnauld, provoked by an instance of bigoted anti-Jansenism, wrote a "Letter to a Person of Quality," for which, on the 31st January, 1656, after a hard contest, he was expelled from the Sorbonne, followed by eighty doctors, who refused to subscribe his expulsion. Now also Pascal began, in his *Lettres à un provincial*, to scourge the Thomists, who, with their outward, mechanical conception of predestination, shared with Jansen's Augustine the harshness so offensive to the Tridentines and Jesuits, yet went against Jansen and Arnauld. Port Royal, now in its bloom, was visited with the torture of subscribing a condemnation of Jansen, and those who refused were imprisoned. The king found, however, that too many bishops took the ground of "respectful silence," and secretly obtained, in 1668, the Papal sanction for a compromise, substantially on the basis of the distinction of *fact* and *droit*, and of *respectueux silence*. All parties seemed satisfied, first of all that the Jansenists directed their "golden pens" mainly against the reformed. The king had hoped for silence from his compromise; but the Jansenists took advantage of it with the Pope in sundry ways, and so offended the king, that Arnauld fled, in 1679, to the Spanish Netherlands. He was preceded thither by Quesnel in 1678, and followed by the Benedictine Gerberon in 1682; and there he labored indefatigably till his death, in 1694. Quesnel's New Testament, published in 1693, gave a fresh start to the crippled Jansenism; but now a controversy among the Jansenists themselves between the old idea of "respectful silence" and a new opinion, that one might sign the condemnation without losing place, gave Louis an opportunity to bring the Pope back, in 1705, to his former requisition of condemnation of the five points as the doctrine of Jansen without reservation. Upon the refusal of the nuns of Port Royal, the convent was abolished in 1709, and demolished in 1710. Noailles, who had sanctioned Quesnel's New Testament, now, as Cardinal Archbishop of Paris, becoming offensive to the Pope also, by his assertion of the rights of bishops, the Pope, in 1708, forbade the reading of Quesnel's Commentary; taking occasion particularly to condemn the Jansenist doctrine of the right and

duty of the laity to read the Scriptures. In 1713 appeared the bull *Unigenitus*, condemning 101 points from Quesnel's New Testament: among them some almost literally Scriptural and even quite Tridentine. The bull was received without qualification neither by the assembly of the French clergy, nor by the Parliament, nor by the Sorbonne; and the king thought to make an end of the matter by a National Council. But the Pope would not risk such a measure, and the old Gallican jurist, Dupin, thought "the king could not allow the Pope to call the Council, nor the Pope the king; nor could the Papal legates be allowed to preside in it." So Louis XIV., at his death, in 1715, left the matter of Jansenism, which for half a century he had used all means to settle, in the greatest confusion. The frivolous regent, the Duke of Orleans, cared nothing for either side; exiles returned, and the Sorbonne was not compelled to accept the bull. The Pope tried the power of a threat of deposition, and even of the ban, upon Noailles in 1716; but above all the din rose an appeal of many bishops, in 1717, from the Pope and his bull to a general Council. The bull, they held, encroached upon the Catholic faith and morality. This stirred both parties to greater activity and virulence; till the minister, Dubois, wishing to be cardinal, and the regent wishing to amuse himself without disturbance, enforced the prohibition of dispute about the bull, and compelled the Parliament to register it in 1720. Noailles and other bishops thence took the pretext of submitting with explanations; and, in 1720, Noailles, infirm with age, submitted with reserve; though the appeal and the Gallican views of rights of bishops produced the addition of concessions from the non-French Catholic bishops to the bull *Unigenitus*. Only stiff appellants, chiefly pastors, resorted to the distinction of the *ecclesia congregata* and *dispersa*. Benedictines and Carthusians, who insisted on the appeal, fled to Utrecht. The Oratorians, at their general convention, in 1727, refused to accept the bull; but after the refractory ones were expelled, the congregation was compelled to accept, by royal command, in 1746.—The populace espoused the cause of the appellants. Francis of Paris died, in 1727, from his own austerities, with the appeal in his hand; and over his grave even children fell into convulsions and ecstasies, and testified and prophesied against the bull. When the king shut up the tomb in 1732, the convulsions increased in houses and conventicles, and great books with plates were written about them. In some cases the convulsions ran into crucifixions, and even into terrible licentiousness. The Jansenists of the first generation had insisted, that confession should be made only to regular pastors, not to monks or Jesuits; the suppression brought them to allow it to appellantist priests, except on the death-bed. Dispute on this point occupied the Jesuits, and even divided the king and the Parliament, till the Pope prudently decided, in 1754, that only the publicly and judicially recognized opponents of the bull should be refused the sacraments.—In the tumult, which preceded the dispersion of the Jesuits, these controversies sank into silence. The

pressure in Church and State produced an unnatural union of earnest, ascetic piety, of fanaticism, and of infidelity, under the name of Janenism, in the years preceding the Revolution. The literature on these controversies, from the all Unigenitus onward, amounts to between three and four thousand volumes in the great library at Paris. The pastoral clergy, who, in 1789, sat in the rank of the clergy in the estates, and whose transition to the citizen class was so decisive, were mostly of the so-called jansenistic party; likewise the constitutionalist ratorians. In the reign of terror many Janenists boldly appeared and bled for the Church and the throne; and only twenty years ago the jansenist principles survived unterrified against the assumptions of the Jesuits in Lanjuinais and Montlosier. The ascetic elements of Janenism have appeared particularly among the lower clergy of France.—In Italy, Ricci, Bishop of Pistoria, whom Napoleon distinguished in 1796, was, in some sense, a Jansenist, as were many who aided the reforms of Joseph II.; also the Archbishop of Tarentum, Joseph Caccia-Latro, prominent under the Napoleonides, who laid down his office in 1817. In Rome Janenism is still, if not feared, yet hated, as Calvinism itself. REUCHLIN.—*E. D. Yeomans.*

Januarius. The Romish Church commemorates fourteen martyrs of this favorite name. The best known of them is St. J., B. of Benevento (Anniv., Sept. 19). The legend says he lived and suffered under Diocletian (*Scripta, Acta Sanct.*, Vol. 5, p. 380, &c.), another account says he died 305 (*Annal. eccl.*, ad a. 305, n. 3, ed. Col. Agr., 1624, II., p. 845). Beyond this his contemporaries say nothing of him. Tradition reports that he was cast into a fiery oven for refusing to sacrifice to the gods. Having escaped this unhurt, he and other Christians, who had shown sympathy for him, were thrown to the wild beasts. But these, also, refused to harm the followers of Jesus. Timothy, the heathen judge of Campania, under whom this was done, then became enraged, and ordered the prisoners to be put to death at Puteoli. But J. smote him with blindness. This led Timothy to seek his victim's help, but J. had no sooner restored his sight, than Timothy again ordered J.'s execution. His corpse was taken to Naples, the inhabitants having been moved to procure it by a special revelation. He thus became the patron saint of Naples. Later legends added other items to this account. The Neapolitans, especially, attribute the protection of their city against the eruptions of Vesuvius, and its deliverance from several threatening perils to the intervention of J. Some strange stories are told concerning the blood of St. J., which is kept in phials in a chapel of the Cathedral of Naples, along with his head.—The martyrology of the Rom. Church mentions a J. (Anniv., Jan. 7), who is said to have suffered with Felix. And in a list of martyrs, who suffered in Africa, a J. (Anniv., Jan. 19) is named. On July 10, two of the name are commemorated; July 11, is the day of one who suffered in Nicopolis; July 15, of one who suffered in Carthage; Aug. 6, of one who suffered in Rome; Oct. 13, of one who suffered in Cordova; Oct. 24, of one who suf-

fered in Carthage; Oct. 25, one in Sardinia; Dec. 2, of one whom the Vandals put to death; and Dec. 15, of one who suffered in Africa.—March 2 and July 17, are the anniversaries of two female martyrs, *Januaria*.

PAUL CASSEL.*

Japheth, son of Noah (Gen. 6:10; 9:18; 10:1, where the three sons are mentioned; Gen. 9:23, 27; 10:2, 21, where this is not the case). 1. Profound views of the world are connected with the mention of Japheth in the Scriptures. The degree of moral sense, which the three sons of Noah manifest when the nakedness of their father is discovered, is the measure of their influence in the history of the world. Ham sees the nakedness of his father, and is satisfied with telling it to his brothers. Shem and Japheth, without seeing the nakedness, cover their father with a garment. Chaste modesty and filial piety cannot be portrayed more beautifully. This chastity of the heart and eye is rewarded with being made the bearer of God; for this alone is the fountain from which the knowledge of God proceeds. Noah blesses Japheth with the words: "God shall enlarge Japheth, and he shall dwell in the tents of Shem; and Canaan shall be his servant." The words, "he shall dwell in the tents of Shem," cannot refer to God, but to Japheth. Indications in the Hebrew text seem to show that Shem suggested the act of filial piety, and Japheth merely consented. Hence the higher blessing to Shem: "Blessed be the Lord God of Shem; and Canaan shall be his servant." Shem has God for his portion; Japheth has extension and temporal dominion: but as Japheth consented to the filial act of Shem, he is also to participate in the portion of the latter: i. e., dwell in the tents of Shem = have part in the God of Shem; and also to participate in this way in the service of Ham due to Shem. All this has already become fulfilled in a gigantic measure.—2. The Scriptural difference between Shem, Ham, and Japheth is not the difference between the brown, black, and white races. To say that Japheth means handsome, and *therefore* white, is wholly untenable. Even if in Ham a reference is had to his dark color, which may be granted, we are not bound to admit a similar reference to color in the others. The differences which subsequently existed between the descendants of Canaan and of Aram are easily recognized. The Euphrates seems to be the local boundary between Shem and Ham. The name of Shem, corresponding philologically, and afterwards historically also, with that of Aram, refers to the *highland*, from which Canaan, even more than his brethren, is distinguished as *netherland*. Canaan, in Gen. 9:26, already, represents Ham, as Aram the sons of his brother, Arphaxad. But, according to the Scriptures, all mankind has descended from Noah. Whatever, therefore, was not included in Ham and Shem, the living opposites in which was manifested the struggle which the confession of the God of Shem had to endure, belonged to Japheth. He embraced whatever was immense in distance, extent, and number. In the sons of Japheth, enumerated in the Scriptures, we will scarcely be able to find all

the ancient nations known to modern geographical science: only those are mentioned, which were known at that time. But virtually the Japheth of the Scriptures is *the enlarged one*, who embraced everything which was not included in Shem and Ham. All this extent was once to dwell in the tents of Shem. There lies a necessity in the explanation which regards Japheth as the father of the "distant, boundless extent," and which finds this idea in the name: for this explanation corresponds with the spirit of the Scriptures, as also with the views of other nations.—3. As sons of Japheth are named: Gomer, Magog, Madai, Javan, Tubal, Meshech, and Tiras. Of these the best known are Madai and Javan. Ezekiel mentions, among other nations from the land of Magog, the powerful northern nations of Gog, Meshech, and Tubal. With these are mentioned Gomer, and Togarma his son. In Ezekiel, Gomer no longer takes the first place; Gog and Magog stand at the head. The Gomer of the Scriptures is undoubtedly the Cimmerian nation of classical antiquity. Magog denotes the people inhabiting Mt. Caucasus. It is evident from the word itself that Magog is a compound of Gog. But the latter is the Sanscrit *yugam*, Lat. *jugum*, Gr. *ζυγόν*, yoke; and denotes a mountain ridge. *Ma*, perhaps = at, upon, behind; or, what is less evident, large. Magog represents all the northern mountain people, which modern ethnography has embraced under different names. Hence also, subsequently, every terrible nation which came from the North, such as the Scythians and Goths, were called Gog and Magog. The Scriptures manifest a special acquaintance with two northern nations; which, according to our other accounts, do not occupy this prominent position, viz.: Tubal and Meshech, the Tibareni and Moschi. This may have resulted from commercial and other relations, as seems evident from Ezek. 27:13. Tiras is mentioned only in Gen. 10:2. From the indefinite extent assigned by antiquity to Thrace—all Europe north of Greece—we may reasonably conclude that Tiras is Thrace.—It cannot be maintained that the Scriptures, in its mention of the seven sons of Noah, wishes to indicate a migration of nations in the modern sense. It enumerates all the nations then known, and which it did not class among the descendants of Ham and Shem. The later exegesis does not pursue a mistaken course in respect to these sons of Japheth, when, with increasing knowledge, it includes among them all nations with which it becomes acquainted, so that China, also, and India, are found among them. All are by the Scriptures included under Japheth, though they may not be expressly mentioned. It is otherwise with the special generic accounts concerning Gomer and Javan. It proceeds from the principle that there must be some inward connection between those who are descended from the same ancestors. It can, therefore, be asserted that Askenaz, Riphath, and Togarma, who are named as brothers, are regarded as inwardly related. The Scriptures give us a hint as regards Askenaz. In Jeremiah 51:27, Ararat, Minni, and Askenaz are called out against Babel; and in

the next verse the kings of Media. Since Ararat and Minni point us to the Armenian highland, and, in general, the northern nations were called out against Babel, Askenaz can be understood only in connection with the Armenian countries. Thus, in fact, the passage is understood by Moses of Chorene. The termination of Askenaz is also frequently found in Armenian proper names. Still further confirmation is afforded by the proper interpretation of the passage in Josephus, which is justly regarded as the most obscure in his works. He says that the *Ἀσκανάζες* were at that time called by the Greeks *Πρυγίαις*. We must not forget that Josephus gives the opinions of his age, though many of them may be employed in Biblical interpretation. The Arsacide dynasty, as is well known, was named the Ascanian. Arsaces himself was called Ashek. This Ashek is regarded as identical with Arshak, and from him the Ascanians were descended. This Arsaces, according to Moses of Chorene, dwelt in the city of Pahl, in the land of Cushan. These inhabitants of Cushan he regards as Parthians, and their city of Pahl is the well-known Rhaga, which, according to Greek accounts, was among the Arsacides called Arsacia (whence Ascania). The derivation of the name from the Greek *πρυγίαις* is futile. Raga is derived from the Sanscrit *râg*, *râgan*, king; and must hence be regarded as the regal city, a meaning which corresponds with that of Pahl and Arsacia. In this way Josephus becomes plain. They are the *Rhégines*, the people of *Rhaga*, otherwise called Ascanians.—If we follow up the name of Askenaz, it will bring us into *Phrygia*, where, in the form of Ascanius, it is often met with. This will also bring us to the wide-spread legend concerning Troy. Askenaz has also been interpreted by *Franks*, especially since the 10th cent. on the part of the Jews. From this has originated the derivation of the *German* from the same source. It is not probable that Scandinavia also is derived from it, as some maintain: for Scanzia, in which stress is laid upon the *z*, is a mere corruption of Scandinavia.—For a long time, already, the name of Japheth has also been connected with Japetos, for which also there seems to be much reason. For the Scriptures did not create the names contained in its ethnographical table: it only gives them as already existing, but in its own form. On the other hand, it gives us plainly to understand the idea which the name of Japheth was understood to express. That Japetos, according to Greek tradition, was also the ancestor of primitive races, his genealogy shows us. The effort to derive the name from *ἰάπτω* must be regarded as unfounded.—The name of Japheth is no further mentioned in the Bible. It was seldom used as a proper name. Very few learned men, or Talmudist teachers, bear it. In the 17th cent. an Egyptian scholar passes under this name.—"Japheth shall dwell in the tents of Shem." This has been fulfilled in Christ. But only *those* sons of Japheth possess the redeemer of Shem who have a chaste eye, and hold the mystery of the faith in a pure conscience.

PAULUS CASSEL—Reinecke.

Jason, the name of several Jews of the Maccabean period. 1) In 1 Macc. 8:17, one of the embassy sent by J. Maccab. to Rome, to renew the league with the Romans, was called Jason, the son of Eleazer. 2) A Greek Jew, Jason of Cyrene, wrote the history of Jud. Macc., and his brothers, and of their wars, &c., in five books, from which the material of the two books of the Maccabees is taken, and dressed up with rhetorical ornaments. Jason's books were lost (1 Macc. 2:19, &c. Cf. *De Wette*, Einl. in's., I. T., § 302, &c.; *Ewald*, Gesch. Isr., IV., 531, &c.). 3) The Jason most noted was the brother of the high-priest Onias III., who sacrificed his religion and country to self-interest and ambition, by buying the high-priest's office of Antiochus Epiph. for a large sum of money, and then abusing his high position, by trying through its influence to force upon his countrymen Hellenistic customs and worship, and robbing them of their civil rights (2 Macc. 4:7, &c.). As he himself changed his original name (Jesus) to Jason (Jos., *Antt.*, 12, 5, 1), so, to further Greek culture, he founded a gymnasium below the citadel at Jerusalem, sent an embassy with 500 drachmas of silver to the games at Tyre, as an offering and gift to Hercules of Tyre, and gave Antiochus a splendid reception into the Holy City (2 Macc. 4:11, &c.). But after three years (173 B. C.) Jason was supplanted by one Menelaos, a brother of Simon the Benjamite (2 Macc. 3:4; 4:23), who outbid him to Antiochus, in the sum of 300 talents of silver. Menelaos became high-priest, and Jason had to flee to the Ammonites (2 Macc. 4:23, &c.). After some time, however, during the second campaign of Antiochus against Egypt (170 B. C.) the report of A.'s death was spread about, and Jason, at the head of 1000 men, marched against Jerusalem, and took it, the citadel excepted, in which Menelaos maintained his position; many citizens were slain. But Jason had soon to flee again to the country of the Ammonites; he was accused before Aretas, King of Arabia, had to flee from city to city, until he finally reached Parthia, where he died in wretchedness (2 Macc. 5:5, &c. Cf. *Ewald*, l. c., IV., 333, &c.).

RÜETSCHL.*

Jazer (LXX., *Ιαζήρ*; Jos., *Antt.*, 12, 8, 1, *Ἰαζήρ*; *ProL.*, 5, 16, *Γαζήρ*); was a considerable city, with territory, in Gilead, at the time the Israelites invaded the country of the Ammonites E. of the Jordan (Numb. 21:32). It fell to the portion of Gad, was rebuilt, and assigned to the Levites (Numb. 32:1, 3, 25; Josh. 13:25; 21:39; 1 Sam. 24:5; 1 Chron. 6:31). Lying on the extreme eastern limits of Israel, it successively fell again into the hands of the Moabites (Is. 16:8, &c.; Jer. 48:2), and (after the exile) the Ammonites, from whom Judas M. took it (1 Macc. 5:8). *Ono-*
last. says it lay 10 Rom. miles W. of Rabbath-Ammon or Philadelphia, and 15 m. northward from Heshbon. In agreement herewith *Seetzen* in v. *Zach's monatl. Corresp.*, XVIII., 429, &c.) found ruins on a small tributary of the Jordan hence not a "*μικροῦ ποταμοῦ*" as Euseb. says), whose name Sz'ir plainly indicates its ancient designation. But it is disputed what Jer. 48:32

means by "the sea of Jazer," as no large water, but only some ponds (which the original may signify), can be found near. Possibly a small lake, formerly there, has sunk away (Cf. *Gesen.*, Comm. on Jer., I., 549, &c.; *Hitzig* on Jer., 347, and on Is., 196, note *, according to the LXX.).—This Jazer must not be confounded with Hazor (Jer. 49:28). 8 miles S. W. of Philadelphia. — (Cf. *Reland's Palest.*, p. 825; *Burckhardt's Travels*, p. 355; v. *Raumer's Paläst.*, p. 229, &c.; *Pauly's Realencycl.*, IV., p. 3; *Ritter, Erdk.*, XV., 2, p. 104, &c.).

RÜETSCHL.*

Javan, the Hebrew, Syriac, Arabic, Coptic, Persian, &c., name of the Greeks (*Schol.* ad Aristoph. *Acharn.* 106). All were called Ionians (*Ἴωνες*, *Hom.* II., 13, 685), the name of the tribe best known to Orientals. *Lassen* (*Ind. Alterthumsk.*, I., 729) says the Indians designate all distant Western nations *Javana*, the name meaning *young*, and referring to their more recent descent from Indo-Germanic races. By means of traffic the Hebrews early became acquainted with the Greeks. Hence Gen. 10:24 reckons Javan as a son of Japheth (see Art.), and the representative of Japhetic tribes in the S. W. Greeks are met with as dealers in slaves in the Phœnician markets (Tyre. Ezek. 27:13; Joel 4:6. Cf. Is. 66:19; Zech. 9:13). In Dan. 8:21, Alexander M. is called king of Javan. (Cf. *Tuch*, Comm. on Gen., p. 210; *Knobel*, d. *Völkertafel*, p. 78, &c.).—In Arabia there was a city of this name, to which Ezek. 27:19, refers.

RÜETSCHL.*

Jebus and the Jebusites. The Jebusites appear as a Canaanitish tribe (Gen 10:16), related to the Amorites, in the wider sense, for their king, Adoni-Zedek, is called an Amorite (Josh. 10:5), and, like the Amorites, they occupied the hill-country (Numb. 13:29). At the time of Joshua they inherited what was subsequently called the mountain of Judah, hence the southern portion of the country, and held the fortress which they called *Jebus* (see *Jerusalem*). In the enumeration of the Canaanite nations the Jebusites are often named last (Gen. 15:20, &c.), but they were among the bravest and most stubborn opponents of Israel. It is true, Joshua slew Adoni-Zedek, but nothing is said of his having taken their city; hence we find them soon again in league with Jabin of Hazor, &c. (Josh. 11:3, &c.), and though once more vanquished by Joshua, they still held their fortified city (Josh. 15:8, 63). It was assigned to Benjamin (18:28); but that tribe could not get possession of it (Judges 1:21; 3:5; 19:11, &c.). David first took the city and its fortress, and made it the metropolis of his kingdom (2 Sam. 5:6, &c.; 1 Chron. 11:4, &c.). The possession of this important point was necessary to the security of Southern and Central Palestine (Cf. *Ewald*, Gesch. Isr., II., 1, p. 288, 583, &c.). The Jebusites were thus conquered but not exterminated (2 Sam. 24:16; Josh. 15:63); Solomon made the remnant tributary (1 King 9:20, &c.; Zech. 9:7). Even after the exile there were Jebusites in the land (Ezra 9:1; Neh. 11:3; 7:57. Cf. *Leng-erke*, Kanaan, I., 192, 643, 662, n. 4; *Bertheau*,

Comm. s. B. d. Richter, p. 13, &c. Ritter, Erdk., XV., 1, p. 117, &c.; XVI., p. 13, 363).

RÜTSCHE.*

Jehoahaz (LXX., Ἰωαχάζ; Vulg., *Joachaz*), was the son and successor of Jehu (see Art.) as king of Israel. He reigned 17 years (for in 2 Kings 13:10, we should read 39 for 37. Cf. 2 Kings 13:1; 14:1; 12:1). He found the kingdom greatly reduced, and it was still more enfeebled under him, by the oppressions of Syrians, so that he had but 50 horsemen, 10 chariots; and 10,000 footmen left him. The brave king (2 Kings 13:8) was greatly humbled by his misfortunes, and turned from his idolatries to Jehovah for help. The Lord promised a deliverer, who appeared in the person of Jeroboam II., then born (v. 5). Ewald (*Gesch. Isr.*) thinks, with some probability, that the incident in 2 Kings 5:1-6, 23, occurred under the reign of Jehoahaz.—2) A younger son (2 Kings 23:31, 36) and successor of Josiah of Judah. After the unhappy death of his father, the army elevated him to the throne, instead of his older brother, Jehoiakim (Cf. 2 Kings 11). In 2 Kings 23:24, he is called Eliakim, and in Jer. 22:11, Shallum. This supplanting of Jehoiakim seems to have resulted from an intrigue with the king of Egypt, who gladly seized the opportunity of interfering in the affairs of the country. The people seem to have regarded Jehoahaz as best suited to carry out his father's policy, otherwise the younger son would not have been chosen (1 Chron. 3:15). But Jehoahaz, although averse to Egyptian domination, allowed himself to be allured to Riblah (Ezek. 19:3, 4; 2 Kings 23:33), where he was insidiously fettered, and taken prisoner to Egypt. He reigned but three months. Jeremiah foretold his sad fate (Jer. 22:10, &c.). He died in Egypt, after probably living a long time in wretched imprisonment. (2 Kings 23:34. Cf. Ewald, *Isr. Gesch.*, 3, 417). VAININGER.*

Jehoiachin (for variations in the form of the name, see Esther 2:6; Jer. 22:24, the LXX., and Vulgate), was the son and successor of Jehoiakim (see Art.), king of Judah. After his father's fall, he ascended the throne in his 18th year (2 Chron. 36:9, has 8, through a copyist's mistake), and, under the guidance of his mother, reigned wickedly (2 Kings 24:9; Ezek. 19:5, &c.; Jer. 26:22; 13:18). The Lord determined to punish him (Jer. 22:24, 30). The Chaldeans, leagued with the Syrians, Moabites, and Ammonites, surrounded the city (2 Kings 24:2, 10), and when, finally, Nebuchadnezzar himself appeared, J., after reigning but three months and ten days (2 Chron. 36:9), resolved to forego the terrors of a siege, and surrendered himself and his mother to the mercy of the enemy. His princes and court officers accompanied him to Nebuchadnezzar's tent. They hoped thus to secure at least the authority of vassals. But J. and his court were banished to Babylon, with a large number of the best warriors and others, making in all 10,000. Among the captives was Ezekiel the priest (Ezek. 1:2). N., bound by a promise, or to keep a check on Egypt, did not then wish to destroy the nation, but utterly crushed its power. The temple also, and palace of the king were

robbed of their treasures. Over those who remained N. set the third (probably youngest) son of Josiah, then 21 years old, as king; he assumed the name of Zedekiah (1 Chron. 3:15). Jehoiachin remained in captivity 37 years, when Evil-merodach liberated him (2 Kings 25:27). Although he had not reigned according to the will of God, the nation longed for his return, a desire which was encouraged by false prophets (Jer. 28:4). But Jeremiah (22:26, 27) expressly proclaimed that he would never be restored. VAININGER.*

Jehoiada, high-priest in the time of Athaliah, and of Joash of Judah (2 Kings 11; 2 Chron. 23; Jer. 29:26), a man in whom, after a long season of languor and degeneracy, the primitive spirit of the Levitical tribe (Ex. 32:26-9; Dent. 33:8-11; Mal. 2:4-6), and of the sacerdotal house (Numb. 25:7, 8, 11-13; Ps. 106:30, 31) revived. His high age also (2 Chron. 24:15) places him in the list of ancient worthies. To his praise be it said, that he counselled the young king, Joash (2 Kings 12:3; 2 Chron. 24:2), in the light of whose history we must study the full account of the seal of Jehoiada (2 Kings 11; 2 Chron. 23). By a secret understanding with the Levites and commanders of the army, he effected the overthrow of Athaliah, and the elevation of Joash (7 years old) to the throne of Judah. The plan was skilfully devised, and executed with decision (Cf. BUDDEI, *hist. eccl.*, V., T. II., 393-7. Keil on Kings, p. 416, &c. Bertheau on Chronicles, p. 358).—The matter of chief interest for us in this whole case is the theological question it involves. In the Scriptural report of this event, the violent revolutionary overthrow of the reigning government is evidently approved of. Although Athaliah is nowhere called queen, both in Kings and Chronicles she is represented as having exercised supreme authority for six years (2 Kings 11:3; 2 Chron. 22:12); the preparation of the bloody scheme also implies this. What now is the practical application of the case? (Rom. 15:4), J. did not act under the direction of a special revelation, but upon private convictions (2 Chronicles 23:1, &c.). Hence older theologians appeal to this case, in determining the ethical limits to civil subordination (see Luther in J. GERHARD, *Loci Theol.*, XIV., 363, 366. CHEMNITZ, *Loci Theol.*, II., 63, ed. Frankf. THEOD. REINKINGK, *de regimine seculari et ecclesiastico*, p. 13, 16. F. BUDDEUS, *Theol. Moral.*, p. 581, 2. Hugo Grotius *de jure belli et pac.*, p. 141). But this view is hazardous, for a revolution may be prompted by fanaticism, as well as by mere frivolity. The application of this incident must be justified by duly settling the limits of such application. Two things then must be noticed: first, the government of Athaliah had reached the acme of its iniquity; next, a fair probability presented itself of subverting this wicked reign, and re-establishing a righteous government. But now the question remains open, whether, in the sphere of Gentile nations, these two things can ever concur. If they cannot, an application of the incident in this sphere must be rejected, though not in an external mechanical way, but according to the law of the Spirit, and of the Bible

self. It might then also be scripturally proven, that Schleiermacher affirms upon the nature of the idea of morality, that every violent overthrow of an established government must be condemned (Christliche Sitte, p. 265-7). This then is the point which Christian ethics must establish, if, as it is bound, it will confirm its doctrine with the seal of divine authority. The name of Jehoiada must be the touchstone of the ethical doctrine concerning civil government.

BAUMGARTEN.*

Jehoiakim, the eldest son of Josiah, and successor of his brother, Jehoahaz (see Art.), 609-598 B. C. His original name, Eliakim, was changed, at Necho's request, to the synonymous Jehoiakim (2 Kings 23:34). The defeat at Megiddo encouraged the heathen party, and Jehoahaz likewise disappointed the hopes of his friends (2 Kings 23:32). It was, therefore, easy for the king of Egypt to put Jehoiakim in his brother's place, and secure from him the tribute of a vassal (2 Kings 23:33, 35; 2 Chron. 36:3). Thus the heathen party triumphed, and introduced idolatry beside the worship of Jehovah. Jeremiah reprov'd and earned in vain (26:1, &c.). Not only were idols, cast down by Josiah, restored, but their number was increased (Jer. 7:18, 30, &c.; 8:2; 11:10, 12, &c., &c.; Ezek. 6:4; 8:3, 7-13, &c., &c.) Moreover, Jehoiakim injured the exhausted country by the erection of splendid buildings, and by oppression and injustice (Jer. 22:11-17). Pharaoh Necho seems, after removing Jehoahaz to Riblah, to have gone to Jerusalem (2 Kings 23:33; 2 Chron. 36:3. Cf. Herod., 2, 159). After arranging matters in Judea according to his mind, and securing himself against revolt, Pharaoh turned against the sinking power of Syria, and established himself at Carchemish (Jer. 26:20, &c.; cf. 22:17, and 13). But the aspiring power of Babylon could not tolerate this. Under the youthful hero, Nebuchadn., a Babylonian army routed the hosts of Egypt at Carchemish, in Jehoakim's fourth year, and pressed its conquests into Syria (Cf. Jer. 46:1-12; 25:1, &c.). It is usually assumed that at this time (or even, according to Daniel 1:1, in his third year) J. subjected himself to Nebuchadn., and became tributary to the Chaldeans. But Jer. 36:11, &c., 29; 47:1, &c., contradict this, and we are compelled to consider the three years of 2 Kings 24:1, as the last of that king. It was in the eighth year of his reign that J. became subject to Nebuchadn. (2 Kings 24:1), after having experienced many difficulties (2 Kings 24:2; Ezek. 16:57; Jer. 49:23-27; 35:1-11). But three years later, when Habakkuk had added his testimony to that of Jeremiah, a new expedition of the Egyptians (2 Kings 24:7) induced Jehoiakim to revolt from Nebuchadnezzar, whereupon N. drove the Egyptians out of Syria (2 Kings 24:7), and inflicted a severe punishment upon Jehoiakim. In this war the army was composed not only of Chaldeans and Elamites (Jer. 49:34-49), but of Syrians, Moabites, and Ammonites. J. let himself be allured into the enemy's camp and was captured and slain (Jer. 22:18, 19; 1 Chron. 36:6).

VAHINGER.*

Jehoram (Sept. 'Iwópáμ). 1) The son of Ahab,

and, after the death of his elder brother, Ahaziah, king of Israel, reigned (2 Kings 3:1) twelve years (896-884 B. C.). The words of Elisha seem to have taken effect in him, for (doubtless in spite of his mother's opposition) he abolished the worship of Baal, at least from the court and its vicinity, and confined himself to the calf worship instituted by Jeroboam. From 2 Kings 9:18-28, we conclude that he did not destroy the idolatry of Baal in Samaria. He had more political power than Ahaziah. By the aid of the kings of Judah and Edom he reduced Mesha, king of Moab, to his former vassalage (2 Kings 3:4-27). The Syrians gave him more trouble. It is true, that through the intervention of Elijah their repeated invasions were frustrated (2 Kings 6:13-23); but when Benhadad led his whole army against Israel, his long siege of Samaria caused a famine there (2 Kings 6:24, &c.). But a rumor arose in the Syrian army that the kings of the Hittites and Egypt were coming upon them, whereupon they hastily raised the siege, and departed, leaving their tents, with great booty, behind (2 Kings 7:6, &c.). Emboldened by this, J. with his royal namesake of Judah united in an expedition against the Syrians, who still held Ramoth-Gilead. In this battle he was dangerously wounded, carried to Jezreel (2 Kings 8:29, &c.), where Jehu slew him (2 Kings 9:24). By Jehu's (see Art.) command the entire posterity of Ahab was exterminated (2 Kings 10:6, &c. — 2) The son and successor of Jehoshaphat in Judah, reigned (alone) 8 years (2 Kings 8:17). He began to reign in the 5th year of Jehoram of Israel. His father had previously associated his son with himself as co-regent (2 Kings 1:17; 9:27; 1 Kings 3:1; 22:42). He married Athaliah (see Art.), the daughter of Ahab and Jezebel, and thus already betrayed a lack of theocratic feeling. This wicked woman completely ruled her husband (1 Kings 21:25; 2 Kings 8:18). It was she, doubtless, who advised him to adopt the Phœnician measure of establishing his throne, and enriching himself, by the murder of his brothers (2 Chron. 21:2-4). His misdeeds, which justly merited the overthrow of his kingdom, and the rejection of David's house, had not God been pleased to spare it for his ancestors' sake, are indicated in 2 Kings 8:19. Politically the kingdom declined under him. The Edomites (see Art.) revolted under him, and also the Levitical city of Libneh (2 Kings 8:22). The Philistines and Arabians (dwelling near the Ethiopians) were stirred up against him (2 Chron. 21:16, 17); the king's children, whom they carried away captives, were ransomed, and subsequently slain by Athaliah. His wicked life came to a painful end. Smitten with an incurable disease of the bowels, perhaps a chronic diarrhoea with colic, his decayed intestines passed from him, and he died. Denied a royal burial, his corpse was simply interred somewhere in the city of David. In Chron. 21:12, we must probably read Elisha for Elijah, who had died some time before.

VAHINGER.*

Jehoshaphat (Sept. 'Iwosápár; Vulg. *Josaphat*, *God is Judge*), the son and successor of Aza, in Judah, reigned from his 35th to his 60th year

of age (1 Kings 15:24; 22:42), 18 years coterminously with Ahab, of Israel, then 2 coterminously with Ahaziah, and 5 coterminously with Jehoram of Israel (in 2 Kings 1:17; 3:1, the text has been corrupted). He pursued the policy of his father, and was even more zealous against the high places (2 Chron. 17:6), and for the full restoration of the true worship. Although not wholly successful, he purged the land of many evils (2 Chron. 17:3, 6; 1 Kings 22:43). He also adopted a method for securing the spread of true religious knowledge among the people, which, had his successors carried it out, would have produced the happiest effect. He appointed five influential laymen, nine Levites and two priests, to visit all the cities of Judah, and instruct the people in the law. It is probable that besides the instruction thus transiently imparted, houses for prayer and public instruction were established in their route. So deeply interested was Jeh. in this measure, that in the 18th year of his reign, on his return from the unfortunate campaign against the Syrians, he himself traveled over the country, and sought to confirm what had been done (2 Chron. 19:3). In Ps. 74:8, allusion is made to the destruction of synagogues. As this Psalm, with eight others, was composed in the time of Athaliah and Joash (see *Vaihinger*, d. Psalmen d. Rhythmus d. Urchrift gemäss metrisch übersetzt u. erklärt), it follows that J.'s arrangement survived him. J. also caused the civil code to be reconstructed and strictly executed (2 Chron. 19:5-11). Zebadiah presided over the civil court, and Amariah (1 Chron. 5:37) over the ecclesiastical court. In external relations J. also adopted what seemed happy measures. Like his father, he saw that the alienations between Israel and Judah only enfeebled both, and concluded a lasting peace with the royal house of the 10 tribes (1 Kings 22:45). This was done, not from indifference to idolatry, but from political considerations, which, however, led to evil consequences for his own house (see *Jehoram* and *Athaliah*). On the same ground he joined Ahab against the Syrians, for which Elisha severely reproved him (2 Chronicles 19:2, 3; 20:34). But, notwithstanding the prophet's counsel, he subsequently made a similar compact with Ahab's son, Jehoram, against Moab. On this expedition, also, he gave proof of his piety (2 Kings 3:4). But soon thereafter, Moab and Ammon leagued with Edom (in 2 Chron. 20:2, we must read **דָּרָא** for **דָּרָא**), invaded Judah, and reached Engedi when J. heard of it. He forthwith assembled the people, and prayed to God for deliverance. The prayer was heard and help promised (2 Chron. 20:5, 17). Spiritual agents (*Ewald*, *Isr. Gesch.*, 3, 190, 1, Aufl.) were employed to discomfit the enemy (Cf. 2 Kings 6:16. &c). This incident is very obviously a different one from that in 2 Kings 3:1 (Cf. Joel 4:2, 12). The valley in which J. offered thanks after this victory is called the Valley of Blessing, a name which it may have borne in common with that mentioned by Joel (*Jehoshaphat* = of God's judgment). It was the Valley of the Kidron, for no other in the vicinity would correspond with the narrative. The proximity of it to Jerusalem would enable the

citizens to participate in the service.—The maritime expedition in which J. united with Ahaziah, from Esiongeber, took place in the 19th year of J.'s reign, whilst that against Moab occurred in the 21st, and the invasion of the three confederates in the 23d of his reign (cf. 1 Kings 22:52). It assumes, however, the entire subjugation of Edom, which must have been effected in the early part of J.'s reign (*Ewald*, *l. c.*, 3, 179, 188). There was then no king in Edom (1 Kings 22:48). J. wished to reopen the navigation of the Elamitic gulf, begun by Solomon, but failed (1 Kings 22:49). Thereupon Ahaziah (see Art.) invited him to take part in a new expedition, but J., profiting by past providences, declined. And yet in Chronicles (2 Chron. 20:25) we have a different account of the matter. The two accounts seem to conflict with each other, unless we regard the instance in 1 Kings 22:50, as a renewed proposition.—When Jehoram succeeded Ahaziah, Jehoshaphat aided him against Moab (2 Kings 3), and secured a happy result (Cf. 2 Kings 3:9 with 1 Kings 22:48). In all these instances he seems to have been animated by the hope of bringing Israel back to the true worship of Jehovah. But his worldly measures to secure this end, not only failed, but brought mischief upon his own house and kingdom. *VAIHINGER.**

Jehovah. יְהוָה is the Old Test. proper name of God, wherefore called by the Jews **שֵׁם הַשָּׁמַיְם** **רַבָּא**, the great name, **שֵׁם הַמְּיוֹהָר**, the only name, most frequently **שֵׁם הַמְּפָרָשׁ**.—I. *The pronunciation and grammatical explanation of the name.* The tetragrammaton יְהוָה has as ἀπόκρυφον in the Masoretic text, on account of a K'ri perpetuum, the points of **אֶרְוֹנִי**; on the other hand, where **אֶרְוֹנִי** stands in apposition as Isaiah 22:12, 14, etc., those of **אֱלֹהִים** (not, however, when the יְהוָה and **אֶרְוֹנִי** belong to different members, as in Ps. 16:2. The prohibition to utter the name is derived by the Jews from Lev. 24:16, by means of an interpretation of the passage already given by the LXX. (*δραμαζωρ το ονομα κυριου*), which is entirely incorrect.—How ancient this awe of uttering the name is, cannot be definitely determined. The first trace of it shows itself already in some of the later canonical books of the O. T. in the relatively less frequent use of יְהוָה in the LXX., which, in this respect, is followed by the writers of the N. T., *κύριος* being universally substituted for it. On the other hand, Sir. 23:9, *ονομασας τοι αγιου μη συνδυαζεις* only means, that the name of God shall not be unnecessarily used. With reference to the Samaritans, Josephus reports, *Ant.*, XII., 5. 5, that they built *ἀναμνηρον* *ισραηλ* on Gerizim. He also says, *Ant.*, II., 12. 4, that it was not allowed to him to speak about the name. Compare with this what Philo says, in *de mut. nom.* § 2 (ed. Marg., I., 580), and *ad Mos.*, III., 25 (II., 166); still it is remarked in the latter work, § 11 (152), that consecrated persons were allowed to hear and utter the name in the holy place. The Mishna contains

rious statements about the matter, as in Bechoth, 9. 5, Sanhedrin, 10, 1, Thamid, 7, 2, d schasaka, 14, 10. (Comp. JAK. ALTING, *exercitatio grammatica de punctis ac pronuntiatione tetragrammati יהוה*, in RELAND's *decas exercitationum philologicarum de vera pronuntiatione nominis Jehova*, 1707, p. 423, sq.). Whilst now, according to the Jews, the knowledge of the pronuntiation of the name has been lost since the destruction of Jerusalem, many earlier and later Christian theologians say that an original pronuntiation exists in the pronuntiation of יהוה. They regard it as a combination of י = יה, ה = יהוה, and ו = יהוה (comp. Stier, *Lehrgebäude der hebr. Sprache*, p. 327). That such a formation of words is entirely abnormal to the Hebrew, need scarcely be remarked. The abbreviation of the name into יה does not necessarily presuppose the pronuntiation of Jehovah. The Jewish tradition, that the name comprehends the three periods, is also justified by the pronuntiations given below. Just as little does the circumlocution of the name in Rev. 1:4; 4:8, by ὁ ὢν καὶ ὁ ᾔων καὶ ὁ ἐρχόμενος evidence for the reading Jehovah, because ὁ ἐρχόμενος does by no means stand for ἐρχόμενος (so BUXTORF, *dissertatio de nomine יהוה* in Reland, l. c., p. 386), it rather signifies nothing else than *the coming one*, wherefore, as soon as the future of the Lord became present, 11:17 (according to the correct reading), and 16:5, only ὁ ὢν καὶ ὁ ᾔων stand (see Hengstenberg, *Beitr. zur Einl. in's A. T.* Bd. II., p. 236, sq.). Concerning the attempt made in favor of the reading Jehovah by the comparison of the Latin Jupiter, Jovis (see already, Fuller in Reland, p. 448, Gataker, in same, p. 494), whereby the more complete forms, Diespiter, Diavis, are overlooked, also concerning the hypothesis, that in the pronuntiation, Jehovah, an Egyptian name of deity, consisting of the seven vocals, יהוהוהוה, is preserved, see Hengstenberg, l. c., 204, sq., Tholuck, *vermischte Schriften*, I., p. 394, sq.—To obtain the pronuntiation and grammatical explanation of the name, we need only go to Ex. 3:13. When Moses asked for the name of him who sent him, he said: יהוה אשר אֵלֶיךָ. Thus shalt thou say to the children of Israel, Ehjeh hath sent me unto you: and when, in v. 15, it is further said: Thus shalt thou say, יהוה the God of your fathers hath sent me unto you, it is clear, that יהוה is to be regarded as a noun formed from the third person of the imperfect of יהוה (the older form for יהוה), and either יהוה (יהוה) or יהוה (יהוה) is to be read. The latter pronuntiation is just as possible as the first, which is now received by the most; although the latter formation is the more common in names derived from the imperfect of the יהוה roots, as יִמְכֶּה, יִמְכֶּה, etc., show (see Caspari, *über Micha*, p. 5, sq.). According to Theodoret (quæst. 15, in Ex.) the Samaritans read the name 'Iaβé, the Jews 'Aia. Clemens of Alexandria, Strom. 5, 6, utters the name 'Iaou

(although, perhaps, 'Iaous is to be read, see Hengstenberg, l. c., p. 226). No weight is to be given to the fact, that in Diod. 1, 94, the God of the Jews is called 'Iaw, and by Philo, of Babylon, in Euseb. *præp. evang.*, 1., 9, 'Taw: for apart from the consideration, that the form יהוה, presupposed for this pronuntiation, is contrary to all analogy of the Hebrew, these forms of names are evidently formed after the mysterious name of Dionysius, which appears among the Greeks in the form 'Iaxos, but in the Semitic form runs יהוה. See, on this point, Movers, *die Phönicier*, I., Bd., p. 539, sq., especially p. 545 and 548).—The abbreviations of the name of God occurring in the Hebrew, in the pronuntiation Jahve or Jahva, can now easily be explained; viz., by apocope of the word arises יהוה, and from this, on the other hand, by further abbreviation יהוה, on the other by contracting the vocals יהוה and יהוה. The formation of nouns from the imperfect is very common in Hebrew, as well in the case of appellations (see Delitzsch, *Jesurun*, p. 208, sq., as especially of proper names (comp. יִשְׂרָאֵל, יַעֲקֹב, etc.). The names thus formed, expressing the fundamental meaning of the imperfect, designate a person according to an attribute, which continually manifests itself, and therefore is characteristic. This brings us, II., to the meaning of the name יהוה. This is, first: *he who is*, further, according to Ex. 3:14, *he who is, who he is*. God is Jehova, so far as he has entered into a *historical* relation with mankind, and continually manifests himself in this relation as him who is, and is, who he is. But as this historical relation is mediated by the revelation in Israel, he becomes first known as Jehovah according to the relation in which he has placed himself with the covenant-people. More particularly, however, there is a twofold meaning in the name. 1) God is he, who he is, so far as he, in his historically known existence, is he who limits himself, and is not limited by anything beyond himself (comp. Hofmann, *der Schriftbeweis*, I., p. 81, sq.). In this view, the name leads into the sphere of divine *freedom*—not in the sense of *arbitrariness*, but of absolute *self-dependence*. From this follows, 2) the absolute *consistency* of God, or this, that in everything, in word as well as in deed, he essentially agrees with himself. So far as the name, as it occurs in Ex. 3:13, sq.; 6:2, sq., is used in relation to the divine decree of election and the promises flowing therefrom, his immutable faithfulness is contained in the second point. That God, as Jehova, is the *immutable* one, is declared, Mal. 3:6 (comp. on this passage Hengstenberg, *Christologie*, 1, Aufl., 3, Bd., p. 419). The name seems to refer to both the absolute self-dependence and absolute consistency of God in Isaiah 41:3; 43:13; 44:6, etc.—Many, especially Jewish theologians, love to translate יהוה by "the eternal one," and certainly this attribute of the divine being is contained in the idea of Jehovah, as already.

Abraham, Gen. 21 : 33, called on the name of Jehovah as that of the *eternal* God.—The comparison of the name Jehovah with the general designation of the Divine Being אֱלֹהִים and יְהוָה will aid in elucidating it, as far as these expressions stand alone, without the article, and without being limited by the use of an adjective or a dependent genitive. We start out from this point, that the *historical* manifestation of God is essential to the idea of Jehovah, according to what has been already remarked, whereas Elohim as such does not yield to a historical process, but is absolutely transcendent to the world, a difference which is already manifest in the relation of Gen. 1 : 1, sq., to 2 : 4, sq. Accordingly, whatever falls under the general cosmical activity of God is referred to *Elohim* or *El*; on the other hand, the government of God in his kingdom on earth is referred to *Jehova*. Therefore God is merely Elohim to the heathen world, before he reveals himself to it in his theocratic glory of judge and redeemer (see already, Gen. 9 : 26, sq.). Specially instructive as regards this difference is Num. 16 : 22, comp. with 27 : 16. Compare also Ps. 19, where in reference to the revelation of God in nature v. 1, *El* is used, on the contrary, in reference to the revelation in the law, from v. 7 to the end, *Jehova* is used. Connected herewith is the fact, that God only as Jehovah is the *living* God, and he is called this not because he is the author of all being, but because he makes himself known and felt in historical manifestations, in word and deed (comp. Deut. 5 : 23; Joshua 3 : 10, etc.). Thus Jehovah is the living God, who *doeth* whatsoever he *pleaseth*, Ps. 115 : 3, who hears prayer, makes known his counsel, manifests himself as saviour and judge, etc., as opposed to the gods of the heathens, who reveal and do nothing. Wherefore, there can be no greater oath in Israel, than *Jehovah lives* (יְהוָה חַי, never אֱלֹהִים). How clearly conscious the O. T. is of this difference, is shown by certain modes of expression running through it, of which we mention the following: All expressions which refer to revelation, occur almost always only in connection with יְהוָה; so כֹּה אָמַר, מַעֲוֹת, נֶאֱמַר, דָּבָר יי, etc., also שֵׁם. Moreover, the theophany belongs to Jehovah, wherefore, the angel, in whom God appears, is generally called מַלְאָךְ יי. And as it is Jehovah, not Elohim, who has intercourse with men in human form, the anthropomorphisms are almost entirely transferred to Jehovah, ex gr. the hand of Jehovah, mouth, eyes, voice of Jehovah, very rarely of Elohim. Especially remarkable is the change of expression in Gen. 7 : 16.

According to all thus far said, the name Jehovah is so connected with the idea of God in the Old Test., that, III., its *origin* can only be sought for in the revelation of the O. T. (comp. Hävernicks spec. Einl. in den Pentateuch, 2. Aufl. von Keil, 1856, p. 75). With reference to the hypothesis, which would derive the name

from Egypt, Phoenicia, and India, compare Tholuck, in literar., Anz., 1832, No. 27–30, also his vermischte Schriften Tbl., I., p. 376 sq. In later times, Röhk (die ägyptische u. semitische Glaubenslehre Anm., 175, p. 146) has again asserted the Egyptian origin of the name, in that he combines it with the name of the Egyptian god of the moon, Joh. But not only Exodus 5 : 2, but also the entire history of the exodus from Egypt is against such a derivation of the name.—The only question remaining is that with regard to the *time* of the origin of the name. The decisive passage on this point is Ex. 6 : 3. According to some this passage declares, that the name יְהוָה was first revealed to Moses, and that the *knowledge* of it was wanting to the patriarchs. (Thus, already, Jer. Ant., II., 12, 4). The passage thus interpreted stands in irreconcilable contradiction with the jehovistic sections of Genesis, especially with 4 : 26; 12 : 8, et al. According to another interpretation, this passage declares, that the name יְהוָה was not yet *known* to the patriarchs, that the perfect experience of what God as יְהוָה was, was wanting to them. (See especially Kurtz, Gesch. d. Alten Bundes, Bd. I., 2. Aufl., p. 345, sq., comp. with Bd. II., p. 67). The passage is then analogous with Ex. 33 : 19, where also mention is made, not of the revelation of a new title, but (comp. 34 : 6) of a more complete disclosure of a quality of the divine essence. The passage regarded in itself admits of both interpretations; although the first must, on account of the connection with v. 7, include the thought of the second. The following considerations make *against* the first interpretation: 1) The at least sporadic occurrence of יְהוָה also in those parts of Genesis which must be referred to the elohistic original document; 2) the occurrence of יְהוָה in the name of the mother of Moses יוֹכֶבֶד, Ex. 6 : 20, a circumstance which led Ewald to the supposition that the name Jehovah was used earlier at least among the maternal ancestors of Moses. Also the names occurring in the genealogies of Chronicles I. 2 : 25; 7 : 8; 4 : 18), Achija, Abija, Bithja are justly made to have weight by Keil (über die Gottesnamen im Pentateuch in der lutherischen Zeitschrift, 1851, II., p. 227). That the name Jehovah does not occur more frequently among the proper names known to us from the earliest times, proves nothing against the existence of this name, because it also appears very rarely among the proper names of the next following centuries, only frequently since the time of David. Finally, 3) It is altogether improbable that Moses, who had a revelation of the God of the fathers to bring to his people, should do so with the use of a name of God heretofore unknown to them. There is valid reason to suppose, therefore, that the origin of the name is pre-Mosaic.

OEHLER.—Beck.

Jehu (יְהוּ), son of Jehoshaphat, the son of Nimshi. King of Israel. His history is related in 2 Kings 9 and 10. It is an evidence of the terrible judgment that befalls apostates from God. Its object is to show that divine retributions are visited upon daring sins. Jehu

as no other significance than to be the instrument to execute such a fearful retribution. The measure of sin in the house of Ahab was full. During his reign, and that of his son, Jehoram, the queen Jezebel, the wife of Ahab (see the Art.), continued to practice the abominations of Baal, despising all Jewish doctrines and customs. Already, during the lifetime of Ahab, the entire destruction of his house was predicted by Elijah. Jehu became the avenging sword to execute this prediction. He is described only as being the executor of this judgment of God, and he regards himself only as being such. He had no other mission than to execute vengeance, and not to awaken a new divine life. He was anointed as king by a disciple of Elisha, in order to be a sword against transgressors, and having destroyed the house of Ahab, and burned the house of Baal, his mission was at an end. He reigned 28 years in Samaria. (3103–3131 of the Creation, or 885–857 A. C.). See 2 Kings 9 and 10.

PAULUS CASSEL.—Beck.

Jephthah (יִפְתָּח; LXX., Ἰεφθά; Vulg., *Jephthē*; Luth., Jephtha), an Israelite hero in Gilead, whose history is narrated in Judges 11 and 12. To estimate him justly, we must have reference to these two chapters alone, and to no extrinsic information. We know only *their* Jephthah, and none other. He was the son of a Gileadite by a harlot. After the father's death the legitimate sons thrust him out, and suffered him not to inherit with them. Jephthah, deprived of his rights and homeless, fled to another country, where he became the chief of a band of adventurers. He is called "a mighty man of valor;" it seems, therefore, that by brave deeds at the head of his men he had made for himself a name. Hence the Gileadites in their distress applied to him for help. In the wars with the Ammonites, the Israelites beyond the Jordan were by their proximity chiefly exposed to depredations. Gilead, therefore, became the scene of the distress which Ammon brought upon Israel. The great men of Gilead are ready to offer the chieftaincy to him who will venture the struggle with Ammon. Jephthah possesses their confidence, and they make the offer to him. In order to explain the sacrifice of his daughter, it has become customary to portray him as a wild and ungodly man, hardened in robbery and murder. For this there is not the least reason: for more than any other judge he bases his resolution and actions upon God and his word. He does not repay the Gileadites for their former rigor, but says to them: "If ye bring me home again to fight against the children of Ammon, and the Lord deliver them before me, shall I be your head?" They call God to witness that it is their sincere intention to place him at their head. They proceed together to Mizpeh, and made him their captain. The words "Jephthah uttered all his words before the Lord in Mizpeh," can only mean that J. accepted his new office on the testimony of God; and that he undertook his present work in honor of God and his cause. So much the narration tells us. For the Israelites had sunken through their sins: and the hero who was to rescue them could labor and fight

only as in the sight of God. The negotiations with Ammon, also, show this. "What hast thou to do with me," asked J. of the king of the Ammonites, "that thou art come against me to fight in my land?" The king has no resource but to justify himself by remote historical reasons: that Israel had been a standing injustice to Ammon, ever since it had come from Egypt; for it had taken away his land from Arnon to the Jabbok and Jordan. Jephthah, well acquainted with the journey of Israel through the wilderness, replies in a convincing manner. He shows that by divine right Israel possessed the land of the Amorites. Very characteristic is the following: "So now the Lord God of Israel hath dispossessed the Amorites from before his people Israel, and shouldst thou possess it? Wilt not thou possess that which *Chemosh* thy god giveth thee to possess? So whosoever the Lord our God shall drive out from before us, them will we possess." That is, your title of possession and ours are the same. Besides, he says, three hundred years have already passed to assert this claim. He concludes: "I have not sinned against thee, but thou doest me wrong to war against me: the *Lord the Judge be judge this day* between the children of Israel and the children of Ammon." The *Spirit of the Lord* had come upon him, and he burned for the victory in order to seal the rights of Israel and the testimony of God. Everything was lost, if he should not gain the victory. This explains the vow which he made to God, viz.: "If thou shalt without fail deliver the children of Ammon into mine hands, then it shall be that whatsoever cometh forth of the doors of my house to meet me, when I return in peace from the children of Ammon, shall surely be the Lord's, and I will offer it up for a burnt-offering." The Lord gives him a complete victory, and he returns home in triumph. When he came to Mizpeh, his daughter comes to meet him. She it is, then, who becomes the victim of his vow. He cries out: "Alas, my daughter! thou hast brought me very low, and thou art one of them that trouble me: for I have opened my mouth unto the Lord, and I cannot go back." The daughter replies, that J. should do to her according to his vow. It is a deeply stirring tragic act, which the Scriptures describe. After J. had gained all, he loses what is dearest to him. He has gained power, but has no heir. But after the victory he is faithful to the God to whom he had cried before the battle.—It is inconceivable how J. has merited this sad stroke: For that God is gracious to him, appears from his decisive victory. The vow itself is an expression of his burning zeal to save Israel. He wishes to thank God with all his heart. To make a vow was very natural from the Israelite customs. If, then, his vow brings a great sorrow upon Jephthah, God no doubt wishes to inculcate some great principle. In his vow J. evidently left it to the guidance of God, to point out the sacrifice which he desired. In his zeal to vanquish the enemy and give thanks to God, J. cannot remember any particular object sufficiently valuable to dedicate unto God. He therefore leaves it to God to point out the sacrifice. He vows with all his heart; God accepts

the vow, and suffers it to be realized in a manner which went beyond the expectations of Jephthah. Hence his only daughter comes out to meet him. God did not choose an animal, or an object of mere property: gratitude to God must proceed from the deepest love of the heart. A broken heart is acceptable to him. Self-conquest and the surrender of what is dearest is well-pleasing to him. This precept could become intelligible to Jephthah through his sorrow, when the fulfilment of his vow revealed to him its nature. His vow had, against his will, become a reality. God had shown him the measure by which He estimated what was dearest, and had directed it that J. should discover in grief the true nature of gratitude and offering to Him; for grief makes sacred the offering. What man gives without his heart's blood cleaving to it, is a mere work, no sacrifice. J., therefore, is only instructed, not punished, by his grief; he discovers the true nature of a sacrifice. This precept appears typically in more than one instance in the old covenant. God desires no human sacrifice. That he demands it of Abraham, is a mere trial from which he delivers his joyfully obedient follower. But in the case of J. grief must be added, since without it his sacrifice would be no sacrifice. God had not tried him, but he has tried God. In the case of Abraham we discover the nature of a constant faith; in that of J., the nature of divine verity, which bursts all forms and pretences, and demands its own rights.—That he is not absolved from his vow, makes it evident that no bloody sacrifice is intended. Otherwise God, in the manner of idols, had directed the bloody sacrifice of a child. From this ethical precept itself of the narration, we premise the exegetical evidence of an unbloody sacrifice. The opinions relating to the fate of Jephthah's daughter have had their own history. Great importance has been attached to the fact that the ancient Jewish interpretation, as given in the Talmud and Midrach, accepted also by Josephus, regards the bloody sacrifice as really accomplished. This interpretation is readily explained from the views of that age concerning vows.—In J. we are to learn the danger of a vow wrongly expressed: the vow was a wrong one, since it included possibilities which were contrary to the law. We are further to learn from it a one-sided conscientiousness in the interpretation of vows. J. is censured for the obstinacy with which he seems to have avoided an absolution from his vow by a priest: i. e., the views of a later age were transferred to him. As he is reported to have fulfilled the vow, it was concluded that he had sacrificed her, because *another* fulfilment except by a sacrifice was beyond the views of the age. The Church Fathers accepted the Jewish interpretation, which also prevailed up to the Reformation. Protestant interpretation followed later Jewish commentaries, which had set aside the Talmudist tradition, and proven very convincingly that J. had, indeed, consecrated his daughter to God, but had not sacrificed her. Catholic interpreters generally retained the former interpretation. Rationalism, also, has generally accepted the older view. Calmet, Michaelis, Studer, Ewald,

and Munk, defend the bloody sacrifice: Salmshütz is an exception to the above. We will try to show that the sacrifice was an unbloody one.—We have already remarked that the Scriptural narrative gives us no reason to regard J. as a wild barbarian: he has been invested with such a character, however, in order to make this bloody sacrifice possible. Though appalled by the fearful consequence of his vow, he was, nevertheless, sufficiently strong to fulfil it. As soon, however, as we admit that the bloody sacrifice was necessarily involved in his vow, we must also admit that a human sacrifice was consciously involved in it. If the words, "Whatsoever cometh forth of the doors of my house to meet me, when I return in peace, shall surely be the Lord's, and I will offer it," necessitates him to the bloody sacrifice of his daughter, he must necessarily have had a human sacrifice in contemplation; for it is impossible that he could have thought or spoken this of an animal merely. That a person should come forth *from the door of his house to meet him*, was, at least, as probable as that an animal capable of being sacrificed should do so. Jephthah was not master of his senses, if he did not think of this. He already included the possible dedication of a person, for the phraseology of the vow evidently contemplates more than the offering of a mere animal.—Jephthah's vow no doubt intended men, as was allowed also by the Mosaic law. But burnt-offerings of men were not allowed. A vow was like a contract agreed upon between two parties. Hence it had to be clearly expressed, so that the vower could in no manner evade it. This is the case with J.'s vow. The words, "It shall surely be the Lord's, and I will offer it up for a burnt-offering," contemplate a twofold possibility which he had in his mind. The person who may meet him, shall belong unto God; and the animal to be brought as a burnt-offering. This we must admit, if we do not suppose that J. had *already meditated* bringing a human sacrifice. His trouble is not accounted for by the fact that he had to offer up a human person; but that it was his *daughter* from whom he was to separate. From the Oriental seclusion of the daughters he had not expected that *she* would come to meet him. He had thought of an offering from his property; now one from his inmost heart is demanded. To this conclusion we are also brought by verse 39. If he had sacrificed her as a burnt-offering, this would have been plainly stated. It would not have been said: "He did with her according to his vow;" but "He offered her for a burnt-offering." That this is not said, indicates, indeed, that a painful vow had been fulfilled in her case, but that she had *not* been made a burnt-offering. For a mere hesitation to report her case is not admissible in the Scriptures, but least of all in the Book of Judges.—How the vow was fulfilled, is not told; it was sufficient to indicate the deep precept, to which the narration pointed. The painful import of the vow, which took the vower himself by surprise, and the fidelity with which he nevertheless fulfilled it, were the chief points of the pathetic act. The vow is fulfilled: the manner of doing this is therefore left in the background. There

the hints, nevertheless, which may lead us to a just conclusion as to the fate of the daughter.—She was J.'s only daughter, and dwelt with him. From this alone we may suppose that she was yet unmarried (v. 34). When she became acquainted with J.'s vow, she requested two months to bewail her virginity. This would be a strange request if she supposed that she was to be made a burnt-offering. If "to bewail her virginity" meant only to bewail "her youthful life," it is hard to see why this should take place *upon the mountains*. It is also contrary to human nature that a child which is to die, should during the interval separate herself from her father. But since the narration lays special stress upon the bewailing of her virginity, this latter must have some relation to the fulfilment of the vow. If a virgin *bewails* her virginity, it must be because this remains an undeveloped bud; being prevented, not by death, but by life itself.—Among ancient nations the marital relation was the completion and crown of youth. Their young men and maidens are dry branches if they do not ripen into this relation. The union of a youth with a virgin is heretofore the brightest festival of the ancients, their religious festivals alone excepted. Hence, that a maiden, instead of being married, should find her mission in preserving her virginity, is an idea foreign to the Biblical sphere. It almost seems as if an unmarried woman had no place in it. Hence it has remained an uninterrupted tradition among the Jews, that it is a calamity for a maiden to remain unmarried. The Mishna classes an ascetic woman among those who corrupt the world. It is an extremely true picture of ancient life, according to which the daughter bewails her virginity, by which she is excluded not only from the joy of her heart, but also of her entire female nature. She, the only ornament and joy of her father's house, is to wither; and her house is to become a dead one.—Jephthah fulfils his vow, and devotes his daughter to God. "What shall meet me, shall surely be the Lord's." He marries his daughter unto God; and with this, all mere human joys perish. She consecrates to God her chastity, but she bewails it; and the daughters of Israel lament with her. She brings her sorrow as an offering, as the father brings his. Only in this way can we understand the words added: "And she knew no man." What would these words import, if she had really died as a sacrifice? And yet they stand in close relation to the preceding: "He did with her according to his vow." They become plain when we regard them as *expressing the fulfilment of the vow*; i. e., if we refer them to the future, not to the past. J. fulfilled his vow and she knew no man; hence the daughters of Israel went yearly to lament her four days. Her chastity was the offering which J. made. In what manner she devoted her life to God, cannot, of course, be known. It was sufficient for the precept involved in the narrative to give the result that a vow had been made with God, and had been fulfilled by the faithfulness of a maiden for the sake of her father. The daughters of Israel praised the daughter of J. four days every year. Wherefore the praise, if she had been slain a sacri-

fice? In the latter case her father would not have been dependent upon her voluntary offering. But the vow to belong unto God throughout an entire life of chastity, is based in the pure heart of the daughter. If she keeps the vow, it is her glory as well as her sacrifice that for the sake of her father's sacred word she forgot joy of heart and hymeneal song.—How modestly it is added, that the daughters of Israel went with her *upon the mountains* to bewail her virginity! If her life was intended, these tears might have flowed at home just as well. But her virginity was the subject of their lamentation; this could not be uttered in the city and in presence of men. Modesty required the solitude of mountains for this. The pure heart of the maiden does not unfold itself before the eyes of all, but pours forth its wailing of love in sacred seclusion.—There is a tragical feature connected with the three great heroes, Gideon, Jephthah, and Samson, around which the histories of the Book of Judges are clustered. Gideon consecrates the conquered gold as an ephod unto God, and thus creates a snare for Israel. Samson bears upon his head the consecration of God, and perishes triumphantly in that power which he had previously lost. Jephthah is the most excellent of the three. He sacrifices unto God his love, his joy, and the hopes of his house. He is therefore justly classed by the apostle among the bearers of a heroic faith and victorious trust in God (Hebr. 11:32). The Scriptures narrate another act of heroism on the part of Jephthah, by which he humbled Ephraim. It would seem that the latter was envious of J.'s triumph, by which he had gained for Gilead the glory of saving Israel. Jephthah inflicted upon them a severe overthrow, and afterwards judged Israel for six years. With him the judgeship departed from Gilead.

PAULUS CASSEL.—Reinecke.

Jeremiah, the Prophet. I. The name יֵרֵמְיָהוּ (Jer. 27:1; 28:5, 10, 11, 15; 29:1. Dan. 9:2; in Greek *Iereμίας*) is not with Simon (Onomast., V., T., p. 535) to be derived from יָרָם (יהָ, elatus Domini), but according to many analogies (ex. gr. יִפְרִיָה, יִבְנִיָה) from יָרָם, and can only mean: *Jova jacit, projicit, dejicit, or ejicit* (comp. Hengstenberg, Christol. 2 Aufl. II., p. 400). The prophet of this name, whose book occupies the second rank among the prophetæ posteriores (comp. Havernick. Einl., II., 2, p. 26. De Wette, Einl., p. 13 and 155), was the son of the priest Hilkiab of Anathoth, in the land of Benjamin (1:1; 11:21, sq.; 29:27; 32:7, sq.). Concerning Anathoth (now Anata) comp. Joshua 21:18; 1 Chron. 6:60; Neh. 11:32. According to Eusebius (Onomast., s. v.) and Jerome (on Jer. 1:1; 11:21; 32:7) it was situated three Roman miles, according to Josephus (Ant., X., 7, 3) 20 stadia, consequently, as the two statements differ only about half a Roman mile, about a half geographical mile north (Isaiah 10:30) of Jerusalem. Comp. Robinson, Palestine; Zeitschr. f. d. Kunde des Morgenl., Bd. II., p. 354, sq. That the father of the prophet

was the same with the high-priest Hilkiah (2 Kings 22:4, sq.; 2 Chron. 34:9) has been supposed by a number of ancient and modern commentators (Clem., Alex., Jerome, Kimchi, Abarbanel, Eichhorn, v. Bohlen, Umbreit), which is refuted as well by the simple

סִי-הַכֹּהֲנִים 1:1, as by the consideration, that the place of residence does not justify an inference in favor of a high-priest, or especially of such an one from the house of Eleazer (comp. 1 Chron. 6:4 in the Hebr. with 24:3, and 1 Kings 2:26). According to Jer. 1:6, Jeremiah was called to be a prophet while yet young, according to 1:2; 25:3, in the thirteenth year of Josiah, i. e., 629 A. C. It was at the time, therefore, when Josiah (2 Chron. 34:3) had already commenced his reformatory labors, and also the time, when the overthrow of Assur by the fall of Nineveh (626 A. C.) was near at hand—a time, accordingly, when the chief internal and external enemies of the theocracy, idolatry, and Assur, received heavy blows. But the reformation of Josiah was not lasting, and the place of Assur was immediately filled by the more terrible power of the Chaldeans. According to 11:21, it is probable that Jeremiah prophesied for a time in Anathoth, but later we find him established in Jerusalem, where he proclaimed the word of the Lord now in the temple (7:2; 26:1), then at the gates of the city (17:19), then also at other places (18:1, sq.; 19:1, sq.), also in the king's palace (22:1; 37:17), by word, writing (29:1, sq.; 36:2, sq.), and signs (18:1, sq.; 19:1, sq.; 27:2). The first 22 years of his prophetic labors passed away without any special personal events, and only the substance of his address during this period is preserved in chapters 2–10. The year 605, however, constitutes a decisive turning-point. This was the first year of Nebuchadnezzar (25:1), the year of the battle at Carchemisch, of the beginning of the spread of the Chaldean rule over Upper Asia, an event, which, in connection with the destruction of Egyptian rule over Judea (2 Kings 24:7), involved the beginning of Chaldean dominion and the exile. It is true, Jeremiah had long before prophesied the destruction of the theocracy by a nation from the north, but that this nation should be the Chaldeans he had not yet said. He says it *first* in the significant prophetic address, chap. 25, which is very properly to be regarded as *the outline of the entire compass of Jeremiah's prophecy*. Evidently it was the important event of this year, the collision of Egyptian and Chaldean power at Carchemisch, and the victory of the latter, that furnished the external historical impulse to this enlargement of the prophetic vision. It is true, Nebuchadnezzar did not seize upon Media immediately after this battle, because, according to Baronius (Jos., *Ant.*, X., 11, 1), the intelligence of his father's death recalled him to Babylon. But four years later (the eighth of Jehoiakim, comp. Jos., *Ant.*, X., 6, 1) he returned and made Judea tributary (2 Kings 24:1). If Jeremiah's situation was perilous before the appearance of the Chaldeans on the scene of action, because he prophesied destruction in case of impenitence (26:1, sq.),

it became much more so, after that event had given occasion to a twofold progress in the labors of the prophet. As to the first, it is very significant, that Jeremiah, after the battle of Carchemisch, sketches for the immediate future a definite *prophetic programme*, not only of the theocracy, but also of the Chaldean kingdom, and of the nations subjected by it (chapter 25, 27, 29). Although he does not say so in express words, yet it is evident, that he regards the supremacy of Nebuchadnezzar as *an fait accompli* in the fourth year of Jehoiakim. The victory at Carchemisch appeared to him as the principle, which, as the first manifestation of a divine decree, carried in its bosom all the subsequent results. Wherefore, from the year 605 onward he regarded Nebuchadnezzar as being, if not *de facto*, at least *de jure*, and that *de jure divino*, the lord and master of all the nations named, chap. 25:11, sq. Comp. concerning this form of implied prophecy, *Havernick*, *Einl.*, II., 2, p. 46, sq.—The second sign of progress in Jeremiah's labors as prophet at this time, appears in the fact, that in the same fourth year of Jehoiakim, he received a command from the Lord that he should *write down* his prophecies (chap. 36). That such a command should come to him just in this year, is a plain evidence, that his prophetic labors were brought to a point of decisive conclusion. What we read in chapters 25–29, is the quintessence and centre of Jeremiah's prophecy: having reached this point it was complete and ready to be fixed in writing. At the same time, however, a last attempt was now to be made, by the combined force of the appeals in this form, to impress the hard heart of the nation (36:3, 7). But it resisted this divine appeal. Then, a few years after the battle at Carchemisch, Nebuchadnezzar really came to accomplish the things prophesied concerning him. Jehoiakim was subject to him three years (2 Kings 24:1). He dying an ignominious death (comp. 2 Kings 24:6. 2 Chron. 36:6, with Jer. 22:18, sq.: 36:30), was succeeded by his son Jehoiachin, who only reigned three months. Nebuchadnezzar, who had determined, as it seems, to weaken the Jewish states, first sent his troops against Jerusalem, although there was no rebellion against him existing. Jehoiachin resisted these; but when Nebuchadnezzar himself came, he yielded (נָשָׁב), 2 Kings 24:12). The policy of N., when he wished to reduce a state to harmlessness, consisted in removing into exile its best elements (see the Art. *Babyl. Capt.*). Thus he did with Judah (2 Kings 24:13–16; Jer. 29:1; 52:28). Jehoiachin (whose end is related, Jer. 52:31–34; 2 Kings 25:27–30) was succeeded by his uncle Zedekiah, son of Josiah (Jer. 37:1; 2 Kings 23:34). Under Zedekiah the situation of the prophet became more painful in proportion as the impiety and obduracy of the nation, and especially of its leaders increased (Jer. 21:24). It is true, he even yet proclaimed grace on the condition of repentance (21:11, sq.; 22:3 sq.; 34:4, sq.), and the people really made a beginning of reformation (34:8, sq.),—but it was transitory. Zedekiah, who, according to 2 Chron. 36:13), swore allegiance

Nebuchadnezzar, broke his oath. He looked to Egypt for aid (Ezek. 17:15; Jer. 37:5). But this aid only came after the Chaldeans had besieged the city. Their marching off against the Egyptians, awakened deceptive hopes. Jeremiah destroyed these (37:6-11), and here properly begins the period of his sufferings. It is true, that previous to this time, he was not free from all kinds of troubles and dangers (Jer. 11:18; 15:20, sq., 18:18, sq.; 20:1, sq.), but from this time forward his persecutions were continuous and extreme. He was first cast into prison (37:11-26), and persevering here in proclaiming the decree of the Lord, he was cast into a dungeon full of mire (38:1-13), from which he was taken at the intercession of Ebed-Melech (39:16-18). This was the height of his suffering, and how dreadful it was appears from chap. 39.—Finally, in the eleventh year of Zedekiah, Jerusalem was captured. Concerning the fate of the prophet at this time there are evidently two accounts, inasmuch as, according to 39:11-14, it appears, as if he had already been liberated in Jerusalem, whilst, according to 40:1, sq., he is taken in chains to Rama, and only there liberated. The contradiction here is only in appearance, as is also indicated by **וַיֵּשֶׁב בְּתוֹךְ הָעָם**, 39:14. For,

if Jeremiah, after his liberation by the *captains*, remained among the people, he might easily, in the confusion, have been treated by the *soldiers* as the other people were treated (comp. *Hitzig*, Jer., p. 325). After his release he went to Gedaliah at Mizpeh (40:1-6); after G.'s death, the people compelled him to accompany them to Egypt; although he opposed the expedition most decidedly as being displeasing to God (41:17; 43:7). The Jews settled at Tahpanhes (*Taphn.* LXX.). There he once more prophesied, announcing destruction, both by word and signs (43:8-13, 44), not only to his nation, but also to Egypt and its king. This is the last notice that we have of Jeremiah in the Bible. What is further reported about him is traditional. According to Jerome (*adv. Jovin.*, 2, 37), Tertullian (*Scorp.*, 8, comp. *Seder ol. rabba*, 26), he was stoned in Egypt, but, according to Epiphanius, at Tahpanhes (*περί τῶν προφητῶν*, etc., *Opp.*, II., p. 239, comp. *FABRIC.*, *Cod. pseudep.*, V., T., p. 1110, sqq.). Another tradition has it, that Alexander the Great had his ashes brought to Alexandria (Dorotheus, *συγγράμ.* in *Chron. pasch.*, p. 156, ed. Dindorf, p. 292). His grave is now shown at Cairo (*Lucas*, *Reise in's Morgenland*, I., p. 37).—As greatly as Jeremiah was persecuted by his countrymen during his life, so greatly was he honored by them after his death. His person was transformed into an ideal, and a multitude of wonderful traditions glorified him (2 Macc. 2:1, sq.; 15:14, sq., *Epist. Jer.*), and his countrymen, by degrees, came to regard him as being by so much the greatest of all the prophets, that they called him *ἐκπονήτης*, and believed in his return at the end of days, in which sense Deut. 18:15, was interpreted. Even in the New Test. reference is made to such a belief, as still then existing, Matt. 16:14; John 1:21; Coll. 6:14; 7:40. Comp. *Sirach* 49:6-8. *Carpov*, introd., P. III.,

C. 3, § 2. *Bertholdt*, *Christ. Jud.*, § 15, p. 61-67. The same, *Einl.*, IV., p. 1415, sq. *De Wette*, *bibl. Dogmatik*, § 197.

II. From this historical representation, it can be perceived under what peculiarly difficult circumstances Jeremiah exercised his *prophetic office*. It can be truly said, that he fulfilled the most difficult mission that was ever committed to a prophet. Being by nature of a tender and timid disposition, more like John than like Peter, or the Baptist, or even Elias, nevertheless the task was laid upon him to carry on a warfare of life and death with powerful and bitter enemies. And, as if the enmity of his own nation was not enough for him to endure, he was required to proclaim to foreign nations judgments, threatened them by Nebuchadnezzar (25, 27, 46-51). On this account he became the object of hatred and contempt from all sides, especially to his own nation. His life was in constant danger (11:21; 20:10, sq.; 38:4, sq.), his honor was continually brought into contempt (20:7-9; Lam. 3:14). He, therefore, curses the day of his birth, like Job (20:15), and desires to be rid of his office (20:9). But the consciousness of his calling allowed him no rest (20:9), and in this weak one also the strength of the Lord became more perfect (1:18, sq.), which he also greatly needed. Everything was against him, and he stood alone, at least at the time of the greatest misfortune, without a protector or even a companion in office. For, of the prophets who were contemporaneous with him, Zephaniah and the prophetess Hulda (2 Kings 22:14; 2 Chron. 34:22) prophesied in the time of Josiah, Habakkuk (see the Art.) and Uriah (26:20, sq.) in the time of Jehoiakim, consequently during the first and more peaceful period of his life. Ezekiel and Daniel, it is true, survived with him the great catastrophe, but they lived at a distance, even already in exile, and he could find no support in them. We read, it is true, that some of the people and princes were his friends (26:16, 24), that even King Zedekiah was secretly attached to him, but what was all this against the hatred of the great mass of the people and their leaders, of the princes, priests, and false prophets. His position was so peculiar and his mission so extraordinary, that we must regard him as the antitype, not of John the Baptist (*Hengstenberg*, *Christol.*, II., p. 400), but of Christ. The first destruction of Jerusalem typified the second. And as Jeremiah was the prophet of the first, so was Christ the prophet of the second (Matt. 23:29-39; Luke 13:34, sq.; 19:41-44; 23:27-31).

III. With regard to the *literary* character of Jeremiah we can say of him in general: *le style c'est l'homme*. As a writer he appears in one view as a brazen wall, in another as soft wax. As a brazen wall, because no worldly power was able to prevent him from uttering his prophecies; as soft wax, because we are persuaded, that the man who spoke these powerful words was of a tender disposition and broken heart. On this account his style lacks the grand, bold terseness and concentration, which we admire so much in Isaiah and Hosea. His periods are long and verbose. When he quotes from others,

he does it in such a way as to take away all that is severe and harsh. Comp. KUEPER, *Jerem. librorum ss. interpretes* (Berlin, 1837), p. XIV.: "*Sæpius complura epitheta adduntur et difficiliora vel audaciora aut fusius explicantur, aut formis ætate Jeremiæ usitatoribus receptis in speciem leviores abeunt.*" This peculiarity shows itself also in the dialectics of the prophet. Whilst he holds fast to his fundamental thoughts with a monotony so steady, that the contents of his prophecy seem almost meagre, on the other hand, the execution manifests such a richness, that the unity and connection of the thought seem to suffer thereby. There is no dialectic development of conclusion from premises in his writings, but we behold, as it were, a series of tableaux pass before our view, each of which presents the same chief person and the same scene, but in manifold groupings (comp. Nägelsbach: *Der Prophet Jerem. und Babylon*, Erlangen, 1850, p. 32, sq.). These tableaux constitute the strophes, into which the discourse of the prophet evidently divides itself, so truly, that pretty equal measure and similar structure recur in all (comp. Ewald, *die Propheten des A. B. II.*, p. 13). This peculiarity of his dialectics refutes the objection, that Jeremiah is illogical, and repeats continually (comp. MAURER: *non ad certum quendam ordinem res dispositæ sunt et descriptæ, sed libere ab una sententia transitur ad alteram.* The transitions are certainly not logically mediated in words, but the logical progress still exists internally, and the repetitions are just the necessary consequence of the tableaux-form style. But there is also another kind of repetition very frequent with Jeremiah, viz., this, that he not only very often quotes himself (a table of these self-citations are in the treatise above-named, p. 128, sq.), but also frequently repeats what others have said. Jeremiah lived especially in the Pentateuch, and of its five books especially in Deuteronomy (comp. Kueper, l. c., and König, *Altest. Studien*, 2. Theil: *Das Deuteronomium und der Proph. Jer.*). On account of this reproduction of the thoughts of others, it is objected, that he lacks originality and power (comp. Knobel, *Prophetismus der Hebräer*, II., p. 267, sq.) But this objection is as groundless as the other, that he lacks poetry. With regard to the first, it must be first proven that Jeremiah himself produced nothing, or only a little and that not important; for, in itself, to absorb one's self in predecessors is more matter of praise than of blame. With regard to the want of poetry, I refer simply to Umbreit (Commentar, p. XV., sq.), who attributes the highest poetical talent to Jeremiah. Moreover, that the style of Jeremiah is not polished, cannot be denied. The judgment of Jerome refers to this: "*sermone aliis prophetis videtur esse rusticior,*"—although, on the other hand, CUNÆUS (*de rep. Hebr.*, Lib. III., cap. 7) says justly: *Jeremiæ omnis majestas posita in verborum neglectu est, adeo illum decet rustica dictio.* Finally, with regard to the language, it is yet to be remarked, that the influence of the Aramaic idiom is very perceptible in Jeremiah. Compare Hävernicks, Einl., I., 1. p. 231, sq. Knobel, *Jeremias chaldaizans*, dissert. Vratisl., 1831.

IV. If we proceed now to the *Book* of the prophet, we meet first of all the question concerning the arrangement of the same. The views on this point are manifold, and for them we must refer to the introductions and commentaries. We shall content ourselves with a statement of the question and an expression of our view concerning it. This much is certain, the book of Jeremiah, within the introductory first and the closing 52d chapter, whose authenticity is very doubtful, is divided into two chief parts of unequal length. The first part embraces chap. 2-45: theocratic prophecies, to which chap. 45 (referring to Baruch) is to be regarded as an appendix. The second part embraces chap. 46-51: prophecies against foreign nations. Thus far the arrangement of the book is clear. Comp. De Wette, Einl., p. 323. Also in the first part there can only be dispute about the arrangement of chap. 21-36, for the chap. 2-20, as also 37-44, follow each other in chronological order. But before we pass to the disputed point (chap. 21-36), it is necessary to look at another subject.

We read, viz., chap. 36, that Jeremiah, at the command of the Lord, committed his prophecies to writing in the form of a book. This book, once burned and then made anew, can, if we compare 36:1 with v. 5 and 32, not well have been completed in its last form before the sixth year of Jehoiakim. But now, that our present book cannot be the one then completed, is evident not only from the fact, that there are many sections in our book that were written after the sixth year of Jehoiakim, but also from the circumstance, that in 1:2, sq., the period of time within which the things recorded in the book occurred is designated, on the one hand, as the 13th year of Josiah, and on the other, as the 5th month of the 11th year of Zedekiah. It is seen from this, that Jeremiah added what he prophesied after the 6th year of Jehoiakim, and that he made a new conclusion after the 5th month of the 11th year of Zedekiah, for which the catastrophe that then occurred gave a very natural occasion. Still even this date is overstepped by the contents of the book, for we find in chap. 40-44 many events of a later date, everything, viz.: that occurred from the destruction to the last prophecy in Egypt. Therefore, either the prophet himself made the additions, without changing the date in 1:3, or some one else incorporated the discourses composed after the 11th year of Zedekiah. That, however, the book does not now contain the original order of its parts, is in the highest degree probable. For not only does 1:2, sq., and 36:2 seem to indicate a chronological arrangement of the original work, but also the character of the arrangement now followed in the critical part of the book, favors the supposition, that we are not to regard it as the work of the prophet, as will hereafter appear.

If we now turn our attention to the arrangement and sequence of the parts, the discovery of these is made easy, because all the sections are designated by superscriptions. The fundamental type of these superscriptions is: יהוה הַדְבָר אֲשֶׁר הָיָה אֶל יִרְמְיָהוּ מֵאֵת (7:1; 11:1, et al.), which, however, occurs also

breviated and modified, according to circumstances, (comp. *Ewald*, *Proph. d. A. B.*, II., 12). Thus the following sections result: I. chap. 2. II. chap. 3:1-6, 30. III. 7:1-10, 11. IV. 11:1-13, 27. V. 14:1-17, 27. VI. 18:1-20, 18. This is the series of the portions containing the exclusively prophetic discourses. It is remarkable, that just these portions, which are destitute of all chronological designations, are nevertheless chronologically arranged, whilst the following portions, which are full of dates, generally do not at least follow in chronological order. For it can now be regarded as fully settled, that the above-named six sections follow each other in this order of time, inasmuch as the first and second belong to the time of Josiah, the third and fourth to that of Jehoiakim and Jehoiachin, the fifth and sixth to that of Zedekiah, which, however, we are not able to show more particularly here.

The seventh section embraces chap. 21:1-24, 10, and with this section begins the series of chapters, extending to chap. 36, in the order and sequence of which interpreters at all times have felt the absence of a fixed principle. We shall see how far this reproach is well grounded. In the first place, chap. 21 is evidently connected with chap. 20, because in both the name Pashur occurs at the beginning (20:1: 21:1). Chapter 22 is connected with chap. 21, because the former begins with the same subject with which the latter closes (comp. 21:12, sq., with 22:3, sq.). Chapter 22, however, is an integral part of a larger whole, which embraces chap. 22 and 23, and contains prophecies against the chiefs of the theocracy, prophets, and kings. With the latter chap. 24 is connected, because it belongs to the same historical period, viz., the period after the overthrow of Jehoiachin, with which the preceding portion (22:24-30) concludes.—The *eighth section* embraces chap. 25:1-29, 32; chap. 25 constitutes the central prophecy, which, chronologically considered, certainly does not stand in a right relation to chap. 24. But how are chap. 26-29 connected with chap. 25? In the first place, chap. 27 stands in the most evident internal connection with chap. 25, if you compare v. 2, sq., with 25:15, sq. Chap. 28 is connected with chap. 27, not only because, according to v. 1, it belongs to the same time, but also because it contains, like chap. 27:9, sq., a severe testimony in word and deed against the false prophets. The same reason connects chap. 29 with 28, apart from the fact, that chap. 25 is closely connected with chap. 28 by the mention of the 70 years, v. 10 (comp. 25:11). Chap. 26, however, which in itself has no kind of connection with 25, but has, notwithstanding, such a connection with 27-29, viz.: because its subject is the conflict of the prophet with the false prophets. But it must *precede* chap. 27, because, according to v. 1, it belongs to the beginning of the reign of Jehoiachin, whilst chap. 27, in spite of the title, in which **יְהוֹיָכִים** instead of **יְדַכְיָה** is a palpable error (comp. vs. 3, 12, 19, sq.; 28:1), belongs, evidently, according to its whole contents, to the time of Zedekiah. Thus, therefore, chap. 26 is not directly connected with chap.

25, but only through the following chapters, and thus stand in a kind of double relation, in that they, by the duplicity of their contents, are, on the one hand, closely related to each other, and on the other, with chap. 25. Section IX. embraces chap. 30-33, prophecies of a comforting and messianic character. That they stand connected is explained by their contents, and by the express command, 30:2,—that they stand here is explained by the historical basis of chap. 32 and 33, which belong to the last period of Zedekiah's reign.—Chapters 34, 35, and 36 constitute each a separate section, as appears from the title as well as from their contents. They stand together here, however, because they all three have the common tendency to place in the clearest light the disobedience of Israel against the word of his God, by contrasting it with the obedience, which the heathen tribes rendered to the command of their human ancestor. They stand, finally, in this place, because the first of them belongs to the time of Zedekiah. Chapters 37-44 are continuous historical narrations, and present no difficulties in regard to their arrangement. Chapter 45 refers to a private person, but that the discourse should take the form of a separate chapter, is evidently an honor that is shown to the faithful servant of the prophet. Chapters 46-51 contain the prophecies against the foreign nations, concerning their relation to each other, and to chap. 25 (their existence is presupposed in this chap., v. 9 and 11). I refer to my treatise: *Jer. u. Bab.*, p. 27-32.

The insight into the original arrangement of the book is made more difficult by the relation of the Alexandrian text to the Masoretic, because both differ materially in arrangement. It may be premised here, that Jeremiah was especially honored in Egypt, where he last taught and probably closed his life, by the Jews living there, just on account of this circumstance. They regarded him as pre-eminently *their* prophet, as the Egyptian prophet (comp. *Chron. pasch.*, p. 156. *FABRIC.*, *Cod. pseudep.*, V., T., p. 1108. *Apocr. N. T.*, p. 1111. *Hävernicks*, *Einl.*, I., 1. p. 45; II., 2. p. 259). The study of him was very diligently pursued, and it is not improbable, that, as *FABRIC.*, *Cod. pseudep.*, V., T., l. c., says: "*Codices græcæ versionis jam privata quorundam Apocryphis se delectantium studio interpolati, jam librorum oscitantia manci fraudi beato Martyri fuerunt.*" The Alexandrian version departs from the Hebrew text, partly in the arrangement of the chapters, partly in the text itself. In the latter respect the difference is so great, that it is supposed to be necessary to believe in two different versions of the text: a Palestinian and an Alexandrian, and several critics, as J. D. Michaelis (*Anm. z. Übers. des N. T.*, T., I., p. 285) and *Movers* (*de utriusque recensione vaticiniorum Jeremiæ indole et origine*, Hamb., 1837), give the so-called Alexandrian the preference. But this position is untenable. An impartial examination shows most strikingly, that the Alexandrian translator did not understand the Hebrew, and that he was intent on translating as briefly and as fitly as possible, and in the Alexandrian sense. All the differences, therefore, can be

explained by the defectiveness of the translation, as has been shown by *De Wette*, Einl., sixth edition, p. 131, sq., 327–331; by *Kueper*, l. c., p. 177, sq.; by *Hävernich*, II., 2. p. 250, sq.; *Wichelhaus*, *de Jeremiae versione Alexandrina*, Halle, 1847, p. 67, sqq.; and by *Nägelsbach*, l. c., p. 86, sq.—The second above-named difference consists in this, that the LXX. introduce the prophecies against the foreign nations at the 13th verse of chap. 25, and so, that they do not stand in the order in which the Masoretic text gives them. The following table will exhibit the difference:—

LXX.	Masor.	LXX.	Masor.
25: 15, sq.	49: 35, sq.	31.	48.
26.	46.	32.	25–15, sq.
27, 28.	50, 51.	33–51.	26–44.
29.	47: 1–7; 49: 7–22.	52.	52.
30.	49: 1–5; 28–33; 23–27.		

In several editions of the LXX. ex. gr. in Reineccius, the chapters stand in the Masoretic order. Comp. Joh. Gottfr. *Eichhorn*, Bemerkk. über den Text des Pr. Jer. im Repert. f. bibl. und Morgenl., Lit. I., p. 141, sq.

The integrity of Jeremiah has been, in proportion, but little called into question. Modern critics pronounce 10: 1–16 the work of Pseudo-Isaiah (comp. contra *E. Meier*, *Gesch. d. post. National-Lit. d. Hebräer.*, Lpz., 1856, p. 391): the same also should have revised 30, 31, 33, 50, and 51; the same was done to chapters 25 (vv. 11–14), 27, 28, 29, by a later person, chap. 48, first by Pseudo-Isaiah, then also by a later hand (so *Hitzig*). All these doubts rest on dogmatic suppositions. Concerning them compare the introductions and commentaries. Of the genuineness of chap. 50 and 51, see *Nägelsbach*, l. c.

Of a different kind are the doubts as to the genuineness of 39: 1, 14, or, at least, of a part of these verses. These doubts are based on external signs: a) Chap. 38 closes with the words:

וְהָיָה כִּבְרֹךְ יְרוּשָׁלַיִם, containing

a premise without a conclusion. b) The conclusion can only be found in chap. 39: 3, or 11, or 15. c) The vv. 1–2 and also 4–10 are an abbreviated and modified reproduction of 52: 4–16. d) The notices of the taking possession of the city are not necessary at this place, they break the connection, etc. For these reasons I am also disposed to regard 39: 1–14 as partly interpolated. I also think it necessary to regard the passages, 50: 41–46 and 51: 19, as glosses, see my treatise, *Jer. u. Bab.*, p. 126, sq.—Chap. 52 is in a condition similar to chap. 39: 1–14. This chap. is either a modified counterfeit of 2 Kings 24: 18; 25: 30, or the reverse relation exists. My opinion is, that chap. 52 is not, at least in this position, the product of Jeremiah. According to another view (comp. *Louth*, *de s. poes. Hebr.* ed. Michaelis, p. 416) chap. 52 does not at all belong to liber vatt. Jer., but is the procemium to Lamentations, which were originally connected with the prophetic book (see the Art.). Besides the works already named, the following critical treatises can be consulted: *intempestiva lectionis emendandae cura e Jerem. illustrata* (4 Programme von *Dr. Mich. Weber*, Wittenberg, 1785, '88, and '94); *J. Andr. Mich. Nagel*,

dissert. in var. lectt. 25 capp. priorum Jer. ex duobus codd. Mss. hebr. desumptas., Altorf, 1772; *Ant. Fr. Wilh. Leiste*, *observ. ad Jer. Vatt. spec. I.*, Gött., 1794; *Joh. Jac. Guilcher*, *observ. crit. in quaedam Jerem. loca in the Symbolis Haganis Cl. I.*; *Jeremias vates e vers. Juxtarum alex. emendatus a G. L. Spohn*, Lpz., 1824.—As to the characteristics of the prophet compare: *Niemeyer*, *Karakteristik der Bibel*, V., 472, sq.; *Roos*, *Fusstapfen des Glaubens Abraham*, hrg. v. Wilh. Fr. Roos, 1838, II., p. 281, sq.; *Sack*, *Apologetik*, p. 273, sq.; *Hengstenberg*, *Christologie*, 1. Aufl., III., p. 495, 2. Aufl., II., p. 399, sq.; *E. Meier*, *Gesch. d. poet. Nat. lit. der Hebräer*, 1856, p. 385, sq.; *Zinzendorf*, *Jeremias, ein Prediger der Gerechtigkeit*.—The most important exegetical works are: The patristic commentaries of *Jerome* and *Theodore*. Of the period of the Reformation, the commentaries by *Calvin* and *Ecclampadius*. Later: *Piscator* (Herb., 1614); *Sanctius* (in *Jer. et Thren.*, 1618); *Ghislerus* (Comm. in *Jer. cum. catena PP. graecorum, et comm. in Lamentt. et Baruch*. Lugd. Bat., 1623, 3 Tom. Fol., comp. *Fabric.*, bibl. gr. ed. Harl. III., p. 734; *Seb. Schmidt*, 1685; *Herm. Venema*, Leov., 1765, 2 Voll., 4; *Benj. Blayney's* *Jerem. and Lamentt.*, Lond., 1784; *J. D. Michaelis*, *observ. phil. et crit. in Jer. vatt. et Thr. ed. J. F. Schleusener.*, Gött., 1793; *Chr. Fr. Schnurrer*, *observ. ad vatt. Jer. Tuh.*, 1793–97; *Hensler*, *Bemerkk. über Stellen in Jer. Weiss.*, Lpz., 1805; *Gaab*, *Erkl. schwerer Stellen in den Weiss. Jer.*, 1824; *Dahler*, *Jérémie traduit sur le texte original, accompagné de notes*, Strassb., 1825, 2 Voll.; *Rosenmüller*, *Scholien*; *Maurer*, 1833; *Ewald*, 1840; *Hitzig*, 1841; the same, *die proph.*, BB. d. A. T. übers., Lpz., 1854; *Umbreit*, 1842; *Heim* and *Hoffmann*, *die vier grossen Propheten erbaulich ausgelegt aus den Schriften der Reformatoren*, Stuttg., 1839; *Ersch und Gruber*, *Art. Jeremia von E. Rödiger*. *E. NÄGELSACH.—Beck.*

Jeremiah, Lamentations of (אִיכָה), be-

cause they commence thus, or קִינָה, *threni* or *lamentationes*), stand, according to the most ancient accounts we have of the succession of the books in the canon, immediately after the prophetic book of Jeremiah: *Jos.*, c. *Apion*, I., 8; *Melito of Sardis* in *Euseb.*, *H. E.*, IV., 26; *Origen* in *Euseb.*, *H. E.*, VI., 25 (*Ἰερემίας οὐκ ἀρνήσκει καὶ τῇ ἐπιστολῇ ἐν ἑνὶ Ἰερემίᾳ*); *Concil. Laodic.* Can. 60 (in *Mansi*, *Concill. nov. et ampliss. coll.*, II., 574). *Ier.*, Βαρούχ, ἀρνήσκει καὶ ἐπιστολαί; *ΕΠΙΦΑΝ.*, *de mens. et pond.* c. 22, 23, *Opp.*, II., 180, ed. *Petav.*; *ἔστι δὲ καὶ ἄλλη μικρὰ βιβλος, ἣ καλεῖται Κινῶδ, ἥτις ἐρμηνεύεται ἀρνήσκει Ἰερემίον αὐτῇ δὲ τῷ Ἰερემίᾳ συναπτεται, ἥτις ἐστὶ περισσὴ τοῦ ἀριθμοῦ καὶ τῷ Ἰερემίᾳ συναπτεται*; *HIERON.*, in *Prol. galeat. et al.*—The Talmud first separated the smaller book from the larger, incorporated it with the five Megilloth, and placed it with these among the hagiographa. Comp. *Thenius*, *Comm. zu den Klagl.*, p. 115. That some regard chap. 52 of the prophecy by Jeremiah not as the conclusion of this work, but as the introduction of Lamentations, has previously been remarked. The book contains, in five chapters, five lamentations over the down-

II of the kingdom of Judah, and the destruction of the holy city by Nebuchadnezzar. It is difficult so to characterize the contents of these that each shall be the bearer of a specific thought, although this has been attempted by several (*Lowth*, de s. poes. Hebr.; *Ewald*, poet. BB., I., p. 145, sq.; *Keil*, in *Hävern.*, Einl., III., p. 510). The alphabetical succession of the verses (see below) made such a disposition difficult for the poet. Still it is evident, that chapter 3, as well on account of the number and of the increased artificialness of the alphabetical arrangement, as also on account of the contents, forms the climax of the whole. If sorrow bows down into the depths, but comfort lifts up on high, then this 3d chap. represents evidently the height, for it is full of glorious comfort, and perhaps it is not without design, that of the 66 verses of this chapter, just the second third part, consequently the middle, not only of this chapter, but of the whole book, is of such comforting character. It is also not to be overlooked, that chap. 3 is divided trichotomically, inasmuch as every letter of the alphabet recurs three times in succession. — As has been already observed, the four first of these Lamentations are arranged alphabetically, similarly to Psalms 25, 34, 37, 119, et al. Chap. 1 and 2 consist of each 22 triple verses. Chap. 3, as said, has 22 triplets, each of which repeats its letters three times. Chap. 4, has 22, composed of two members each; chap. 5, finally, although it has also 22 verses, is still not alphabetically arranged. Another dissimilarity consists in this, that in chap. 2, 3, 4, Δ stands before Υ , whilst in chap. 1, the correct order is observed. The different attempts to explain this variation, see in *Keil*, *Hävern.*, III., p. 512, sq. That the prophet Jeremiah is the author of Lamentations is guaranteed by its contents and style (comp. *Pareau*, Comm. in Thren. Lugd. Bat. 1790, observ. gener., § 6–8; *Kueper*, Jer. II., 55, interp., p. 45–47), is confirmed by tradition (comp. LXX., 1:1: καὶ ἐγενετο μετὰ τὸ αἰχμαλωτισθῆναι τὸν Ἰσραὴλ, καὶ Ἱερουσαλὴμ ἰρημωθῆναι, ἐκάθισεν Ἱερεμίας κλαίων, καὶ ἐδρησεν τὸν δῆμον τοῦτον ἐπὶ Ἱερουσαλὴμ καὶ εἶπε: πῶς ἐκάθισεν, etc., Hieron., l. c., Talm., Baba bathra, Fol. 15, Col. 1), and is acknowledged by the critics with few exceptions: *De Wette*, Einl., p. 409; *Ewald*, l. c., p. 145 — the latter expresses himself somewhat indefinitely. Consult also: *Tarnov*, Comm., 1707; *J. Th. Lessing*, observ. in Tristia Jer., 1770; *Pareau*, Thr. Jer. phil. et crit. ill., 1790; *Schleussner*, cursæ exeg. et crit. in Thr. (in Eichh., Rep. XII.); *Thenius* (Kurzgef. exeg. Hdbch.), 1855. — Translations: *Riegler*, 1814. Conz, in *Bengel's Archiv.*, IV., p. 161, sq., 422, sq.; *Goldwitzer*, mit Vergl. der LXX. u. Vulg. u. Krit. Anm., 1828; *Wiedenfeld*, 1838; *Ewald*, poet. Bd. d. A. T., 1839. E. NÄGELSBACH. — *Beck*.

Jeremiah, Epistle of, occurs in many MSS. and editions, as the 6th chap. of Baruch. But it is wholly independent of that book. For, apart from its import, many MSS. omit it, or assign to it another place. Theodoret would not have passed it over, in his Comm. on Baruch, had he found it there. It is a verbose, rhythmical, admonitory address of Jeremiah the prophet, to

the Jews who were about to be led away to Babylon, warning them against idolatry, in imitation of Jer. 29 and 10:1–16. All evangelical theologians admit that it was written originally in Greek, and is an Alexandrian production; only Romish theologians (excepting such as *Jahn*, Einl., II., Theil, 867) insists upon its authenticity. In 2 Macc. 2:2, there is a reference to v. 4; but ἀπεσθὲ θεοὺς ἀργυροῦς is so indefinite that the reference is disputed. That v. 3 has reference to Dan. 9:24, is also questionable. The latest Comm. on this ep. is that of *Fritzsche*, kurzgef. exeg. Handb. zu d. Apokr., d. A. T., p. 205, &c. E. NÄGELSBACH.*

Jeremiah II., Patriarch of Constantinople, born at Akkali (Anchialus on the Black Sea). Although not remarkably talented, he was appointed Metropolitan of Lerissa, Thessalia, in his youth; and when scarcely 36 years of age was chosen Patriarch of Constant. by a Synod held there, May 5, 1572. In this office he displayed much zeal. His life is of special interest for us, on account of the correspondence opened with him, in 1573, by the Tübingen theologians, in which Crusius and Andreä were prominent. Although several letters were sent, together with copies of a sermon, and the Augsburg Confession in Greek, their efforts to convert the Patriarch, or bring their University into closer connection with Constantinople proved fruitless. After considerable delay, Jeremiah yielded to their urgent solicitation for his opinion of the Augsburg Confession, and in a reply, covering nearly 90 pages, folio, attempted to refute it in every point, excepting its agreements with the Greek against the Romish Church. He died in 1594. (Cf. the diary of *Stephen Gerlach*, Sr., publ. by his grandson, Samuel Gerlach, 1674. CHR. F. SCHNURRER, orat. acad. historiam liter. illustr., ed. H. E. G. Paulus, Tübing., 1828, p. 113. Theol. Quartalschr., 1843, p. 544. *Karamsin*, Gesch. d. russ. Reichs, Bd., IX., p. 181, &c.). TH. PRESSEL.*

Jericho (LXX., Ἰεριχώ; *Jos.*, Ἰεριχὺς; *Strabo*, XVI., 2, 41, Ἰεριχούς), the largest city in the valley of the Jordan, lay on the W. side of the river, and N. of its entrance into the Dead Sea. It is one of the oldest cities of Palestine, and was a royal residence before the Israelites took it (*Joshua* 2:2, 3; 8:2; 10:1, 28; 12:19), belonging to the Kenites (*Judges* 1:16, cf. 4:11). For the account of the wonderful conquest of the city, see *Joshua* 3:16; 4:12; 6:1, &c. Notwithstanding the curse pronounced by Joshua upon any attempts to rebuild the city, we find it soon after (*Judges* 3:13) occupied by Israelites (cf. 2 Sam. 10:5; 1 Chron. 20:5), though not fortified. Hiel, the Bethelite, was signally punished for an attempt to restore it (1 Kings 16:34. See *Maurer*, Comm. on Joshua, p. 59, &c.). Subsequently, Elijah spent his last days there, and a school of prophets was located in it (2 Kings 2:4, 5, 15). It lay in the plain (Deut. 34:3; *Joshua* 4:13; 5:10) in which the Chaldeans took King Zedekiah (2 Kings 25:4; *Jerem.* 39:5). After the exile the inhabitants returned thither (*Ezra* 3:34; *Nehem.* 7:36), and the men of Jericho helped them to build the walls of Jerusalem (*Neh.* 3:2). The Syrian, Bacchides, subsequently

fortified the city (1 Macc. 9:50), over which one Ptolemy was placed, who occupied the fortress Dagon (Jos., *B. J.*, I., 2, 3; 1 Macc. 16:11, 14, 15). Herod M. (see Art.) took and plundered Jericho, but, after diverting the revenues of the city from Cleopatra to himself, beautified it with palaces, and re fortified the citadel, calling it Cypros (Jos., *Antt.*, XV., 4, 1, 2; 16, 5, 2; 17, 6, 5; *B. J.*, I., 21, 4, 9; 33, 6). — In the N. T. Jericho is mentioned as the place in whose vicinity the Lord restored two blind men, and where he tarried with Zaccheus (Matth. 20:29, 30; Mark 10:46, 47; Luke 18:35, &c.; 19:1-10). The fearful wilderness between Jericho and Jerusalem is still the haunt of robbers (cf. Luke 10:30). Under the Romans Jericho was the chief city of a toparchy, and was visited by Vespasian shortly before his departure from Palestine (Jos., *B. J.*, 3, 3, 5; 4, 8, 1; 9, 1; 5, 2, 3). During the siege of Jerusalem by Titus, Jericho is said to have been overthrown, but again rebuilt (*Euseb.* and *Hieron.* in *Onomast.*). Afterwards it is but rarely named. N. Adamnanus (c. 680) describes the site of the city as without a human habitation, excepting the house of Rahab, and as covered with barley-fields and vineyards. During the Crusades sugar-cane was cultivated in the adjacent plain, of which the water-courses of Syrian structure still furnish evidence. Its present inhabitants pay no attention to the cultivation of the soil. The fertility of the oasis on which Jericho stands, to be attributed to the Ain es Sultân (probably referred to in 2 Kings 2:19-22), was anciently celebrated. Palm-trees grew there, hence its name (Deut. 34:3; Judges 1:16; 3:13; 2 Chron. 28:15), roses (Sir. 24:18). The plant brought back by pilgrims as the Jericho rose, is not a rose, nor even indigenous there. Cf. *Ritter*, *Erdk.*, XV., 1, p. 511; *Robinson*, *Palest.*) and balsam (Jos., *Antt.*, 4, 6, 1; 14, 4, 1; 15, 4, 2. *B. J.*, I., 6, 6, 18, 5; 4, 8, 3). Josephus gives a glowing description of the surrounding country, calling it an earthly paradise. And yet in the midst of this fertile plain, easy of cultivation, there is at present a wretched, filthy village of c. 200 inhabitants, *Erika* or *Ri'hah* (*Merâs*, I., 496), a single deserted palm-tree, reminding one of the Palm city. N. of the village is the castle, a tower 30 feet square, and 40 feet high, almost in ruins. Tradition calls it the house of Zaccheus. Robinson supposes it was built in the 12th cent. Remains of water-courses, and traces of walls near *Ri'hah*, indicate the site of ancient Jericho; although the location of the earlier city, and that rebuilt by Herod, or during the Byzantine period, cannot be ascertained without further researches. (See *RELAND*, *Palest.*; *Robinson*; *Gadow*, *Ztschr. d. deutschen. morgenl. Gesellsch.*, II., 1848, p. 55, &c. *Ritter*, l. c.).

ARNOLD.*

Jeroboam. 1) The son of Nebat, of the tribe of Ephraim, was the first king of the ten tribes, 975-54 B. C. He was born at Zereda (1 Kings 11:26; 2 Chron. 4:17; Judges 7:22; Joshua 3:16; 1 Kings 4:12), near which place Solomon established his great brass foundries (c. Kings 7:46). In the fortification of Jerusalem, Jeroboam displayed such skill that

Solomon made him ruler over the party furnished by the tribe of Joseph (1 Kings 11:28). But he took advantage of the growing opposition of that tribe to such exacted services, and having been symbolically designated by the prophet Ahijah, as the future ruler of the ten tribes, he headed an insurrection against Solomon. The scheme failed, and he fled to Egypt, where he remained until Solomon's death (1 Kings 11:14, 18, 40). But as soon as he heard of this event (according to the reading of the LXX., cf. *Ewald*, *Isr. Gesch.*, 3, 117, &c.) he returned and abode in his city, protected by his tribe. Rehoboam, instead of taking warning from the discontentment excited by his father's severe exactions of service and taxes, in which Judah seems to have been measurably shunned (it is not named in 1 Kings 4:7-20), assumed a still more imperial tone. Ten tribes revolted, and all Rehoboam's attempts to bring them back to allegiance proved futile. Jeroboam became their king, and proved himself competent for the office. He fortified Sichem and Peniel, at the junction of the Jabbok with the Jordan; at first he lived in Sichem, but afterwards at Thirza (1 Kings 12:25; 14:17). That he understood how to secure the affections of his people is evident from the general sorrow exhibited at the death of his promising son, Ahijah (14:13, 18). On this occasion, however, the prophet told him of God's displeasure with him, for having failed to use his power for the maintenance of the true religion. For in order to confirm and perpetuate his reign, he put a stop to pilgrimages to the temple in Jerusalem, by building temples in Dan and Bethel, where sanctuaries previously existed (Judges 18:30; Gen. 28), and there reinstating the worship of Jehovah under the similitude of a golden calf (1 Kings 12:27-29). But this arrangement aroused considerable opposition, not only among the priests and Levites, but among the more thoughtful of the people. Hence it led to large emigrations to Judah (2 Chron. 11:13-16). But J. persisted, and appointed priests from among the lowest classes. The success of the measure was owing to the taste of the people for sensuous forms of religion. This idolatry became so deeply rooted that none of J.'s successors ventured to abolish it. Hence the frequently recurring phrase: he walked in the way of Jeroboam, the son of Nebat, &c. (1 Kings 16:26; 12:25-33, &c.) He also changed the feast of Tabernacles from the seventh to the eighth month, thus the more to estrange Israel from Judah, and he probably succeeded in this because in the north the vintage occurred later in the season. If J., in his adherence to these untheocratic arrangements, proves himself, on the one hand, a man born to rule, he belongs, on the other hand, to those rulers who adopt any measures to secure their end. This was his weakness, and laid the mine which ultimately overthrew his house. Ahijah must have been sadly deceived in him (cf. 1 Kings 11:38; 14:7, 8, &c.). It must have been hard for him, as well as for the prophets of Judah, one of whom went into the revolted kingdom to testify against Jeroboam (1 Kings 13:1, &c.), to reconcile the opinion that the revolt had been

providentially ordered, with its sad consequences. In that kingdom it was hoped to secure for the prophetic offices a position independent of royal supremacy; but, instead of this, the office became involved in endless conflicts with the throne (*Ewald*, l. c., 3, 131, &c.). Jeroboam died after reigning 22 years, and was succeeded by his son, Nadab.

2) *Jeroboam II.*, the son and successor of *Josiah* of Israel, 825–784 B. C., 2 Kings 14: 23. But this leaves an interregnum of 12 years, whereas, according to 2 Kings 14: 29, his son *Zachariah* immediately succeeded him. Hence *Thenius* assigns 51, and *Ewald* 53 years to his reign (825–772 B. C.). He was a warlike, wise, and energetic ruler, under whom the sinking kingdom seemed to revive again (2 Kings 13: 5), as did Judah under *Josiah*. His renown was foretold, especially by *Jonah*, in prophecies which have been lost. He restored the old boundaries of the nation, and made Ammon and Moab vassals (2 Kings 14: 25, &c.), though he did not exterminate them (Amos 1: 3; 2: 3). In consequence of his victories the population of the tribes beyond the Jordan so increased that a new census was ordered (1 Chron. 5: 17). Throughout the kingdom temporal prosperity abounded to the end of his reign. But as both king and people lacked moral and religious steadfastness (Hosea 7: 3–7), this prosperity only led to luxury and licentiousness (Amos 4: 1–8), and even to shameful idolatry (Hosea 4: 12–19; 7: 1–7). The prophetic office, once so mighty an agency in Israel, lost its power (see *Amos*, *Hosea*), and was suppressed by Jeroboam (Amos 5: 10, 13; Hosea 4: 4). Thus the sluices of iniquity and violence were thrown wide open, and J. finally hastened the downfall of the kingdom. For when the fear of the prophets was gone, royalty in Israel lost its necessary counterpoise, and sank helplessly to ruin. The prophets named foresaw this, and were commissioned to proclaim the approaching downfall of the nation. VAHINGER.*

Jerome (*Sophronius Eusebius*), is justly styled the most learned Father of the Western Church, although, in originality, depth, and loftiness of thought, inferior to Tertullian, Cyprian, Ambrose, and Augustine. He was born in 331 (see *Shröckh*, K. G.), at *Stridon*, a border-town between Dalmatia and Pannonia, which the Goths afterwards (377) overthrew. He, with his friend Bonosus, received his first instruction in his Christian father's (*Eusebius*) house, but was soon sent to Rome, and there taught Roman literature by the grammarian, Donat, and orator Victorinus. At the same time he studied Greek philosophy. But there he likewise experienced Christian influences. He tells us (*Comm. in Ezech.*, 40) with what feelings of awe he saw the relics of martyrs in the catacombs. He was baptized in Rome, and then traveled through Gaul, along the Rhine, and tarried awhile (372) in Aquileja (Aglar in Friaul). There he joined Evagrius, Innocentius, and Heliodorus, in a journey to the East. During a fever, which seized him in Antioch, he had that dream which led him forever to renounce the study of heathen authors, and give himself wholly to divine things (see *Apolog.*, II., T. II.,

p. 560. Cf. *HEUMANN*, *de Ecclasi Hier. &c.*, *Diss.*, I., 655). Still we find him, subsequently, making diligent use of the classics in his study of the Bible (see Ep. LXX. *ad Oceanum*, &c.). He became severely ascetic, retiring to the desert of Chalcis. His feeble body failing under his austerities, he repaired to Antioch, and, against his will, was ordained presbyter by *B. Paulinus*. Although past a student's age, he was not ashamed to sit at the feet of Gregory Naz. in Constantinople. Matters arising from the Meletian controversy in the Church of Antioch led him to go to Rome with Paulinus and Epiphanius. There Damasus perceived his learning, and engaged his services (though not as an amanuensis). Some think the domineering manner of Damasus made Jerome somewhat pliant and servile. Soon his piety and learning drew around him a circle of Christian women, widows and virgins (*Marcella*, *Paula*, and her daughters, *Blasilla* and *Eutochium*, *Principia*, *Fabiola*, *Asella*, *Sophronia*, *Melamia*, *Felicitas*, &c.), to whom he expounded the Scriptures, and gave counsel in questions of conscience, so that he acquired a growing influence over them. This subjected him to ridicule and even suspicions. But disregarding this, *Paula*, and her daughter, *Eustochium*, accompanied him on a pilgrimage to the holy places in Palestine. Alexandria and the monastic societies of the Nitrian Desert also claimed their attention. Jerome retired to a cell near Bethlehem, *Paula* supplying his wants. Houses for the entertainment of pilgrims arose, also a nunnery, over which *Paula* presided, besides a residence for monks, at the head of which stood Jerome (Ep. c. VIII., *ad Eustochium*, and *PALLADI*, *hist. Lausi.*, p. 114, 115). There he abode, in pious and learned employment, until his death (September 30, 420), meantime, also, participating in the controversies of the Church. He was buried in Bethlehem. When he was canonized, his remains, it is said, were taken to Rome, and deposited in the Church of St. Mary Maggiore (but see *Shröckh*). All sorts of wonderful stories were circulated about him, both before and after his death. Ecclesiastical art has even decked him with a Cardinal's hat, on account of his relation to Damasus. The lion and death's head seen in his pictures, symbolize his anchoritism, and his writing or reading position refer to his literary character. And, indeed, he owes his renown mainly to his learning, for upon the theology of the age he exerted no great influence. He was painfully jealous of his orthodoxy (Epp. XV., XVI., *ad Damasum papam*). Once an ardent adherent of *Origen*, whose writings he translated into Latin, he afterwards opposed him, and thus broke friendship with *B. John* of Jerusalem and *Rufinus* (see *Origenistic Controversy*). About this time, (394) he (60 years old) was acquainted with Augustine (then 40 years of age). Although he could not fully agree with A., he greatly respected him (Epp. LVI., LXVV., CI., CII., CXXXIV., *Opp.*, I., 1043). In the *Pelagian controversy* (see Art.) he was wholly with A., and called the Synod of Diospolis (*Lydda*, 415) *synodum miserabilem*. But he hardly apprehended the real essence of Augustinism, for he

gave great prominence to work-holiness, and only condemned the extravagance of Pelagius' proposition: *posse hominem sine peccato esse si velit*, and *facilia esse Dei præcepta* (Ep. 133). In his other theological views he cherished, in opposition to Origen, a strong realism, especially in regard to the resurrection of the body (*Opp.*, II., 118). He most zealously contended for the perpetual virginity of Mary, against *Helvidius*, for the meritoriousness of fasting and celibacy, against *Jovinian*, and for the worship of martyrs and their relics, against *Vigilantius* (see Art. Cf. *Opp.*, II., 206, sq.; 231, sq., and Ep. 50, *ad Domnionem*; 385, &c. — But his great work was the *Itala*, the Latin version of the Bible, from which the Vulgate sprang (see *Latin versions*, &c.). He also merits high consideration as an *exegete*, on account of his superior knowledge of the Hebrew and Chaldaic languages, although he followed Jewish traditions too closely, and even indulged in allegories and witticisms. One valuable result of his exegetical labors was the sundering of the Apocrypha from the canonical books of the O. T.; the latter he allowed to be read for edification, but not to have doctrinal authority (*Prolog. galeatus*). His *geographical* and *antiquarian* writings (*Opp.*, III., 121, &c.) laid the basis for Biblical archæology, and his work upon *Biblical authors* (*de vir. illustr. s. de scriptoribus eccles.*) the foundation for *patristics*. He also translated into Latin the history of Eusebius, the lives of the anchorites Paulus, Hilaria, and Malchus, and the monastic rules of Pachomius. His numerous *letters* possess historical value, referring as many of them do to the movements, vices, and follies of his age, and furnishing a sort of autobiography. — *Luther*, *Clericus* and others could not endure him (*Luther's Tischr.*, Walch, XXII., 2070. *J. Clerici*, *Quæstiones Hieron.*, Amstel., 1700, 12mo.). *Erasmus* highly commends him, and, aided by *Æcolampadius*, first secured the publication of his works (Basel, 1516–20, IX., fol.). This ed. was followed by the ed. of *Marianus Victorius* (Rome, 1566–72, IX., fol.), and the Prot. *Adam Tribbechovius* (Frankf., 1684, XII., fol.); then the defective Benedictine ed. of *J. Martianay* and *Anth. Pouget* (Paris, 1706, V vols.). Various editions of his separate works, Epistles, &c., have also appeared (*Valarsi* first arranged the epp. chronologically). The so-called *Comes* of J. (see *Lectonarius*) belongs to a later period; so the Martyrology ascribed to him, and some letters. *Erasmus* and *Martianay* furnished biographies of J.; *SEB. DOLCI* (*Max. Hieron., vitæ suæ scriptor. Anconæ*, 1750, 4to.), and the Jesuit, *Stilling* (in the *Actis Sancti*, VIII., 418, &c.), panegyrics. — Besides the general Church and patristic histories of *Tillemont* (XII.), *Cave* (I.), *Oudin* (I.), *Schönemann* (I.), *Rössler* (IX.), *Schröckh* (K. G., XI., 5–244; VII., 122; IX., 246), see *Zimmermann* upon Solitude; *ENGELSTOFF*, *L. Hieron. Stridon., interpret.*, &c., *Havn.*, 1798, 8vo. *COLLONBOT*, *Hist. de S. Jérôme*; *Erach and Gruber*, 2, Sect. 8, Th.).

HAGENBACH.*

Jerome of Prague, a witness of the truth, and forerunner of the Reformation, the true friend of John Hus, whose martyrdom he shared, was superior to Hus in learning, but of a rasher

temperament. He was surnamed after his native city, his patronymic being v. *Faulfisch*. His father, Nicholas v. *Faulfisch*, and mother (whose maiden name is unknown) were of noble birth. He was born c. 1360–70. Of his early education nothing is known. At the University of Prague he studied theology, then visited Heidelberg, Cologne, and Paris, where he obtained his Master's degree, after having (1399) received the Doctorate of Theology. From Paris he went to Oxford, thence returned to Prague. His visit to England was of great moment for him, for there he became acquainted with Wicliffe's views and books, which he afterwards zealously circulated in Bohemia. His learning was soon acknowledged at home, and though he never became an ecclesiastic, Wladislaus II. of Poland invited him to organize (1410) the new University of Cracow, and Sigismund of Hungary desired him to become his preacher. But the clergy then already suspected him of Wicliffe's heresy, and persecuted him. Sbynek, Archbishop of Prague, had previously ordered Wicliffe's books to be burned. Charged with heresy, Jerome had to flee; he reached Vienna, and there, at the instigation of Hungarian priests, was imprisoned, but soon liberated through the influence of some Prague friends. He returned to Prague, and attached himself closely to Hus, whom he made better acquainted with Wicliffe's views. Meanwhile, the University was violently agitated. Its numerous German teachers favored scholastic nominalism, and were the more embittered against Hus and Jerome, because they represented Bohemia at the University, and had effected a restriction of the rights of foreigners, limiting them to one vote instead of three (*Pelzel*, *Lebensgesch. d. Königs Wenzel*, II., 543, &c. *Urkundenbuch*, p. 125). The Germans left, Prague felt the loss, and the priests seized the opportunity to incite the populace against Hus and Jerome. J. avenged himself by fiercely denouncing indulgences, relics, and monks, some of whom he imprisoned, and even had one cast into the Moldau. When John XXIII. proclaimed a crusade against Ladislaus of Naples, Jerome caused the bull to be carried about the streets by a lewd woman, and then burnt it, with some indulgence briefs, at the pillory of the new town. All this served to incite Hus to take more decided steps. Meantime the Council of Constance had convened, and Hus (see Art.) was imprisoned as a heretic. Jerome hastened to defend him, but unavailingly. After the execution of Hus, Jerome was in danger. He left Constance, and from Ueberlingen addressed letters to Sigismund and the Council, offering to answer every accusation, provided he received a guarantee of personal safety. As the emperor would not give this unconditionally, Jerome thought it better to return to Prague; but on his way he was taken prisoner by the Duke of Bavaria, at Hirschau (April, 1415), sent in chains to Constance, and delivered to the Council. After six months' rigid incarceration, he yielded to his foes, and recanted, Sept. 23, 1415, solemnly renouncing his own doctrines, and those of Wicliffe and Hus, endorsing the condemnation of Hus, and promising to assent in full to all the

teachings of the Romish C., and even to submit to its rules; and, finally, he was compelled to say that he did all this without constraint (v. d. *HARDT*, *Magnum œcumenicum Constant. Concilium*, IV., 520, &c. *Narratio de Mag. Hieronymo Pragensi, &c.*, in *Hist. et Monum. Jo. Hus atque Hier. Prag.*, Norimb., 1715, II., 522, &c.). But soon new accusations were preferred against him, which, despite Cardinal d'Ailly's desire to suppress them, Gerson insisted upon entertaining. By this time Jerome had regained courage and faith: he solemnly retracted his previous recantation, boldly avowed his adherence to the doctrines of Wicliffe and Hus, and addressed the Council with eloquent earnestness. The Council condemned him (May 30, 1416), and he courageously endured the flames, proclaiming his faith in the gospel, and commending himself in prayer to God. His ashes were thrown into the Rhine. An eye-witness of his martyrdom, Poggius Florentinus, asserted (see v. d. *Hardt*, l. c., III., 64, &c.) that he suffered unmoved the pains of his execution.—(See *Leben d. Hier. v. Prag*, by J. F. W. *Tischer*, Lpz., 1802; *Hier. v. Pr.*, by L. *Heller*, Lübeck, 1835; *Hus u. Hier. Studie v. Jos. Alex. Helfert*, Prag, 1853, p. 151, &c., 208, &c. (not impartial).)

NEUDECKER.*

Jeromites, or Hermits of St. Jerome; the name of several branches of the same Order, which chose St. Jerome for their patron, adopted the rule of St. Augustine, and flourished in Spain, Portugal, and somewhat in Italy. They arose in 1370, in the parish of Toledo, through the efforts of Vasco, a Portuguese, and Franciscan tertiary, and Peter Ferdinand Pecha, chamberlain of Peter of Castile. Gregory XI. confirmed the Order, which rapidly spread in Spain and Portugal, and was even transplanted to America. It was devoted to literature, had its chief monasteries in Guadalupe, St. Justus, in the Escorial (through Philip II.), and at Boleim, in Brazil. It attained to high distinction, but gradually declined, then was dissolved, and maintained itself in Brazil only. The dress was a white coarse coat, a small black cowl, and the scapulary. In public they wore a long black cloak. The *nuns of St. Jerome* were a branch of this Order, founded by *Mary Garcias* of Toledo, in the Monastery of St. Paul, 1375. They took no vow, spread in Spain, and wore a white frock with a brown scapulary. They were first required to take vows under Julius II., and were then attached to the Jeromites. The third General of the Jeromites, *Lupus Olivetus* (others say *Lupus d'Olanedo*), formed from members of the Order, an independent congregation, called the *Congregation of the Hermits of St. Jerome of the Observance*, with rules drawn from the works of Jerome. This branch was confirmed in 1426, by Martin V., and from 1429 it spread into Italy. In Spain, under Philip II., it was united again (1595) with the other Jeromites, but maintained itself in Italy, where it still has a few monasteries under the name of the *Congregation of St. Jerome of Lombardy*. In Italy Peter Gambacorti, or Peter de Pisis, founded (1377) the *Hermits of St. Jerome*, in a desert of Montebello; it was composed of converted robbers (also called *Pauperes Eremitæ s. Hiero-*

nymi). They had a strict rule, which was relaxed in 1444, and exchanged for that of St. Augustine, in 1568. Then the Order widely spread again, many members, hermits of Bavaria and the Tyrol, joining it. Now but few of its monasteries remain. Charles of Montegranni, in Fiesole, founded another congregation of Jeromites in 1406, *Congregatio Fesularia*, which was dissolved under Clement IX., 1668.—(Cf. *HELLOT*, *Hist. des ordres monastiques*, III., 423, &c.; IV., 18, &c.).

NEUDECKER.*

Jerusalem, the Patriarchate of, owes what it attained to, more to its name and location, than to itself. This is not the place to treat of the beginnings of the Jewish-Christian congregation of James and Simeon (see the Art.), the oldest overseers, who were afterwards cited as the first bishops. We are indebted to Eusebius for a long register of "bishops," of whom, however, he makes but little further mention, although he lived in the country. According to Euseb., III., 35, Simeon was succeeded by Justus, under whom many Jews were converted to Christianity, then follow Jewish names: Zaccheus, Tobias, Benjamin, John, Matthias, Philip, etc., who still belong to the period of the sojourn of the congregation at Pella. The first heathen-Christian overseer is Marcus, Euseb., V., 12. The next succeeding one of note is Narcissus, of whom Euseb. relates, that during the reign of Severus he became distinguished for his piety and miracles, also took part in the controversy about Easter, fled from persecution, when his office was filled by Dins, Germanus, and Gordius, in succession; returned later and shared the administration, to a high old age, (116 years,) with Alexander, the former Bishop of Cappadocia (Euseb., V., 23, 25; VI., 9, 11). Alexander founded a library at Jerusalem, which still existed in Eusebius' time (Euseb., VI., 20). The register of bishops given by Eusebius is repeated by Nicephorus with little variation, and is continued beyond the time of Justinian (Niceph. chronogr. compend., vol. I., p. 764-68, ed. Bonn. Comp. besides Le Quien, *Oriens christ.*, III., p. 145, sqq.). Jerusalem raised itself in the 4th cent. by the building of churches and as the possessor of Christian relics, and was also drawn into the ecclesiastical and dogmatic controversies, a Synod being held there in 415. But these circumstances, with others, did not secure the patriarchate, and into the fifth century it was subject to the Bishop of Cesarea. The Council of Nice, in can. 7, acknowledged its pre-eminence of honor, but did not remove its dependence. Supported by this distinction, already Cyril, and after him John, opposed with all zeal the superiority of Cesarea, as did also Juvenal (about 420-58) (Theodoret, H. E., II., 26. Sozom., IV., 25. *HEKRON*, epist., 38, *ad Pammach. contra errores Johannis*). Finally, the Emperor Theodosius II. conferred the patriarchal honor, and the Synod of Chalcedon adjusted a dispute between Juvenal of Jerusalem and Maximus of Antioch, by decreeing that the former should rule over the three Palestinian provinces, the latter over Phœnicia and Arabia. Thus Jerusalem was raised to the same rank of honor with Alexandria and Antioch.

The Persian, Arabian, and Turkish conquests separated the holy city from the general progress of the Church. Its ecclesiastical character was maintained, notwithstanding the increasing embarrassments. The Christian conquest of 1099 marks the first break, as it placed the patriarchate in the hands of the Latins. The conquerors found the episcopal chair vacant, the last patriarch having fled to Cyprus, where he soon after died. Against the strong opposition of the clergy, Arnulph, an immoral man, was made the first Latin patriarch and guardian of the sacred relics, supported by 20 canons. His successor, Dagobert, was a better man. He gave the civil government a hierarchical character (*Wilken, Geschichte der Kreuzzüge*, I., p. 306; II., p. 53. *Guilielm., Tyr.*, IX., 16-18). But progress in this direction met with other hindrances. The relation with the Papacy did not remain undisturbed. After Antioch had liberated itself from Roman connection, William of Jerusalem made a similar attempt, 1138, but allowed himself to be restrained by Innocent II. At the same time disputes arose about the dependence of Tyre on Antioch, which a Roman legate settled in favor of Jerusalem (*Wilken*, l. c., II., p. 695). The internal affairs of the diocese also were in a confused state, several districts being subject to the chief city without the mediation of a metropolitan. There were four metropolitan seats under Jerusalem: Tyre, Cesarea, Nazareth, and Petra (*Canis. Lectt. antiquæ*, IV., p. 436).—In 1187 the city was transferred by Heraclius to Saladin. A hundred years later Nicolaus made every effort to reserve it from Ptolemais, and even in 1316 Peter, Patriarch of Jerusalem, appeared as Papal legate in Paris, to urge a new crusade (*Wilken*, l. c., VII., p. 727, 783).

In general, it may be said of the 88 years of Western rule, that, with promised freedom, it at the same time led to oppression of the native Greek cultus. After this period the Greek patriarchate again assumed its rights. Saladin expelled all the Latins from their establishments, 1187, but a remnant, which found shelter under the direction of the Order of St. Francis, in a cloister of Mount Zion, and maintained this asylum by the protection and support of Western princes. The patriarchs of the city from this time forward opposed all Latin churchdom. But, on the other hand, they connected themselves with the Russian Church. The Confession of Faith of 1643 was subscribed by Parisius of Jerusalem. As a result of the disturbances caused by Cyrillus Lucaris (see the Art.), it came to pass, that the Greek Church was also freed on this side from foreign influences. This was reached by Synods at Constantinople (1638), under Cyrill of Berea, at Jassy under Parthenius (1642), and a third at Bethlehem and Jerusalem. The patriarch of the latter city, Dosithus (1672-1706), expelled all Latins from his Church, made journeys to Georgia and Russia, and called an ecclesiastical convention, 1672, which again rejected the Protestant doctrines, but acquitted Cyrillus Lucaris of the charge of Calvinism (*Libri symb. eccl. Gr. ed. Kimmel, Proleg.*, p. 75, sq.). This

time, therefore, an ecclesiastical act really proceeded from Jerusalem, for the transactions of these Synods can be regarded as the last part of the Greek Confessions (see the Art. Jerusalem, Synods at).

As for the rest, the latest accounts describe the increasing weakness and poverty of the patriarchate at Jerusalem. From 68 bishops and 25 suffragans in its best times, it by degrees limited itself to fewer districts, and was compelled to tolerate all other Confessions of the united Greeks, Latins (who, in 1847, received a titular patriarch of their own). Armenians, Jacobites, and Evangelicals. It also remained dependent on Constantinople, where, for a long time, even the patriarchs of Jerusalem resided, and transferred the administration to a college of vicars (*Watzils*), which was composed of the bishops of Lydda, Nazareth and Petra, the archimandrite and other assistants. Thus lately the Patriarch Athanasius lived on one of the islands in the sea of Marmora, and permitted the affairs to be governed by a Synod of 150 managers at Constantinople. He died 1843, and the vicars elected Cyrill of Lydda as his successor. Cyrill resides at Jerusalem, and has brought to pass a better state of things. The pilgrims are better cared for, and the 12 monasteries and 5 nunneries are more strictly managed than formerly. Six native married priests preach in Greek, and have the care of souls. Subject to the patriarch are still the Bishops of Nazareth, Acca, Lydda, Gaza, Sebaste, Nabulus, Philadelphia and Petra. The Greek-orthodox congregation at Jerusalem numbers not quite 1000 souls, and in the whole diocese there are only about 17,000. *Comp. DAN. PAPERBROCHTUS*, in *Actis Sanctorum*, III., *Prolegom.* *Heineccius*, *Abbildung der alten u. neuen gr. K. Anhang*, p. 61. *Robinson*, *Palestine. Ritter. Erdkunde*, Thl., XVI., p. 490, sq., 500. *Tobler*, *Topographie von Jerus.*, I., p. 276. *A. Scholz*, *Reise*, Lpz., 1822, p. 192. *Wilson*, *Lands of the Bible*, II., p. 569. *GASS.—Beck.*

Jerusalem, Synods held there. Their number is greater or less, according to the limitation of the idea of a Synod. But in any case, that of the Apostles (see *Apost. Council*), and that of 1672, are of main ecclesiastical and theological interest. We shall, therefore, only glance at the rest. Baronius reckons as the first that convened (Acts 1:15, &c.) to fill the vacancy of Judas; the second that at which deacons were chosen (Acts 6:1-6); and the third that of the Apostles named above (Acts 15). A smaller assembly is mentioned in Acts 21:28.—The *libellus synodicus* refers to a convention held in J., under Narcissus and 14 other bishops, to settle the time of observing Easter.—In 355 many bishops were convened in Jerusalem to consecrate the Church of the Holy Sepulchre, built by Constantine, when he directed them to strive first to heal the divisions then distracting the Church, so that they might the more devoutly attend to the service. Accordingly Arius was restored to fellowship, and the emperor requested to allow his return to Alexandria. To complete the triumph of Arianism the Synod placed Marcellus of Ancyra on trial, for refusing to participate in its proceedings. But

new order of the emperor, requiring the bishops who had been in Tyre to hasten to Constantinople, rendered a postponement of this case necessary. Euseb. (*Vit. Const.*, IV., 47) says this Synod was the largest he knew, next to the Council of Nice, with which he compares it.—About 349, after the Synod of Sardica, B. Maximus constituted a Synod at which Athanasius was acknowledged.—In 415 a Synod was held at J., over which B. John presided, at which the presbyter Paul Orosius appeared as accuser of Pelagius. Nothing was done but to refer the case to Innocent I.—About 536 Peter of Jerusalem held a Synod there, attended by 45 bishops, at which the Severians, condemned already at Constantinople, were excommunicated.—From the acts of the 2d Council of Nice, some have concluded that after the Gen. Council of 553, a Synod was held at J., confirming the resolutions against the three chapters.—In 634 Sophronius, Patriarch of J., convoked a Synod there of all the bishops of Palestine, which, in the circular it adopted, avowed dyotheletism and denounced monotheletism.—In 730 the Patr. Theodorus held one against iconoclasts.—During the Crusades, under the kingdom of Jerusalem, several Synods were held there: 1099, 1107, 1143.—The most important Synod held there was that of 1672. On March 16, of that year, Dositheus, Patr. of Jer., convened the Oriental prelates of his diocese. 53 met, including the ex-patr. Nectarius, six metropolitans, archimandrites, presbyters, deacons and monks. The Synod called itself *ἀσκή, ἐκδοξίας, ἡ ἀπολογία*, and mainly opposed Calvinism, condemning Cyrillus Lucaris, who had introduced it into Greece. John Claude (see Art.) had affirmed that Cyrillus set forth the true doctrine of the Greek Church upon the Lord's Supper, wherefore the French commissioner to the Synod, Olier de Nointel, requested its opinion upon Cyrillus's confession. The assembled fathers said the Calvinists well knew the distinctive doctrines of the Eastern Church, and merely strove to conceal them, so that they might not seem to stand beyond the pale of every Church. In regard to the confession of C., they stated: "*scripsit illam non Patriarcha, sed homo obscurus Cyrillus, ex dolo factus.*" The Synod vowed solemn adherence to the confession of Mogilas, and published a confession of 18 chapters and 4 responses, which were directly opposed to the confession of Cyrillus. This *Confessio Dosithei*, was not a private affair, but subscribed by 67 bishops and clergy, and forms an integral portion of the *libri Symbolici* of the Greek C.—It excited violent opposition, many charging the Synod with Romish propensities, for which its utter silence in regard to points of diversity between the Greek and Rom. Churches, gave occasion.—(For the acts of this Synod, see HARDUIN, XI., 179, &c. AYMON, *Monuments authent.*, p. 259, &c. Especially J. KIMMEL, *libri Symbolici eccl. orient.*, Jen., 1843.)

TH. PRESSEL.*

Jerusalem, the new Bishopric of St. James in. The Evangelical C. of our day has, for the first time, succeeded in securing a footing in the Holy Land. The low religious state of the Jews there has led the American Board of Fo-

reign Missions, in 1818, to send two missionaries to Palestine. In 1832 the London Jewish Missionary Society also entered the field. In 1840 followed the expedition of the Great Powers to the East, the result of which awakened in some hearts the hope that at length Palestine would be wholly emancipated from the Osman rule. Frederick William IV. of Prussia, with true political foresight, seized the opportunity of securing for Evangelical Christians in the East a position never yet obtained for them (see Petermann, Beitr. z. e. Gesch. d. neuest. Reformen d. ottom. Reichs, Berlin, 1842). Prussia having failed, at the ratification of the treaty of July 15, 1840, in obtaining the desired support for its proposition in favor of religious liberty for Eastern Christians, submitted to the Queen of England, the Archbishop of Canterbury, and Bishop of London, a plan for founding in common a Protestant bishopric in J., which should unitedly represent the German Evangelical and Anglican C. in Palestine. This arrangement contemplated a fraternal relation of both Churches in the movement. The higher clergy of England cheerfully approved of the proposition, but took a different view of the movement from that entertained in Prussia; for they hoped that the new bishopric would 1) prove an excellent centre of operations for their mission among the Jews, and 2) open the way for a full union "of discipline as well as doctrine between their own Church and the less perfectly constituted one of the Protestant Churches of Europe."—The endowment of the See was fixed at £30,000. England undertook to raise its half by a general collection; Prussia resolved annually to pay £600 in support of the See, until it could be supported in Palestine itself. The Bishop is alternately appointed by England and Prussia; but the Primate of England may veto the appointment of Prussia. On the whole it is an Anglican C. bishopric, the Bishop being, until other local arrangements are made, subject to the Archb. of Canterbury. The relation of German Evangelical Christians to the See are determined by the following rules: 1) the Bishop shall take German congregations under his care, and aid them to the extent of his power. 2) They are to be furnished with German pastors, whom the Bishop, after receiving proper testimonials and evidence of their fitness, shall ordain according to the Anglican ritual, then pledging themselves to due eccl. obedience. 3) The Liturgy used by them is one selected from the Prussian Liturgies, and carefully examined by the Anglican Primate. 4) The Bishop confirms German catechumens according to the Anglican form.—On October 5, 1841, Parliament passed an act, allowing institution and consecration to a person not a subject of the British crown, and dispensing such a one from the usual oaths, provided that deacons and priests ordained by him shall not be allowed to hold office in England.—England had the first choice, and, after the declination of Dr. McCaul of Ireland, appointed a convert from Judaism, Dr. Michael Solomon Alexander, Prof. of Hebrew and Rabbin. literature in King's College, London, to the new see. He was born at Shönlanke, Posen, in 1799. On

Jan. 21, 1842, he, with his wife and children, entered Jerusalem. The Porte was told that he came simply as a high Church official from England, to have only spiritual supervision over English Christians, or persons related to them. At that time, besides the missionaries of the American Board, stationed in J. and Beirut, Nicolayson and four assistants, employed by the Church Miss. Soc. of England, were in the city, and owned a plot of ground, designed for a Church, on Mt. Zion. The Jewish-Christian part of the congregation consisted of but three families. Alexander died, Nov. 23, 1845, in the desert near Cairo. Prussia nominated Samuel Gobat, of Berne, Switzerland, previously missionary in Abyssinia.—At present the diocese has a Church (Christ) on Mt. Zion, where the gospel is preached in Hebrew, English, German, Spanish, and Arabic; a separate cemetery; a school, with a house of two apartments, attended by Jewish, some Mohammedan, and Christian children; a hospital for the Jews, affording them opportunity also for reading the Scriptures; a hospital for proselytes, &c., with German deaconesses, almost wholly supported by Germany; a house of industry for proselytes, and a school of industry for Jewesses. Thus far from 7–9 Jewish converts have been annually received. For Christians of other churches, Bible readers are appointed. In consequence of the firman, which secures to the Protestant C. of Turkey the same rights guaranteed to other churches, small Protestant congregations, with schools, have been formed in *Bethlehem*, *Jaffa*, *Nablus*, and *Nazareth*.—The movement excited much discussion at first, not only among Romanists and Puseyites, but even among Evangelical Christians in Germany, Switzerland, and France, especially as the plan adopted seemed partial to England and the Anglican Church.—(See *Rheinwald's* Repert., Bd., 36, 3, p. 268, &c.; 45, 4, p. 95, &c.; the *Neues* Repert., 1845, 1, 84, &c.; 2, 176, &c.; 3, 250, &c. We may consider as official, *Abeken's* evang. Bisthum in Jer. Gesch. Darlegung mit Urkunden, Berlin, 1842).

GÜDER.*

Jesse (יֵשׁוּעָ, Matth. 1: 5, 6, &c.), a son of Obed, a grandson of Boaz, by Ruth, and David's father. Usually the Messiah is called David's son; but Isaiah 11: 1, 10, traces him directly to Jesse. There he is, by metonymy, called the root, for the offshoot (Is. 53: 2; Rom. 15: 12). In Rev. 5: 5, he is called the root, in 22: 16, the offspring of David. This honor is conferred upon Jesse on account of his faith, which he conveyed to his son David. For this family certainly cherished the tradition of the patriarchs with special fidelity; and served to develop it. The faith expressed so beautifully by David in many Psalms, was, doubtless, a product of ancestral piety, which descended upon him in larger measure than upon his brethren (1 Sam. 16: 7, 10; 17: 12). The power of the Spirit, however, then revealed itself in a superior external fitness (1 Sam. 17: 34–36; reminding one of Samson), without, of course, excluding intimate communion with God, as many Psalms prove. The same, indeed, is still true, though it is otherwise regarded by the morbid sentiment of our age.

VAIHINGER.*

Jesuits, the members of a monastic Order, founded at Siena, 1367, by the noblemen, John of Colombini, Gonfaloniere, and Francis of Mino Vincentini; it was a secular Order, under the rule of St. Augustine. They were also called *Apostolic Clerks*, because they sought to follow the example of Christ and his apostles in piety and deeds of charity. Having chosen St. Jerome for their patron, they are also called a *Congregation of Jerome*. As they prepared medicines for the relief of the poor, and for this purpose distilled brandy, the people called them "*Padri dell' aqua vita*." The Order was at once confirmed by Urban V., and spread especially in Italy. Pius V. attached it to the Order of mendicants, and Paul V. elevated it to a religious Order (1606). But it had in it the germ of decay, and Clement IX. dissolved it, on account of disorders, in 1668. The monks also had sisters of the Order, *Jesuitesses*, simultaneously founded by Catharine of Colombini. These still exist in Italy, under the rule of St. Augustine, and observe, besides the customs of the dissolved male Order, still stricter monastic discipline.

NEUDECKER.*

Jesuits, Order of. In discussing this subject, we will consider its establishment, its nature and constitution, its history and abolition, its restoration and fortunes to the present time.

I. *Its Establishment.* Don Inigo Lopez de Recalde, the youngest son of the Knight Beltran of Loyola, was born 1491, in the Province Guipuzcoa, Spain. His confinement by sickness, which was brought about by a ball that shattered one of his feet, while engaged in defending Pampeluna against the French, formed an epoch in his life. The history of Jesus and the saints now constituted his chief delight. On his recovery, he betook himself to the cloister Montserrat, made a general confession, exchanged his rich attire for the garb of a mendicant, and hung his armor before the image of Mary. At Manresa, where he lived sometimes in a solitary cave, sometimes in the Dominican monastery, he practised severe penances, and indulged in corporal chastisements and fasts. Every eighth day he received the sacrament. He beheld in a state of ecstasy the mystery of the Trinity represented by three keys of a harp attuned to harmony, and, above the elevated host, the glory of the divine Light, and in it the God-Man. He himself assures us that at Manresa, during prayer, there appeared to him, from 20–40 times, the humanity of Christ, now in the form of a white body of medium size, without visible clothing, then, of a large golden disc (*res quædam rotunda tanquam ex auro et magna*)—no doubt a symbol of the sun. This faculty of sensual contemplation was peculiar to him, and is a key to the right understanding of his *exercitia spiritualia*.—Those fond of instituting a comparison between the spiritual experiences of Ignatius and Luther, will discover a great difference in their respective characters. The soul-conflict of Luther originated in a profound sense of sin and damnation; that of Ign. in a complacent desire to rival and surpass the most eminent saints. The one achieved a victory by the weapons of the Word, the other rioted in visions and fancies. The former found

peace in the righteousness of faith based on the merits of Christ, the latter, in an unconditional submission to the authority of the Romish See and the righteousness of his own deeds. In both the year 1521 formed an epoch, and, while Luther asserted before the Diet at Worms the freedom of conscience from all human authority, Ign. was becoming one of the staunchest defenders of the declining Papacy.—On his return from Palestine, he studied grammar at Barcelona, and philosophy at Alcalá. He lived on alms, and devoted himself to the care of the sick. Arrived in Paris, 1528, he prosecuted the study of grammar in the College Montaigu, and philosophy and theology in the College of St. Barbara. The persecutions that assailed him, served but to inflame his zeal, and he succeeded in gaining to his interests Peter Faber, Franz. Xavier, Alphons Salmeron, Jacob Lainez, Nic. Bobadilla, and Simon Rodriguez. On 15th August, 1534, these assembled in the Church of Montmartre, and, having taken the vows of chastity and poverty, resolved to devote themselves to the care of the sick in Jerusalem, and to foreign missions, or, in case of failure, to submit to any work the Pope might lay upon them.

Whilst in Venice, January, 1537, the war between the Republic and the Turks, which prevented them from going to Jerusalem, gave an unexpected turn to their designs. Elevated to the priesthood, they traversed the country, condemning vice, praising virtue, and recommending contempt of the world. Even Bishops, unable to withstand their energy, became their friends. As at Manresa, so here Ign. had visions, in one of which he saw the Father hand over to the Son the care of the Society, which he now called *societas Jesu*, and heard Christ say: *Ego vobis Romæ propitius ero*. In Rome they wrought with incredible zeal. Their fame spread so rapidly that, at the request of John III. of Portugal, Franz. Xavier and Simon Rodriguez visited his realm. By the bull *Regimini militantis*, September 27, 1540, Paul III. sanctioned the Society. The reluctance of Ignatius to become its general was overcome by the advice of his confessor, who admonished him not to resist the Holy Spirit.

To brand Ignatius, the founder of this gigantic institute, a pure fanatic, would be doing him gross injustice. An iron will was the main trait in his character, and in his person were singularly combined enthusiasm and prudence. When Loyola died, July 31, 1556, his Order comprised 13 provinces, seven of which were in Spain and its colonies, three in Italy, and its influence extended to Brazil and the East Indies. On March 13, 1623, he and Franz. Xavier were canonized by Greg. XV.; and the appropriate bulls issued by Urban VIII., Aug. 6.

II. *Its Nature and Constitution*. This can be best studied in the exercises of Ign. and the laws of the Society. The object of the former is by means of meditation pursued under the tuition of a director to form in the soul an irrevocable resolution to fulfil the end of life. It is divided into periods of four weeks, the first of which is devoted to meditation on sin; the second, on the birth and life of Christ; the third, on His passion and death; the fourth, on His glo-

rification. Each meditation, generally of an hour's length, begins with a preparatory prayer, in which is invoked the grace of God, which is succeeded by two preludes, the first designed to make present, by a lively representation, the place, persons, and circumstances of the Biblical fact; the second, to a prayer for the feelings, thoughts, and resolutions appropriate to the subject under consideration. Now follows the meditation proper, which ends in a conversation with Jesus, who is supposed to be now more than ordinarily near to the soul. Of special importance is the so-called application of the senses. The subject having been thoroughly convinced of sin and his own damnable guilt, now makes use of his senses to represent hell: he *sees* its narrow walls immersed in fire, *hears* the shriek of despair, *smells* the stench of brimstone and rottenness, *tastes* the bitterness of the tears there shed, and *feels* in his limbs the flames that devour souls. The last meditation of each day of the second week is devoted to this peculiar exercise. Outward circumstances are made to correspond to the inward state of the subject. During the first week, which is devoted to self-examination, the windows are hung with blinds, and the penitent prostrates himself on the ground or on his knees, while, during the last week, the sun is allowed to shine into his chamber, and everything wears the garb of joy. The final end of the first week's doings is the making of a general confession, and of the second, to determine one's vocation in life. The progressive stages of the exercises are called *via purgativa*, *illuminativa*, and *unitiva*, and their ultimate design is to develop the highest energy of the will, and subject it to the authority of the Church.

The Order is composed of four classes: novices, scholastics, coadjutors, and professed. The noviciate, which is preceded by the exercises and an examination of the intentions of the applicant, continues two years, and must be devoted to Church-offices, pious reading, meditation, prayer, &c. Each one applies the discipline with a whip twice a week. During hours of recreation and walks none but devotional subjects dare be discussed. The probation over, the novice becomes a *scholastic*, and, as such, studies for two years rhetoric and literature, for three years philosophy, physics, and mathematics, and, after having taught these branches five or six years, is allowed to take up theology, which is continued from four to six years. The course of study is prescribed in the *ratio studiorum*, the oldest of which dates from 1586. He now enters upon another year of probation, repeats the exercises of his noviciate, studies with special care the *Institutum S. J.*, and is finally elevated to the priesthood, and assumes the vows either of *coadjutor spiritualis*, or of a professed. The coadj. assumes the three vows of a monk, *solī Deo et non homini*, and promises special attention to the instruction of youth; the professed add a fourth (*professi quatuor votorum*), which binds them to unconditional obedience to the Pope. The *societas professa*, in number the smallest, comprises the authorized membership of the general congregation, and inhabit the *professed* houses, which are forbidden

the possession of property. By a bull of Paul III., June 5, 1546, *Exponi nobis*, the Society obtained the privilege of selecting assistants from the ranks of the laity, whose business was confined to menial occupations.

At the head of all stands the General, who is represented in each province by a provincial (*præpositus provincialis*), to whom are subordinated the superiors of single houses. To each superior are given consultors and an advisor. Besides these there are prefects, *e. g. præf. studiorum generalium, inferiorum, bibliothecæ, ecclesiæ, concionum, &c.*—The power of the general, to whom all owe obedience, is limited by the general congregation, composed mainly of the professed, which assembles, 1) to elect a general; 2) to consider the deposition of a general; 3) when the provincials, &c., think a meeting necessary; and when, 4) the representatives of the provinces in Rome favor it. During the time of election, its members receive nothing but bread and water. In the event of deposition, which may find place in case of certain offences, such as dishonesty in money transactions, &c., the general is to be induced to hand in a voluntary resignation, or, if the charges be not sustained, the object of the meeting is to be kept a secret (*De aliis rebus agatur, propter quas convocata societas videatur, et quod ad Præpositum attinet, dissimuletur. Declar. C. ad Concl., Prt. IX., cap. V., § 5*).—The bond which unites all the members in one compact body, is obedience to the superior. *Omnem sententiam ac judicium nostrum contrarium cæca quadam obedientia, abnegando et id quidem in omnibus, quæ a Superiore disponuntur, ubi definiri non possit, aliquod peccati genus intercedere, Const. Part. VI., cap. 7, § 1*. This obedience required the abnegation of all earthly attachments, and the practical abandonment of father, mother, brother, and sister. No correspondence could be carried on without consent of the superior, who perused every letter, and was made fully acquainted with the thoughts and feelings of all under his control. Under such supervision the patient gradually lost his individuality, and was merged in the spirit of the Society. He dare not freely move his head, but must keep it erect and gently inclined forwards, the eyes must tend towards the earth, and, during conversation with another, must only look at the lower part of his face. The forehead must not be wrinkled, the nose not turned up—in short, the *Regulæ modestiæ* were to be impressed on the gait, gesture, voice, &c. It would be a mistake, however, to conclude that the individuality of a man was utterly annihilated. Only so much of it had to yield to the spirit of the Order as conflicted with its designs. This excepted, it displayed wonderful tact in making use of peculiarities of constitution, and in assigning each man his proper position in the general organization. Hence that great diversity of talent and labor, of which Macauley speaks in the 6th chap. of his *History of England*: "They guided the councils of kings. They deciphered Latin inscriptions. They observed the motion of Jupiter's satellites. They published whole libraries, controversy, casuistry, history, treatises on optics, Alcaic odes, editions of the Fathers, madri-

gals, catechisms, and lampoons.—None of them had chosen his dwelling-place or his avocation for himself. Whether the Jesuit should live under the Arctic circle or under the equator, whether he should pass his life in arranging and collecting manuscripts at the Vatican or in persuading naked barbarians in the southern hemisphere not to eat each other, were matters which he left with profound submission to the decision of others."

To attain its object—the restoration of mediæval Catholicism—the Soc. turned to account everything that might conduce to it. Religion and its exercises, science and art, were nothing but means to accomplish this design. Its operations were threefold in character: *Foreign missions, domestic missions within the R. Cath. Church itself, and the conversion of heretics, particularly Protestants*. Directing the attention of our readers for the first to the article on Missions of the Catholic Church, we will dwell briefly on the two last. While reviving the faith of lukewarm Catholics, they won back whole territories that had fallen under the power of Protestantism. Relieved of many obligations incumbent on the clergy generally by Paul III., the Jesuits devoted their undivided attention to the duties of their office. In their preaching—which formed one of their chief occupations—they enforced the importance of the institutions of the Church, of confession, of prayer, and of the education of the young. To give greater efficiency to confession, the priests underwent a special preparation for the discharge of its functions (*Reg. sacerdot., 10–12*). Only in *casus necessitatis* were they allowed to confess women. These were 1) when the woman was of noble birth and rank; 2) when, on account of any services, she had claims on the Order; 3) when it might be presumed that the husband would not object. The inviolate secrecy of confession was strongly insisted on by Aquaviva, 1590, who vehemently opposed the opinion that, in certain circumstances, its seal might be broken (*Instr. V. de notitia habita per Confessionem*). The sacrament of penance once more obtained universal favor in Catholic countries, and the importance attached to it is clearly seen in the expression of French missionaries who labored in the age of Louis XIV.: *ou la confession, ou l'enfer, il n'y a point de milieu* (*Gieseler, Eccl. Hist.*). Nor were they less zealous in the religious and literary education of the young, and in the training of a priesthood exclusively devoted to the Catholic Church. The ancient languages and the exact sciences were cultivated as a means for disciplining the mind and imparting to it a practical tendency, while philosophy, in its Aristotelian-scholastic form, became the hand-maiden of theology, which was based on the *Summa* of Thomas Aquinas, and everything discarded that might have the least tendency to weaken faith or excite doubt.

Though the Jesuit Order can justly boast of a long list of learned men, yet it cannot be admitted that it advanced the interests of true science, which, rejecting all partial tendencies and prejudices, has its end in itself, and presupposes a liberty of thought and investigation that found no place in its domain. It paid

pecial attention to polemics and casuistry, and, by means of its theology, wielded an immense influence over the scientific character of the Church. Neglecting the mysticism of the middle ages, which had also been more or less ignored by the Protestantism of the 16th cent., it laid most stress on the doctrines that stood in direct opposition to the cardinal points of the Reformation. Thus, at the Council of Trent, where many inclined more or less strongly to a modified Protestant view of justification by faith, Lainez and Salmeron succeeded in imposing the scholastic doctrine on the subject. To vindicate the unlimited independence of the Papal power, appears to be its main object. Some of its members were bold enough to defend the mediæval opinion that, even in temporal things, kings should be subordinated by the Pope (comp. extracts of Azorius, Ozonius, Cornelius a Lapide, Rob. Bellarmine, in *Gieseler*, *Ecol. Hist.*). It even elevated to the rank of a formal dogma of the Order the infallibility of the Pope, in such sense that no one can sin who, in opposition to conscience, yields obedience to the Pope. To magnify his authority General Lainez, at Trent, 1562, derived the Papacy immediately from God, and held the civil power to be a transfer by the people. Upon this view was based the *right*, yes, the *duty* of dethroning a non-Catholic or tyrannical ruler. Thus spoke the Jesuit, Robert Person, of Elizabeth of England; so, too, Mariana, in his *de rege et regis institutione*, and Bellarmine, particularly in his work on the authority of the Pope.—In accordance with this view of popular sovereignty, the Jesuits of the 16th cent. defended the doctrine rejected by the Council of Constance, that it was right to murder tyrants, and thus openly sanctioned the maxim, that the end justifies the means (comp. extracts in *Perrault*, *la morale des Jesuites*, III., 276; *Ellendorf*, *die Moral u. Politik d. Jes.*, p. 400). The Jesuits, Ribadeneira and Mariana praised the Dominican, Jacob Clement, for having murdered King Henry IV., Aug. 1, 1589, and Balthasar Gerard, who shot Prince William of Orange, July 7, 1584, confessed at his trial that a Jesuit in Trent had confirmed him in his murderous design.—The Jesuits from the start inclined to Pelagianism, and the Protestants to Augustinianism. The Spanish Jesuit, Luis Molina (see Art.), carried the former tendency to its last result. He invested the human will with power to dispose itself to acts which were considered to be effects of supernatural grace, and made justification to be the joint product of grace and free will. The theological faculty condemned 34 propositions extracted from the writings of Leonard Hess and John Hamel, who denied the direct and verbal inspiration of the Scriptures.—In the department of morals the Jesuits obtained a mournful celebrity. Ranke and other historians are mistaken in supposing the immoral principles of the Order to have originated in the period of its decline. Already, in the *censura præcipuis doctrinæ capitibus*, of Cologne, 1560, sin was explained as a *deliberate* and *voluntary* violation of the Divine law, and the assertion made, that in this life man has nothing to do with a morality that included his entire being. Protestantism based

its ethics on the moral law of conscience and Scripture; Jesuitism dealt in mere opinions and measured morality by probabilities. By a probability was meant that which had some weighty authorities on its side. Thus all moral certainty was annihilated, and dissolved in mere probabilities or possibilities. The second fundamental principle of Jesuit casuistry is the *methodus dirigendæ intentionis*, which enabled a man to commit a violation of the law without incurring guilt, provided he intended not to sin, and aimed at the accomplishment of a praiseworthy end. The third is the *restrictio* or *reservatio mentalis*, which allowed a person, in order to effect a laudable design, to put a meaning in a promise or oath different from that conveyed by words, or make them secretly to depend on conditions of which others are ignorant. The Benedictine, Mabillon, justly remarked that the moral system of the heathen was better than that of this Order. Of those who were specially active in developing and applying it, we mention Cardinal Toledo, a Spaniard, †1596; Emanuel Say, a Portuguese, †1596; Thos. Sanchez, †1610; Franz Juaréz, †1617; Vincenz Fillucio, an Italian, †1622; Leonard Less, †1623; Stephen Banny, a Frenchman, †1649; the two Germans, Paul Laymann, †1635, and Hermann Busenbaum, †1688; and the Spaniard, Escobar, †1669. If it be true, as some say, that the Order must not be held responsible for such monstrosities, it will be hard to understand how it happened that for a period of 100 years such men—the most distinguished of its moralists—could have taught principles inconsistent with its genius. Moreover, facts demonstrate that, even in our day, Jesuits act on the very same policy. Comp. *Imhof*, *die Jesuiten in Luzern*, 1848, p. 73; *Gieseler*, l. c.

III. *External History and Operations.* Next to Italy, the Jesuits were received with special favor in Portugal. They became the confessors of the royal family, educated the successors to the throne, and really governed the kingdom. They experienced great difficulty in obtaining a foothold in Spain, where they met with determined opposition from the Dominican, Melchior Canus (see Art.), who regarded them as forerunners of Antichrist, and from the royal librarian, Urias Montanus. They succeeded at last in locating at Alcalá and Salamanca, and were not without influence in the country. The national antipathies of France at first prevented their settlement in this land. Through the preaching of Edmund Augier they were enabled to make Lyons the centre of their operations in this empire. They even succeeded in inspiring the younger members of the Sorbonne with their spirit. Though Henry IV. had passed over to the Catholic Church, they refused to pray for him, because he had not yet been absolved from the Papal bull. The Parliament expelled them from the kingdom. In 1603, Henry IV. recalled the decree of condemnation, and it was only at the end of sixty years' struggle, that they obtained unrestricted freedom of action. About this time the gates of Venice were closed against them. Though the conflict between the Papacy and this republic touching the relations of the spiritual and civil

powers had been adjusted, the republic steadfastly refused them admittance. Ignatius had early discovered the importance of the German missions, and established in Rome, 1552, the Collegium Germanicum. From Vienna, Cologne, and Ingolstadt, as centres, they started on the career of conquest. In 1556, they founded a Royal Institute in Prague, and, in 1561, Archbishop Nic. Olaus of Gran built them a College in Tyrnau. Treves, Mayence, Spire, Aschaffenburg, and Würzburg, became seats of universities. In 1559, they settled in Munich, which became the Rome of Germany. The excellence of their schools overcame the objections of Protestants, who entrusted their sons to their care. Violence increased the progress of the restoration. Duke Albert V. of Bavaria compelled the Protestants of Lower Bavaria either to return to the Catholic Church, or to quit the country, and caused his ward, Philip of Baden, to be educated in the Catholic faith. Most conspicuous, however, in point of zeal, was Bishop Julius of Würzburg, who, accompanied in his Church-visitation by the Jesuit, Gerhard Weller, 1584-86, went from village to village, offering his Protestant subjects the alternative of a return to the Catholic Church, or expulsion from the country. Three hundred cloisters were erected to secure the victory. In 1588, the young Archbishop Wolf Dieterich of Salzburg forced his Protestant subjects to re-enter the Cath. communion, and in 1595 the Bishop of Bamberg destroyed the Evangelical Church in his dominions. During the reign of Rudolf II., 1578, began the restoration in Austria, where, in a short time, 13 towns were re-converted. What the Archduke Charles of Steyermark began, his son Ferdinand completed. In Upper Austria, Hungary, and Bohemia, blackened ruins covered the sites of Protestant Churches. The Jesuits followed in the wake of the victorious Catholic armies, and Protestants themselves aided their work by theological janglings on the differences between the Lutheran and Reformed Confessions. In Belgium they obtained a foothold, 1542. Their colleges crowded Courtray, Ypern, Bruges, Antwerp, and Brussels. Thence they penetrated the United Netherlands, 1592, in which year, according to Ranke, the number of Catholics in this country amounted to 345,000. In 1569, William Allen established a college at Douay, and, in 1579, at Rome, for the benefit of England. Young Jesuits followed the example of Person and Campian, who had gone over to this country in 1580. About 200 martyrs attested the zeal of this Order during the reign of Elizabeth, who branded, 1582, conversion to Catholicism as high treason, and, in 1585, expelled them. Charles II., though outwardly respecting the service of the Anglican Church, concluded a secret treaty at Dover, 1670, in which he bound himself to the Romish communion, and James II. submitted himself to their direction. In Poland, Stanislaus Hosius (see Art.), Bishop of Ermeland, 1569, established the first college for their use in Braunsberg, and other cities, as Posen, Wilna, &c., followed his example. Through John III., who was secretly received into the Romish Church by the Papal Legate, Anton Possevin, Catholicism was intro-

duced into Sweden. His marriage, however, to a staunch Protestant lady brought about a reaction, and, when his successor, Sigmund, King of Poland, attempted to check it, the Swedish nobility transferred the crown to Charles, 1644. They were more successful in Poland, where their pupils stormed the Evangelical Church of Cracow, 1606, of Wilna, 1611, of Posen, 1615. The opposition of the Russians thwarted the designs of Possevin, who, as early as 1581, conferred with Czar Ivan IV. Wassielwitsch on the propriety of re-uniting the Prussian Church to the Roman on the basis of the Florentine Council. They established a College, 1603, in Galata, in the suburbs of Constantinople. Though expelled from Turkey, 1628, they re-entered it under cover of another name, and rested not till they had effected the strangulation of their chief opponent.

The limits of this article forbid our giving an account of their nefarious doings in Hungary, Silesia, and other countries, and we pass on to consider

IV. *The Internal Development of the Order to its abolition.* After the death of Ignatius, Jacob Lainez (1558-1565) discharged the duties of General-Vicariate, and, at a general convocation, 1553, was elected to this position. He was succeeded by Franz. Borgia, 1564, Duke of Candia, who expended his estate in building the Collegium Romanum, 1551. He laid greater stress on piety and morality than on learning, and was canonized by Clement X., 1671. His successor was P. Eberhard Mercurian, of Belgium—a weak man and the tool of others. Now followed, 1581, *Claudius Aquaviva*, a Neapolitan, in point of administrative talent the most distinguished the Order ever produced, adroit and shrewd in movement, mild in demeanor, but possessed of an iron, inflexible will. At the general congregation, 1592, he succeeded in gaining a victory over his Spanish enemies, and, at that of 1607, another over the machinations of both Rome and Spain. Equally abortive were the plans set in motion by the Dominicans to procure his downfall. During his reign, the Order achieved its most brilliant victories. From his pen we have *industria pro superioribus*, and the oldest *ratio studiorum*, 1586. He died 1615. He was succeeded by the Roman, *Mutius Vitelleschi* (1615-1645), the “angel of peace,” as he was styled. In his reign, the Order held its first centennial celebration, 1640. Its energies, however, now began to decline. His successors, *Vincent Caraffa* (†1649), and *Francis Piccolomini* (†1651), failed to stem the tide of corruption. By the side of *Goswin Nickel*, a German, who had given offence by his self-will, the general congregation placed the Genoese, *Joh. Paul Oliva*, as assistant, who acted in this capacity till 1664, and, in 1681, became general. The original spirit of the Order was rapidly waning. It gradually became a secular institution, and the colleges, banks of exchange. To replenish their coffers, the Jesuits turned merchants, and engaged in business. The rise of Jansenism, which inculcated the principles of Augustine, and insisted on a rigid morality, hastened the catastrophe that finally overtook the Order. In his *Lettres provinciales*, 1656,

Pascal (see Art.) exposed its casuistry with such elegance and biting satire as to turn the tide of public opinion against it. Yet more ruinous to it were the liberal, philosophic doctrines which had begun to prevail in France, in the time of Louis XV. Choiseul in France, Wall and Squillace in Spain, Tanucci in Naples, Carvalho (Pombal) in Portugal, who became prime ministers of their respective governments in the middle of the 18th cent., combated it as detrimental to the prosperity of a nation. Even in Rome it had declined, more or less, in favor. Interference in the civil concerns of Portugal brought about its expulsion from this country, Sept. 3, 1759. In August, 1761, the French Parliament declared its casuistry incompatible with the laws of the empire, and abolished it, Aug. 6, 1762. An insurrection against the Spanish minister Squillace, March 23, 1766, occasioned the transportation of its members to Civita Vecchia, March 31, 1767, and on April 3, appeared the royal decree for its abolition. Naples enacted the same measures, Nov. 5, 1767, and Parma Feb. 7, 1768. Though it must be admitted that the overthrow of the Order was the work of cabals and despots, there is yet cause for rejoicing that a society so injurious to the interests of humanity was abolished. Compelled by circumstances he could not control, Clement XIV. issued his bull, *Domine ac Redemptor noster*, July 21, 1773, applying the decisions of Portugal and the Bourbon court to all Catholic Christendom. The attacks made upon Ganganelli in Cretinetti-Joly's work: *Clement XIV. et les Jesuites*, Paris, 1847, have been successfully repelled in the work of the Oratorian Augustin Theiner: *Histoire du Pontificat de Cl. XIV.*, Paris, 1852.

V. *Its Restoration and Later History.* Notwithstanding the Papal decree, the organization was not totally dissolved. Some of its members joined the *Redemptorists* or *Signorians*. In Russia it held on its old course, and elected as Vicar General, Stanislaus Czerniewicz, of Poland. The third vicar, Frans Kareu, obtained a brief from Pope Pius VII. which permitted the establishment, March 7, 1801, of the Order for all Russia, and Ferdinand IV. one for its restoration in the two Sicilies, July 30, 1804. Pius VII. finally restored the Order to its ancient position by the bull, *solicitude omnium sollicitudinis*, August 7, 1814. France, Germany, the Netherlands, Brazil, and Portugal protested, and it was only in the States of the Church, in Spain, Naples, Sardinia, and Modena, the Jesuits at first succeeded in gaining admission. Their proselyting zeal awakened the fear of Emperor Alexander of Russia, who had been one of their warmest friends, and when they succeeded in converting Prince Alexander Galizin, December, 1814, they were expelled from Petersburg and Moscow, January 1, 1816, and March 25, 1820, visited with a decree of eternal banishment from the whole empire. On Oct. 18, 1820, Father Luigi Fortis was elected General. Leo XII. transferred to them the Collegium Romanum, 1824, and put into their hands the education of the clergy. Father John Roothaan succeeded Fortis, July 9, 1829. Greg. XVI. placed under their charge, Oct. 2, 1836,

the celebrated College of the Propaganda. Roothaan, who died May 8, 1853, was succeeded by Peter Beckx, the Provincial of Austria.¹—The Order having, on the death of Ferdinand, (Sept. 29, 1833), of Spain, espoused the cause of Don Carlos, the people stormed the College at Madrid, July 17, 1834, and expelled the Regent Maria Christina, July 4, 1835. Portugal was only opened to it about July 10, 1829, through the influence of Don Miguel, but again closed, May 24, 1834, by Don Pedro. Though possessed of a large convent in Insbruck, 1844, they were not popular in the Tyrol. The number of young Prussians who studied in Rome became so numerous, that King Frederick William III. forbade his subjects the frequentation of foreign Jesuit Colleges, July 13, 1827. In Great Britain the Catholic Emancipation Act was passed, 1829, and though the Jesuits were excluded, the progress of Catholicism in that country proves their secret presence and operations. In Belgium they appear to have gained a complete victory. Louis XVIII. having granted them the privilege of missionating, Sept. 25, 1816, they soon planted colonies in some of the principal cities, and established a congregation in Lyons, 1822. During the reign of Charles X. their influence became so great that the king was compelled, Jan. 5, 1828, to dismiss Villele from his ministry, and put in his place Martignac. The revolution of July drove the Jesuits, whose number had increased to 436, from France, and their colleges were destroyed. Under Louis Philippe, they quietly returned, and were tolerated. All Paris was enchanted with the eloquence of the Jesuit, Xavier de Rassignan. Yet there was more or less opposition to the Order, and to adjust difficulties, Father Roothaan recalled his associates, and the government abolished the principal houses of the Order in Paris, Lyons, Avignon, and St. Acheul. Soon after their restoration, they again came into possession of their old colleges in Sitten and Brieg, Switzerland, and the Council of Freiburg, Sept. 19, 1818, presented their institutions in the Canton with a fund of one million Swiss francs. The revival of a democratic government in some of the

¹ For the sake of convenience, we subjoin a catalogue of all the Generals of the Order:—

Name.	Day of Election.	Day of Death.
1. Ignatius of Loyola, Spaniard,	Apr. 15, 1541.	July 31, 1556.
2. Juan Luis de S.	July 2, 1555.	Jan. 18, 1566.
3. Francis Borgia, Spaniard,	July 2, 1565.	Oct. 1, 1592.
4. Theobald Mathias,	Apr. 28, 1573.	Aug. 1, 1593.
5. Claude de Aquino, Neapolitan,	Feb. 26, 1580.	Jan. 21, 1595.
6. Michael de S.	Mar. 14, 1581.	Feb. 9, 1596.
7. Vincent de S.	Jan. 1, 1585.	June 8, 1598.
8. Francis de S.	Dec. 31, 1589.	June 17, 1591.
9. Albert de S.	Jan. 31, 1592.	Mar. 25, 1593.
10. Giovanni de S.	Mar. 17, 1594.	July 31, 1595.
11. John Peter Oliva, German, (died 1600) Gen. Trier and extended successor,	July 31, 1594.	Nov. 28, 1601.
12. Charles of Neapoli, Belgian,	July 5, 1595.	Dec. 21, 1599.
13. Thomas Gonzalez, Spaniard,	July 6, 1597.	Oct. 27, 1700.
14. Michael Augustus Tombari, Modenese,	Jan. 31, 1700.	Feb. 28, 1720.
15. Francis Remy, Bohemian,	Nov. 20, 1700.	Nov. 20, 1705.
16. Ignatius Vianon, Milanese,	July 2, 1704.	Nov. 4, 1705.
17. Anthony Costantini, Genoese,	Nov. 20, 1705.	Oct. 2, 1711.
18. Leopold Ricci, Florentine,	May 31, 1710.	Nov. 28, 1720.
19. Stephen de S.	Oct. 17, 1710.	July 7, 1715.
20. Gabriel Lischewitz, Polish,	Sept. 17, 1710.	Sept. 10, 1715.
21. Francis Xavier Kareu, Polish, from March 7, 1801, Gen. for all Russia,	Feb. 1, 1700.	July 20, 1800.
22. Gabriel Gruber, German,	Oct. 20, 1800.	Mar. 20, 1805.
23. Theobald Bronschoy, Polish, from August 7, 1816, Gen. of Restored Order,	Sept. 2, 1800.	Feb. 2, 1810.
24. Augustus Fortis, Venetian,	Oct. 20, 1800.	Jan. 27, 1829.
25. John Roothaan, Amsterdam,	July 9, 1829.	May 8, 1853.
26. Peter Beckx, Antwerp,	July 7, 1853.	

Cantons promised to thwart their designs, but the impolitic call of Dr. Strauss to the theological chair of Zurich, and the insurrection of the peasants occasioned thereby, Sept. 6, 1839, tended rather to promote them. After having experienced a series of alternate fortunes and misfortunes, they were banished the country, Sept. 3, 1847. The revolutions of 1848 proved disastrous to their interests. They were compelled to leave Genoa, March 1, Naples, March 11, Sicily, July 31. Even Pius IX. found himself under the necessity of expelling them from his States, March 29. April 17, 1848, the Redemptorist mission in Bavaria was abolished, and, April 6, in Vienna. On April 10, the Jesuits were driven from Linz, and on 8th of May Emperor Ferdinand extirpated the Order out of his territories. Disasters, however, appear not to have broken their zeal. For, after the victory of the French troops, July 3, 1849, they returned to Rome, to Austria, 1854, and conducted missions with incredible energy in Germany, Bavaria, Prussia, Westphalia, &c. In France also they obtained a firm foothold.—In the year 1626, the Order comprised 10 European and 6 foreign departments, or 39 provinces, 15,493 members in 803 houses, of which the professed were 25, colleges 467, missions 63, presidencies 165, seminaries 36; in 1749, 22,589 members, the professed houses 39, colleges 669, missions 273, seminaries 176; from 1838–1844, in the four countries, Italy, Spain, France, Germany, 16 provinces and vice-provinces; in 1838, in 173 houses lived 1246 priests, 943 scholastics, 887 lay brothers, total 3067; in 1844, 1645 priests, 1281 schol., 1207 lay b., 4133 in 233 houses; in 1847, the number—5510 members, showing an increase of 2443 in 17 years.

The only objects of the Order seem to have been the extension of Catholicism and the subjection of the world to the Church. Protestants, if they would not be recreant to their principles, cannot grant it any toleration, and, in Germany, particularly, where, in our day, the Jesuits are straining every nerve to accomplish their purposes, the Reformed and Lutherans ought to lay aside all differences, and unite in a common defence against a common foe.—Of the sources of information, we mention the seven volumes of *historiæ soc. Jesu* by Orlandini, Sacchini, Possinus, Jouveny and Cordara, extending from 1540–1625; the *Imago sæculi primi Soc. Jesu.*, Antwerp, 1640 (comp. Ranke, III., 381; *Wolf's* allgem. Gesch. d. Jes. 2. A. Lpz., 1803, 4 vol.; *Sugenheim's* G. d. J. in D., 1540–1773, 2 vol., Frankf., 1847; *Kortüm: Die Entstehungsg. d. J.-Ordens*, Mannheim, 1843 *Schröckh's* K. Gesch., and *Gieseler*. Of Jesuit historians, *Histoire religieuse, politique et littéraire de la Compagnie de Jésus*, Paris, 1844–46, 6 vol., and *F. G. Buss*, *die G. Jesu, ihr Zweck*, Mayence, 1854. The best representation by Ranke, in his *History of the Popes*. Comp. *Jordan*, *de Jesuit. u. d. Jesuitismus*, Altona u. Lpz., 1839; *Orelli*, *das Wesen d. J.*, Potsdam, 1846, and *Bode*, *das Innere d. Gesells. Jesu*, Lpz., 1849. G. E. STERTZ.—*Ermentrout*.

Jesuitesses. Whilst Ignatius, (see *Jesuits*), before his journey to Jerusalem, tarried in Bar-

celona, he, one day in the church, attracted the notice of Isabella of Rosella, a distinguished woman of the place. On her return home she persuaded her husband to go in search of the stranger. He found him, and made him his guest. At table Ignatius spoke so fervently in favor of a godly life, that Isabella's heart was captivated. On his return from Jerusalem (1524) to Barcelona, Isabella entertained him. Her purpose became fixed. With two other women she followed him to Rome, and desired to be placed under the spiritual guidance of Ignatius. His plans had meanwhile changed, and he sought to escape their wishes. But the women persisted, and obtained from Paul III. an injunction in their favor. Ignatius soon experienced more trouble from this source than in the management of his company. At his entreaty Paul III. released him (1546) from his new charge. He then hastened to release Isabella from the duty of obedience, and from being a spiritual daughter she became a worthy mother (*Ribadeneira, Vita Ignatii*, Lij. I., 10, 13; III., 14).—Another society of Jesuitesses, wholly distinct from the former, was constituted early in the 17th cent., in Germany and Italy, and without Papal approval, which is known only through the breve of Urban VIII., *Pastoralis Romani pontif.*, of Jan. 13, 1631 (*Bullar. M. Luxemb.*, V., 215, &c.). These women had regular colleges, and houses of probation, rectresses, visitors, and a general, in whose hands they placed solemn vows. They did not live secluded, but went about performing spiritual services. Urban, in the breve above-named, dissolved them, not thinking their public duties suited to female modesty (cf. *Helyot*, VII., 569. *Sainjore* (*Rich. Simon*), *Biblioth. crit.*, I., 289).—Another society, at first called Jesuitesses, was formed by Joanna, widow of the Marquis of Montferrat, and confirmed, April 7, 1607, as the Order of "*The daughters of our beloved Lady*." Its object was the religious instruction of young women, and its rules like those of Ignatius, but it was placed under the Benedictines (*Helyot*, VI., 398, &c.).—We may more truly regard the Order of the "*Women of the sacred heart, or faith of Jesus*," founded by Mlle. Barat, of Paris, for the instruction of women, and confirmed by Leo XII., Dec. 22, 1826, as a branch of the Society of Jesus. This order is more closely affiliated with that of the Jesuits.

G. E. STERTZ.*

Jesus Christ.—In the fulness of the time ordained of God from eternity for the salvation of man, after an interval of 400 years, from the completion of the canon of the Old Testament, began the final and fullest series of the revelations of God to his people Israel. Herod the Great, in the year 717 of the city of Rome, had been established king of Judea. In his reign the Angel Gabriel appeared to Zacharias, of the course of Abia, while ministering at the altar in the temple at Jerusalem, and announced to him that his wife Elizabeth should bear to him a son, of whom Isaiah and Malachi prophesied as the forerunner of the Lord to prepare the way before him. This annunciation was made to Zacharias in the month of April, in the year 748 of the city of Rome, and six

ears before the Christian era, according to the common reckoning. Six months later, in October, Gabriel announced to a virgin named Mary, in the retired mountain town of Nazareth, in Galilee, that she should be overshadowed by the person of the Holy Ghost, and become the mother of the promised Messiah. Mary was already espoused to Joseph, of the lineage of David; and immediately after this annunciation proceeded to visit her cousin Elizabeth, in a Levitical city, probably Jutta, in the hill country of Judea. Confirmed in the revelation respecting herself by the prophetic salutation of Elizabeth, she returned, after three months, to Nazareth, and was received by Joseph to his own house as his wife.

Soon after the departure of Mary, Elizabeth bore a son who, to the surprise of all the relatives, received the name of John. About the same time the Emperor Augustus published a decree that a census should be taken, and a tax levied upon the whole Roman Empire, including that of Herod the Great. This vassal of Augustus complied so far as to have the census taken, but the taxation was not assessed until ten years later, under Quirinus, then the Roman governor of Syria. That command of the pagan emperor caused the fulfilment of an ancient prophecy that the promised Messiah, the King of the Jews, should be born in the city of David. It required Joseph to return to Bethlehem to be enrolled for the required taxation, at the ancestral residence of the family of David. Mary accompanied Joseph in this journey; and, in her poverty finding no suitable place of entertainment, gave birth, in a manger, to the promised Messiah—Christ, the Lord. This event occurred, not on the day observed as its commemorative festival in December, but in June or July, in the year 749 of Rome, and five years before the common reckoning of the Christian era. Only the shepherds of the place who watched their flocks by night on the plains below, learned from angelic songs that a Saviour then was born in that lowly condition in Bethlehem.

Eight days after his birth this child received the seal of the covenant of his people with the name of Jesus = Saviour, Deliverer, and at the end of forty days was presented, according to the custom of the Levitical laws (Lev. 12: 6-8), at the temple, where He was saluted by the aged Simeon as the Light of the Gentiles, and the glory of his people Israel. This testimony of Simeon was also confirmed by the prophetess Hannah, who had passed a long life in acts of devotion around the temple, like Simeon, waiting for the consolation of Israel. Thus in all the lowliness of the Son of Man, shone conspicuous in manifold forms, tokens of the glory of the only begotten Son of God. Neither were these tokens restricted to the Jewish nation, for He was to be the Light of the Gentiles, as well as the King of the Jews. While Joseph continued to linger at Bethlehem, either engaged in private occupations, or under the supposition that the Son of David should be reared in the city of David, came the wise men of the East,—either from the region of Arabia, or of Parthia above Babylon, to Jerusalem, inquiring for him that was born King of the Jews. They must have

obtained some knowledge of the promised Messiah from Jews being in their country. Their profession as astrologers gave them a religious character. A remarkable conjunction of Jupiter and Saturn in the sign of *the Fishes*, which was the national emblem of Israel, occurring in the year 747, to which was added, in the year following, that of Mars, seems profoundly to have impressed them of some extraordinary event among the Jewish nation. Then the marvellous appearance of a singular star in the heavens confirmed their expectation of an universal Deliverer, and awakened a conviction that this extraordinary personage might already have arisen in Israel. In the winter of 750 they were induced by these considerations to enter upon their long and difficult journey; and about the last of February they arrived at the capital of Judea. Their inquiries awakened the jealousy of the king and the interest of the people. Knowing that the Scriptures designated Bethlehem as the birthplace of the Son of David, they proceeded thither—that sign in the heavens, whatever it may have been, conspiring with the word of God to direct them to the infant Saviour. Joyously entering the house over which the star seemed to hang, they saluted reverently the young child, notwithstanding the poverty of the parents, and presented their royal gifts. Thus was Jesus recognized by Gentile princes as the Saviour of the world.

The jealousy of Herod soon endangered the life of the child, by a cruel decree ordering all the children of Bethlehem, who were two years old and under, to be put to death. But God preserved the life of the child; warning Joseph by an angel, to flee with Him and the mother into Egypt before the execution of the bloody decree. Herod soon died at Jericho, just before the Passover, in April, 750, and his kingdom, according to a revision of his will by Augustus, was distributed to several of his sons: to Archelaus, Judea, Samaria, and Idumea; to Herod Antipas, Galilee and Peræa; to Philip, Batanæa, Gaulanitis, and Trachonitis. Warned by an angel, Joseph soon returned with Mary and the child to Palestine; not to Judea, where Archelaus reigned with a cruelty resembling that of his father, but to Nazareth, in Galilee, his former residence. From this place He finally entered on his public ministry, not as the son of David, the king of Israel, but as a prophet from Nazareth, a place wholly unknown in Jewish Scriptures, thus fulfilling the prophecy that he should be unknown to his people. To the men of Nazareth nothing was known of the miraculous circumstances attending the birth of Jesus. They, among whom He lived to the age of manhood, knew Him only as the son of Joseph the carpenter, while his parents silently pondered over the mysterious character of the child. Jesus belonged to a numerous family, which called into habitual action the duties of a son and of a brother. The sisters of Jesus are mentioned, but whether they were in reality such, or whether they were the daughters of Alphæus, brother of Joseph, and adopted by him after his brother's death, does not appear. As the first born, Jesus, after the death of Joseph, took the charge of the family and sup-

ported them by continuing the occupation of his foster father. Thus lived Jesus for thirty years in the deepest retirement and obscurity. Once only did He give any indication of his higher calling and Divine character. At the age of twelve years, He went up for the first time with his parents to Jerusalem, at the feast of the Passover, March or April, 761. There in the temple, his Father's house, He showed them the higher relations which he sustained to God as his Father, but they continued in great measure unconscious of the full import of his words, until his public ministry compelled all to recognize in the carpenter of Nazareth, the King of Israel, the Saviour of the world, who, in his infancy, had in vain been announced by angels and men, the star in the East, and the Holy Scriptures. Before entering on his public ministry, one other attestation of his Divine character remained to be made according to the Scriptures. Ancient prophets had announced that one should go before Him in the spirit and form of Elias, as his forerunner to prepare men for the revelation of himself.

It was now the 779th year of Rome. Tiberius, a voluptuous, gloomy tyrant, in Jan. 765, had been accepted as regent, and Aug. 19, 767, had been proclaimed Emperor of Rome. The kingdom of David, which had been re-established under Herod the Great, at his death had again been dissolved. Archelaus had been set aside, and Pontius Pilate, in 779, appointed governor of Judea, a capricious ruler who sought by every means to insult and oppress the Jews. The tetrarchy of Abilene had become a fourth dependency of the Roman Empire under Ly-sanias.

The ecclesiastical and moral condition of the country was equally unhappy. One Joseph, named Caiaphas, was high-priest from 778 to 790, whose father-in-law, Annas, had held the same office from 760 to 767. Both belonged to the sect of the Sadducees—in morals and habits of thought, closely allied to the corrupt Roman magistrates, while equally jealous of the influence of the Pharisees in a strict observance of Jewish laws and rites. Such were the political and ecclesiastical relations of the country when Jesus entered on his public ministry. John the Baptist, who had passed his youth in solitude in the hill country of Judea, began in the autumn of 779 to preach in the wilderness between Jerusalem and the Jordan, north of the Dead Sea. Preaching repentance and proclaiming the near approach of the kingdom of heaven, he fulfilled his prophetic mission as forerunner of the Lord, to prepare the way before him, and make ready the people for the coming of the Son of Man. Jesus announced himself to John by presenting himself in the wilderness for baptism by him in the Jordan, Dec. 779, or Jan. 780. It became him to fulfil all righteousness; and, accordingly, though he knew no sin, it became him as a man to receive the sign of repentance by this public rite of baptism. John, by this act, gave a visible and palpable sign that Jesus was the Christ of God, not merely belonging to the kingdom of heaven, but actually setting up that kingdom in the world. In token of his heavenly mission the Holy Ghost, in the form

of a dove, descended and rested on Him, arming him for his work and indicating the gentleness of his ministry, while a voice from heaven proclaimed him God's well beloved Son.

But before presenting himself before his people as the Saviour, He, like the first Adam, encountered the temptation of Satan. Immediately after his baptism he withdrew into the desert west of the Jordan, where for forty days and nights he was assailed by the power of the tempter. Oppressed with hunger from long fasting, He is urged by the deceiver to exert his miraculous power for his own relief, by converting the stones into bread. This might convince the most incredulous. Next, as Lord of the world, He is urged to assume his power and begin his rule. And again, to commit himself to the protecting power of God, who should bear Him up and give his angels charge to keep Him in all His ways, by casting Himself from the pinnacle of the temple to the ground far below. But these various wiles of the great deceiver were alike powerless over the sinless Son of God.

At the conclusion of these forty days of fasting and temptation in the wilderness came a delegation from the high council of the nation to John the Baptist, inquiring whether he were not himself the expected Messiah? With great humility he turns their attention to another who is preferred before himself, and openly declares Him to be the Son of God, of whom the prophets spake. The day following, John beholding Jesus returning from the wilderness, points the attention of his disciples to Him, saying, "Behold the Lamb of God!" the true paschal lamb that taketh away the sin of the world. Upon this annunciation Andrew and John attached themselves to Jesus as his disciples, and these again were soon joined by James the brother of John, and Simon Peter, brother of Andrew, all fishermen of Galilee, and disciples of John the Baptist. The next day, when about to return to Galilee, Jesus called Philip, who also brought his brother Nathaniel to Jesus. With these six disciples he returned homeward, and on the third day met his mother at a marriage-feast in Cana of Galilee. Here, at the unseasonable call of his mother, and to confirm the faith of his disciples, he wrought his first miracle, though the time for entering on his public ministry had not fully come. Judea, rather than Galilee, was also the appropriate place for the manifestation of his miraculous powers. From Cana Jesus proceeded with his relatives and his disciples to the home of the latter in the neighborhood of Capernaum, and soon returned to Jerusalem, to the feast of the Passover in March or April of 780 of Rome, and the 27th of the Christian era. Here He gave signal proof of his divine authority and power in purifying the courts of the temple from the profane merchandise of the money changers. Amazed at this fiery zeal, the Jews demand some token of his assumed authority. "Destroy this temple and in three days I will build it up," referring to this final miracle of his resurrection as the fullest attestation of divine authority over the temple of God and the people who profaned his Father's house. Many

her miracles were wrought by Him during the week of the Passover, the effect of which was to awaken the jealous hostility of the chief priests and rulers of the Jews. To Nicodemus, a Pharisee and member of the Sanhedrim, He taught the necessity of regeneration as an indispensable condition of admission to the kingdom of heaven. Having in these various ways fully attested his mission from heaven without fully entering upon it, He returned to Galilee with his disciples, who betook themselves again to their customary occupations.

John, though distinctly directing his hearers to one infinitely greater than himself, still continued his ministry, baptizing near Salim, perhaps in the south of Judah, not far from his native place.¹ Late in the autumn of 781, Jesus, calling together his disciples, returned to Judea, apparently over the Jordan, to co-operate with John in calling men to repentance. Here multitudes resorted to Him and were baptized by his disciples, for this outward symbol could not with propriety be administered by the great Author of Salvation himself. The disciples of John, murmuring at this diversion of the multitude from his ministry to that of Jesus, gave their master an opportunity again more fully to declare Him to be the Christ, the Son of God. But the declaration only drew the attention of the Pharisees to both as dangerous men, whom the people were blindly following. Jesus, therefore, that He might not seem to counteract the ministry of John, which He only sought to aid, as He heard how the Pharisees regarded his own ministrations, withdrew, and retired to private life at Nazareth, December, 781. On his way he revealed Himself to the woman of Samaria as the Messiah

of the Jews, and at the request of many of the Samaritans who believed on Him, he tarried with them two days, and passed on to the seclusion and retirement of his own domestic circle in Galilee. Though urged by those who had witnessed his miracles at the feast at Jerusalem, and who knew something of the thronged attendance upon his ministry near the Jordan, He did no mighty works among them save the healing of the nobleman's son at Capernaum. This He did, not as an act of his public ministry, but out of compassion for the affliction, and at the earnest entreaty of the father, who left his dying child to seek relief from Jesus at Nazareth.

About three-fourths of a year were passed by Jesus in His retirement, when the imprisonment of John the Baptist again called Him into public life. In September, 781 of Rome, He went up to Jerusalem, where He healed the impotent man at the pool of Bethesda on the Sabbath-day. At this the Jews were greatly incensed, as a violation of their laws and a profanation of the day. In the discussion which followed Jesus appealed to the Lord as his Father, whose works of mercy suffered no suspension on the Sabbath-day,² thus openly declaring himself the Son of God. This apparent blasphemy so exasperated the Jews that they sought to kill Him. From this date He becomes the object of the deadly hatred of the priests, who eagerly seek for an opportunity to compass his death in uniformity with their laws. Under the malignant eye of the priests and scribes, Jesus accordingly takes up the ministry of John, by the preaching of repentance, and the near approach of the kingdom of heaven, to prepare the way for his own intro-

¹ This suggestion of the author respecting the locality of *Enon* appears to be quite peculiar and untenable. Dr. Barclay has, with great probability, identified the waters of *Enon*:

“John was baptizing in *Enon*, near to Salim, because there was much water there.’ The name Salim has hitherto directed the attention of travellers to the neighborhood of the ancient Shalim, a city of Shechem, east of that place; but all research has utterly failed to identify the *fountains* of *Enon*, the many waters or *fountains*, as the meaning of the text is, which were convenient for the baptism of John. But Dr. Barclay has recently discovered a remarkable assemblage of fountains and pools on the margin of the desert beyond and below the Mount of Olives, six miles north-east of Jerusalem, which seem to satisfy the conditions of the narrative, and give at last a fixed position to this floating, uncertain locality. In one of his excursions in the wild rugged wilderness east of Olivet, Dr. Barclay discovered ‘a delightful, grand, and fearful wady,’ shut out from all the world by rocks and precipices, which tower heavenward to ‘a sublime height.’ From the base of these flow many waters from different springs, which, being united, form a powerful stream, and become the head-waters of the Wady Kelt of the desert, the Cherith of Elijah the prophet (1 Kings 17:3, 6); ‘and surely a more admirable place of seclusion could nowhere be found. Some of its yawning chasms are absolutely frightful to behold.’ One of these springs is a siphon spring, occupying about twelve minutes in its ebb and flow, disappearing three minutes, then gushing out in a volume sufficient ‘to drive several mills.’ At the distance of a mile or two above are various pools, varying in depth ‘from a few inches to four fathoms or more,’ and ‘supplied by some half-dozen springs of the purest

and coldest water, bursting from rocky crevices at various intervals.’ ‘Richer land I have never seen than is much of this charming valley: capable, too, of being made yet richer by the guano of goats, many large mounds of which—the accumulation of long ages—are here found. Several kinds of cattle were voraciously feeding on the rich herbage near the stream; and thousands of sheep and goats were seen approaching the stream, or resting at noon-day in the shadow of the great rock composing the overhanging cliff, here and there. The cooing dove and the kharking raven are here seen in strange affinity. And many birds of many kinds, from the chirping little sparrow to the immense condor-looking vulture, were sweetly carolling, or swiftly flitting across the valley, or securely reposing upon its lofty cliffs; and the most delicious perfume pervaded many spots in this beautiful little Eden. Rank grasses, luxurious reeds, tall weeds, and shrubbery and trees of various kinds, entirely conceal the stream from view in many places; forming around its pebbly little pools just such shady and picturesque alcoves and bowers as classic poets picture out for the haunts of their naiads, sylphs, and fairies.’

“This being the only accessible water for many miles, herds of gazelles, that graze on the neighboring hill-sides, resort here in great numbers; and the dense forests of cane-brakes are the favorite resort of wild boars, which abound below.’

“One of the wadys, within a mile and a half of this place, bears the name of Salim. Shalim, Saleim, &c.; but, without insisting on this coincidence, or detailing the author's course of argument, we accept his conclusions, and rest with him in an ‘assured conviction that this is, indeed, no other than the *Enon* near to Salim, where John was baptizing, because there was much water there.’—*Tr.*

duction of that kingdom. His work is the same as that of John, but with the difference that He goes among the people preaching as he may gain a hearing; the Baptist preached to those chiefly who came out to him; John spake even of another who should come after him, and of himself only as his forerunner and herald to prepare the way of the Lord. Jesus declares himself as He that was to come, of whom John and all the prophets spake, confirming the word spoken by miracles and signs from heaven innumerable and incontrovertible.

Galilee was chiefly the theatre of the ministry of our Lord. Here He was better known and might expect a more favorable hearing. The people were neither so bigoted in their superstitions nor bitter in spirit as the inhabitants of Judea, but equally as far from the kingdom of heaven. Immediately after his return from the Feast of Tabernacles He separates Himself finally from his family and his home in the mountains at Nazareth, and takes up his abode at Capernaum, on the coast of the sea of Galilee. This city was on the great line of travel between Gaza and Damascus, between Egypt and Assyria, and all the East. It was accessible by land and water, and a convenient centre for his circuits and missionary tours in every direction. The burden of his ministry was everywhere in substance the same as that of John—repentance and faith as a preparation for the kingdom of heaven. Multitudes flocked around Him from all quarters, attracted by his strange doctrines and astonishing miracles, among which was the miraculous draught of fishes by four of his former disciples, who had toiled all night and caught nothing. From the boat of Peter, at a short distance from the shore He taught the vast multitude that pressed around to the margin of the water. Then directing Peter to put out into the sea, He gave him to understand that the multitude of fishes was but a token of the greater multitudes of men whom he should yet gather into the kingdom of heaven. On coming to the shore He next called Andrew the brother of Peter; and soon after added to these James and John, the sons of Zebedee the fisherman. These all even forsook forever their occupations and their family, and became the constant attendants of Jesus in his ministry from place to place, partners not only of his daily toils, but of the perils to which He was exposed from the settled malice of the leaders of the people. The next day was the Sabbath, when He taught in the synagogue at Capernaum, and healed a demoniac, then repairing to the house of Peter, He restored to health Peter's wife's mother, sick of a fever. The events of the day, on being known abroad, caused the people, when the Sabbath was ended, to bring together a great multitude of demoniacs and invalids of every kind to be healed.

In the former part of his ministry in Galilee our Lord directed his efforts particularly to the common people, frequenting the largest assemblies, and seeking as far as possible to win all to the knowledge of his doctrines and acceptance of the truth. But gradually He sought to withdraw Himself from the notice of the public, suspended his missionary circuits, attached

Himself chiefly to his disciples, and silently passed from place to place, to sustain and enforce the convictions already made, rather than to gain new converts.

Manifold were the forms of his instructions: sometimes in a protracted discourse in the synagogue, in the court of the temple, or under the open heavens; frequently in brief remarks, in reply to some inquiry, or in a word fitly spoken as the occasion required; now, in a proverb verified in himself, and now, as in his sermon on the mount, in an exposition of his doctrine, contrasted with that of the Pharisees. Not unfrequently He availed Himself of comparisons to illustrate his meaning, or silence an opponent. Often He veiled his instructions under the garb of a parable illustrative of the true nature of the kingdom of heaven which the multitude failed to comprehend, but intelligible to the more enlightened.

He taught that the time had fully come for the advent of the Saviour according to the prophetic promises of the Jewish Scriptures, and that he of whom John the Baptist spake was the promised Messiah. To the woman of Samaria, the blind man at Jerusalem, and to Pilate He distinctly declared Himself to be the Messiah, Christ the King of the Jews. But with these exceptions He revealed not Himself directly as the Messiah, seeking rather by word and deed to enforce the conviction that He was none other than the Saviour that was to come. He declared Himself not a son of man like any one of the human family, but in a sense altogether peculiar and distinct, *THE SON OF GOD*, and *THE SON OF MAN* also in a sense equally peculiar and distinct. He became flesh and dwelt among them to whom He spake as a man, but He was not of this world, He was with the Father before the world was, and after a little time He was to return again on high to his Father in heaven. The Jews so universally associated with the expected Messiah the idea of a sovereign who should reign over them on earth as their king, and establish the throne of David, that He carefully suppressed this appropriate designation of Himself and his office among men. They who truly believed on Him could not fail to acknowledge Him as the Son of God, the Saviour of the world, but the revelation of his spiritual kingdom, and of the sufferings and death through which He was to pass away to his reign on high, was only made to his disciples at the latest hour. Not until then were they prepared for this great mystery of his mysterious character.

All that Jesus said of Himself was confirmed by signs from heaven, and miracles which He wrought in attestation of his Divine mission. They distinctly revealed the coming of the kingdom of heaven on earth. They taught, as nothing else could teach, forgiveness of sins and deliverance from all evils, spiritual and temporal, by this same Jesus of Nazareth. By raising the dead to life He manifested his power over death and the grave; by healing them that were possessed of devils he discovered his power over the devil and his angels. To the disciples whom John sent from his distant dungeon to inquire whether He were in reality the Messiah

from whom the prophets spake, He simply replied: 'Go tell John what things ye have seen and heard—the blind see, the lame walk, the deaf hear, the dead are raised up, and the poor have the gospel preached unto them.' That was enough—He that was to come had come. The scriptures were fulfilled. The Saviour was in their midst. Behold the Lamb of God that taketh away the sin of the world.

Most unworthily did they to whom Jesus came preaching the gospel of the kingdom, requite his mission among them. They wondered at the miracles which He wrought. They accounted Him a great prophet,—perhaps one of the old prophets, or possibly John the Baptist raised from the dead. Few inquired whether He were the Son of David, the Christ of God. To-day they are ready to hail Him as the King of the Jews. To-morrow they demand again of Him a sign from heaven. Their spiritual leaders, entertaining a more profound impression of the character of Jesus, arrayed themselves in settled hostility against Him.

At this stage of his public ministry our Lord chose his disciples, twelve in number, corresponding to the tribes of Israel, to become the founders of the Christian Church. They were to become the apostles, not of one nation, but of all the world, though beginning their ministrations, like their great Master, with the Jews. Peter was at the head of these Apostles, not as having any supremacy or superiority over them, but as the first disciple and foremost in zeal for his Lord. The twelve met, not like the seventy, as the heralds of the Lord, but as his ministers, representatives, and aids, invested with like miraculous powers to preach his gospel. These He carefully enlightened into a knowledge of his Word, and sought by every means to correct their misapprehensions, and give them just views of the future kingdom of heaven.

Our Lord now prosecuted his ministry an entire year in Galilee without intermission. In the winter of 782 He returned to Capernaum, thronged by a vast multitude, for whom provision could only with great difficulty be made to supply their daily wants. The chief priests and scribes here sent from Jerusalem emissaries to watch his proceedings. Among the multitude of those whom Jesus healed was a demoniac, blind and dumb. While the astonished assembly exclaimed, "Is not this the Messiah!" the emissaries of the Scribes and Pharisees at Jerusalem, in their malignant hatred of Christ, ascribed these miraculous powers to Satan himself, the prince of devils. This drew Him into a protracted discourse, exposing the absurdity and malignity of these blasphemers. In the afternoon of the same day Jesus repaired to the shore of the lake, when, in the parable of the sower, the tares, and other similitudes, He taught the multitude on the land, as He sat in a ship before them. Late in the evening He dismisses the assembly, and in sailing by night to the opposite shore, stills the raging of the wind on the sea, heals on the day following the two demoniacs of the inhospitable Gadarenes, and according to their request, returns the same day to Capernaum, when He teaches the multitude awaiting his return, heals their sick, teaches

again in the afternoon by the sea side, and becomes at night the guest of Matthew, whom He had called from the receipt of custom to be his disciple; whereupon the Pharisees murmur that He consorts with publicans and sinners, and the disciples of John murmur that He mingles in scenes of festivity, when it became him and his disciples to fast rather, in view of the loss of this prophet in Israel. These complaints are interrupted by Jairus, a ruler of the synagogue, entreating Him in behalf of his dying child. In passing through the crowd to this scene of sorrow, the woman with bloody flux is healed. The daughter of Jairus, already dead, is restored alive to her parents; then on leaving the house of Jairus two blind men following him, are healed, and at a later hour a dumb demoniac is released from his tormentors. So unwearied, so unceasing are the labors of Jesus, in his efforts to win men to Himself. Going about doing good He passes over all Galilee, and in the beginning of March, 782, is again at Capernaum, attended by a great multitude from all Palestine, who resort there to hear the great prophet of Nazareth, and to be healed of their maladies. The sermon on the mount, the healing of the centurion's servant, and restoration to life of the son of the widow of Nain, fall into this period of our Lord's history.

Perceiving how ineffectual were all his individual efforts for the people through the counter working of their spiritual leaders, Jesus resolved to multiply his labors, by sending out his disciples to preach and work miracles in his name. In the absence of the apostles in this tour, John was beheaded by Herod, at the instigation of Herodias. Immediately on the return of the apostles, March, 782, Jesus, wishing to give them opportunity for rest from their labors, and desiring retirement for meditation and prayer in view of his own death, of which He was firmly impressed by that of his forerunner and friend, set sail for the desert region on the north-east shore of the sea, near Bethsaida Julias. The multitude, from whom He sought to withdraw, soon passed around the head of the lake, and, in eager crowds, broke in upon the seclusion of Christ and his apostles. Touched with compassion for the enthusiastic throng, He begins without delay to instruct them and heal their diseases; and at even, with five loaves and two small fishes, feeds the multitude to the number of 5000. Finding their wants relieved in this distant place, in this miraculous manner, the people unitedly declare Him that prophet that should come, their deliverer and king, so universally, so ardently expected. To guard his disciples from the contagion of this delusion, Jesus directs them to embark in haste and then return again to the western shore of the sea, and retired Himself apart to a mountain. The disciples, themselves tossed in the midst of the sea by baffling winds and waves, labored in vain through the night to bring the ship to land, until Jesus came to them in the morning watch, walking on the sea, and immediately they came to their landing. But even the disciples, though amazed beyond measure at these miracles, failed to comprehend and improve the moral which they taught, insomuch

that when Jesus, in the synagogue at Capernaum, declared Himself to be the bread which cometh down from heaven, whereof if a man eat he shall never die, they were confounded and scandalized. Many of his followers, from this discourse, turned back and went no more with him.

This disaffection of the people spread so far as to interrupt, in a great measure, our Lord's public ministration. His own ministry is fast drawing to a close, and it only remains now for Him to direct his efforts chiefly to his apostles, to prepare them to carry forward his work the more successfully as he ceases from his labors. He now resorts no more to the most frequented places of public resort, but shunning the Jewish population, repairs to distant parts, on the borders of the land where the Jewish and pagan forms of religion were commingled, and neither was earnestly defended. Whether He went up to the Passover in the spring of this year, 782, does not appear. Little is known of his public life in the interval from the Passover to the feast of Tabernacles. The defence of his disciples for plucking the ears of corn on the Sabbath, and his healing the man with a withered hand on the Sabbath-day, his final visit to Nazareth and violent expulsion from the place, fall within this period of time. Encountering the more determined opposition of the Scribes and Pharisees, our Lord soon departs into the region of Tyre and Sidon, heals there the daughter of the Syrophenician woman, and by a wide circuit passes over into the region of Decapolis beyond the Jordan. Here, by healing a deaf and dumb man, He again gathers about Him a great multitude whom He instructs, working miracles in their behalf in restoring the lame, the blind, the dumb, the maimed; and feeding them, to the number of 4000, besides women and children, with seven loaves and a few fishes.

The feast of Tabernacles, Oct. 12-19, 782, begins a new epoch in the life of our Saviour. His own brethren, still undecided what to believe respecting him, urge him to go up to Jerusalem, and openly declare himself in the presence of the people as the Messiah. But the time had not yet come for such a revelation of Himself; He therefore dismisses them as though not intending to go up to the feast, and then privately follows them with his disciples. In the midst of the feast, whilst the multitude are divided in angry discussion respecting the character of Jesus and his doctrines, He presents Himself in their midst at the temple, and openly vindicates his right to teach and work miracles, and explains his relations to his Father in heaven. But the people are only all the more divided and incensed. "Is not this the prophet, the Christ?" Some only reason against the absurd conclusion. Others are ready to lay hands on Him. The chief priests and Pharisees send officers to arrest Him, who, themselves confounded by his discourse, return saying, "Never man spake like this man." This raises an angry division among the members of the Sanhedrim themselves, and every man goes to his own house, while Jesus retires to the Mount of Olives.

After the feast Jesus retired to the remotest region of Galilee, in the neighborhood of Cæsarea Philippi, where He might better prosecute his

great endeavor to prepare his apostles for their work after his decease, by enlightening them into a fuller knowledge of his mediatorial office and work on earth. From Peter, in the name of the twelve, He receives the declaration that whatever others may say of Him, they believe Him to be the Christ, the Son of God. But they have not yet advanced to a comprehension of the mysteries of redeeming grace connected with the death and resurrection of our Lord. He distinctly declares to them his approaching death and resurrection, and warns them of the trials that await them. Six days after this conversation, He gives to Peter, James, and John, in his own transfiguration, a glimpse of the glorified state of the righteous, and a further revelation of his death at Jerusalem, of which Moses and Elias spake, as they talked with Him in the transfiguration. The next day, on coming down from the mount, He heals a demoniac, upon whom the disciples, in his absence, had tried in vain their powers; and with this act of mercy closes his public ministrations in Galilee. Shunning all public demonstrations, He passes privately through the country, confining his attention exclusively to his disciples, to whom again He foretells his departure from them. Still they only receive in sorrow the declaration, without comprehending its fearful import. On his way He returns for the last time to Capernaum, the centre of his benevolent and unavailing mission in Galilee, pays unjust tribute by miracle to avoid offence, teaches his disciples, under the similitude of a little child, the requisite qualifications for the kingdom of heaven. Leaving Galilee at the time of the latter harvest He would pass through Samaria, but encountering the opposition of the Samaritans, He lingers awhile on their borders, heals the two lepers near one of their villages, then turning Eastward, passes over the Jordan into the Pæra beyond. Here He enters on a new field of labor, and begins at once to proclaim the gospel of the kingdom of heaven. The ensnaring interrogations of the Pharisees respecting the law of divorce, the interview with the amiable young ruler whom Jesus loved, the mission of the seventy whom He sent out as heralds and ministers of his kingdom, are incidents of his ministry in the region beyond Jordan, as He travelled slowly through village and city on his way to the lower fords where He received baptism at the hands of John the Baptist. From this place He went up to Jerusalem at the feast of the Dedication, Dec. 20, 782, merely to improve this final opportunity to win, if possible, converts from the assembly. As he walked in Solomon's temple a multitude of Jews surrounded Him, demanding an explicit declaration whether He were the Messiah or not. He tells them of his oneness with the Father. They are ready to stone Him. He appeals to his works, and when in their rage they would cast stones at Him, escapes out of their hands and returns to his former position near the Jordan, where for a time He renews his labors with success. Certain Pharisees warn Him of the dangerous proximity of Herod, to whom Jesus replies, "It cannot be that a prophet perish out of Jerusalem."

In March, 783 of Rome, and in the 30th year of Christ, He raised Lazarus to life after he had been four days in his grave. This extraordinary miracle made a profound impression upon the Jews at Jerusalem, and brought the rulers to decisive action respecting Jesus, the Prince of life. The Sanhedrim convened, and Caiaphas, the high priest, unconsciously designated Jesus as the real paschal lamb, who at that approaching festival should die for the people; but they were yet in doubt how to accomplish this end, because of the people, many of whom believed in Jesus as the Messiah. It was not in accordance with the counsels of heaven that He should become a victim of popular tumult, or of the secret malice of his enemies. He must be led as a lamb to the slaughter, and be made an offering for the sin of the world in the sight of the assembled multitude who should convene for the sacrifice of the Passover. Our Lord accordingly withdrew to the retired village of Ephraim, a few miles North of Jerusalem, where He attached himself exclusively to his disciples. From this retreat Jesus again went over the Jordan into the Peræa, and from thence joined himself to other pilgrims going up to the Passover. Again, the third time, He foretells to his disciples, while on the way to Jerusalem, his betrayal, death, and resurrection on the third day. They are alarmed and astonished, but, not understanding what He said, quiet their forebodings in the expectation of the Messiah's kingdom. Under this delusion, Salome, the mother of James and John, even prefers her ambitious request in their behalf for the chief posts of honor under his reign. On the 30th of March, 783, He crosses over the Jordan, heals the two blind beggars by the wayside, near Jericho, and is entertained in that city by Zachæus, the rich publican. The day following, Friday, March 31st, He, with his disciples, tarries at Bethany while the attendant multitude of pilgrims pass on to the city of Jerusalem. On Saturday, the Sabbath of the Jews, while a guest of Simon the leper, with Lazarus and Martha his sister, Mary anoints the feet of the honored guest with precious ointment—an act which Jesus accepts and explains to the company in answer to the murmurs of Judas Iscariot, as done beforehand for his burial. From this time, as at Jericho, Jesus accepts all public demonstrations of honor, as a manifestation of his royal rights as King of the Jews. In the evening many came out from the city to see both Jesus and Lazarus, whom He had so recently raised from the dead, which so exasperated the chief priests and rulers of the people that they secretly conspired to compass the death both of Jesus and of Lazarus, the living witness of His most miraculous work.

Monday, April 2, a vast multitude, who had come up to the Feast of the Passover, came out to Bethany to conduct Jesus into the city. In the afternoon of the same day Jesus makes his triumphal entry into Jerusalem as the son of David, in fulfilment of the prophecy of Zechariah, borne, not upon a war horse, as an earthly monarch or military conqueror, but riding meek and lowly upon the foal of an ass, while the attending throng rend the air with their

acclamations, shouting Hosanna to the Son of David. As a prevention against the secret malice of his enemies, Jesus, after having presented Himself in the temple, returned the same night to Bethany, for his hour had not yet come. On his way to the city the next day, Monday, April 3, seeing a fig-tree putting forth leaves, in token of fruit, but bearing none, He cursed it as an emblem of Israel, "that under the ancient dispensation bore no fruit, and now in the spring of the new year gave promise of none for their Messiah, now hungering to receive it." At the temple in Jerusalem He publicly exercised his prophetic office, instructing the people, healing the sick, and again purifying the temple of profanations to which it was subjected by the abuses of the money changers and the traffic of the tradesmen. Late in the evening He again returned to Bethany; and the next day, Tuesday, April 4, on his way to the city, by the example of the fig-tree, already withered, He taught his astonished disciples that the iniquity of the Israelites was already full, and that their judgment could linger no more; teaching them, at the same time, the power of faith and of prayer. In the temple Jesus vindicated the authority under which He acted and taught in answer to the cavils of the chief priests, scribes, and elders; silenced the insidious efforts of the Pharisees and Herodians to entangle Him in his doctrines, and those of the Sadducees touching the resurrection of the dead, baffled the cunning of the lawyer who sought to draw Him into a discussion respecting the great commandment, exposed the hypocrisy of the Scribes and Pharisees, foretold the overthrow of the temple and the destruction of the city, and commended the liberality of the poor widow above all the offerings of the rich to the treasury of the temple. On the Mount of Olives, as He retired at night to Bethany, He discoursed at length to his disciples of the destruction of the holy city, the final judgment, and his second coming in the clouds of heaven, and concluded by declaring to them that after two days He should be betrayed and delivered to be crucified, while they should be persecuted and dispersed. At this same hour the council of the Sanhedrim were convened in the house of Caiaphas, the high priest, deliberating how they might, after the feast, take Jesus by subtlety and kill Him. In the midst of their consultations the traitor Judas presents himself a ready agent for the accomplishment of their murderous intent. Thus, by their cherished malice, they were to be, in the councils of heaven, the unconscious agents in bringing to the altar the true Paschal Lamb—the Lamb of God slain from the foundation of the world to take away its sins.

Wednesday, April 5, was passed in retirement at Bethany by Jesus, in company with his disciples. As in Galilee and in the Peræa, so in Judea, Jesus closed his public ministry by giving his latest counsels to his disciples. To them how important, how sacred these final counsels and prayers! To Him how needful, how precious this hallowed day of rest, though but the hush of the warring elements—the awful calm that precedes the tempest!

Thursday, April 6, the stated day for cele-

brating the Passover, Jesus sends Peter and John into the city to bespeak an upper chamber, where He may keep this festival with his disciples. When here assembled in the afternoon, Jesus says to his disciples: "With desire I have desired to eat this Passover with you, before I suffer." Then after the distribution of the first cup, the ritual of the Passover begins, a part of which consists in chanting the 113-114 Psalms. Then washing his disciples' feet, as a significant expression of that humility and purity which becomes his disciples, and discoursing of these graces, He partakes with them of the Paschal Lamb, announces the startling declaration, that he who should presently betray Him is sitting at meat with Him. Thus the traitor himself, as if innocent of the intention, exclaims, with the others, Lord, is it I? is it I? Then, being distinctly designated, Judas, under the disguise of injured innocence, leaves the assembly to execute his dark design. This solemnity ended the sacrament of the Old Testament, Jesus proceeds to institute the corresponding sacrament of the New Testament, sealed also, like that, with blood—the blood of the Lamb of God shed to take away sin. This sacrament was to be a perpetual memorial of Himself—and the means of confirming and strengthening his followers in all their conflicts in life. Then, after singing the second part of the sacramental songs of the Passover, Psalms 115-118, Jesus discourses at length of his immediate death and return to his Father, warns them that they will all desert Him in this last extremity, and appoints a meeting with them again in Galilee. To Peter He had already foretold his denial of Him and the gift of the Holy Spirit, the Comforter, and his own invisible presence with them until He should come again to reunite them to Himself. This intimacy and identity of Himself with his disciples, He illustrates at length by the union of the vine with the branches, offering up to his Father one final prayer in their behalf. At some time after midnight He dismisses the assembly. April 7th, 783 of Rome, and the thirtieth of Christ, according to the common date of the Christian era.

From the chamber of the last supper Jesus repairs to the garden of Gethsemane, beyond the Kedron, in the valley of Jehoshaphat. Here in his agony for the sins of the world, taking with Him three of his most trusty disciples, into the deepest seclusion of Gethsemane. He falls prostrate upon the earth and prays. Three times He repeats the same prayer, and returning as often to the three disciples, finds them in weariness and sorrow, fast asleep. In this hour of his abandonment by the Father, and of the onset of the powers of darkness, an angel appears unto Him, strengthening Him. But as the traitor approaches, He arouses his disciples, that they may be witnesses of his voluntary surrender to his enemies. The Sanhedrim, receiving from Judas the proposal to betray his Master, readily risk the tumult which they feared, rather than lose the opportunity they had sought so long, to lay their hands on Jesus. Assisted by a portion of the Roman cohorts from the tower of Antonia, the servants of the chief priests and Pharisees now come, under

the guidance of Judas, to arrest their victim. While the traitor gives to his confederates the concerted signal of his treacherous kiss, Jesus advances to meet them. Struck with awe at his presence, they fall prostrate to the earth, thus manifesting their own impotency before Jesus surrenders Himself into their hands. The disciples, amazed, bewildered, overwhelmed with horror at the spectacle of their Lord and Master, Christ, the Son of God, in the hands of his enemies, fly from the scene. Caiaphas, the high-priest, elated with the arrest, convenes hastily at this unwonted hour the Sanhedrim, to effect if possible the trial of Jesus before the offering of the morning sacrifice at 9 A. M., and thus surprise and forestall the sentiments of the fickle multitude. In the meantime he consigns his victim to the guardianship of Annas, his father-in-law, on the south-west angle of Mount Zion. To the impertinent interrogations of this official, Jesus deigns not to reply: but while detained a prisoner here, Peter and John, receiving courage to follow their Lord afar off, mingle unobserved with a crowd of attendants around a fire in the court without. Then Peter denies his Lord first to the damsel that kept the door, then to one of the servants, a friend of Malchus. At this instant the cock crows, and Peter, stricken with horror at the denial, as his Lord had forewarned him, goes out into the porch. It is now between one and two o'clock at night. In the meantime the Sanhedrim had assembled, and Jesus is brought before them in the house of Caiaphas. The testimony of the witnesses is frivolous and contradictory. Then, under the solemnity of an oath, Jesus is constrained by the court, in answer to the inquiry, to declare Himself the Messiah, upon which they pronounce Him worthy of death, as a blasphemer against God, and resolve to submit their decision to the Roman governor, who alone has power to inflict the penalty of death. It was in accordance with the determinate counsel of God, that Jesus, the Mediator and Saviour of the world, should suffer the death of the cross as a spectacle to the world. At this stage of the trial, Peter the second time denies his Lord, first to a damsel present at the door, then before the bystanders, who recognize him, by his provisional dialect, as a Galilean and a disciple of Jesus. At this instant, between 2 and 3 o'clock, the cock crows, the meek, reproving glance of Jesus, before the tribunal of Pilate, falls upon his faltering disciple, just now so confident, so courageous. That look overwhelms in sorrow this frail and fallen disciple. He goes out and weeps—and weeps bitterly. Judas the traitor also relents, but his repentance comes too late, his protestations of the innocence of the victim of his betrayal are rejected with scorn and contempt by the council, and, frantic with remorse, without the soft relentings of godly contrition, he goes away and hangs himself, vainly seeking relief in death itself from the consciousness of the innocent blood he has betrayed.

About 9 in the morning Jesus was brought before the judgment-hall of Pilate, perhaps at the palace of Herod the Great, on the south of Mount Zion, the whole council of the Sanhedrim

standing without, lest they should be defiled by entering the court of this foreign prince. When pressed by Pilate for a specific accusation against the prisoner, from which they sought in vain to excuse themselves, knowing that the charge of blasphemy, of which they had found him guilty, was of no consideration with Pilate, they represented him to be a disturber of the public peace, claiming to be Himself the King of the Jews, and diverting the tribute from Cæsar. In answer to the interrogations of Pilate, Jesus admits the charge, but with such explanations as convinced Pilate that He was at most but a harmless enthusiast, and that it was on the part of the Jews a malicious persecution of an innocent captive. But they allege that He has been a seditious disturber of the peace in Galilee. This suggests to Pilate an expedient to relieve himself from this unwelcome trial by sending Jesus to Herod, now in attendance at the feasts, who has jurisdiction over Galilee. Herod, finding nothing either satisfactory or suspicious in Jesus, sends Him back to Pilate, who is disturbed and troubled by a message from his wife, at this instant received, charging him to have nothing to do with this just person. Twice he declares that he finds no fault in the object of their persecutions. Thrice he proposes to them to consent to his release. To appease their malice, he subjects their victim to the torture of the scourge, and appeals both to their sympathy and their generosity to consent to the discharge of their prisoner, according to an established custom of releasing an offender at the time of the feast. But only the more exasperated they exclaim: "Not this man, but Barabbas," a notorious culprit, in prison for sedition and murder. Pilate, alarmed and perplexed by the charge of the Jews, that Jesus claimed to be the son of God, and profoundly impressed with the harmlessness of this mysterious character, makes a final but ineffectual effort to relieve himself, and save the life of this innocent victim of the jealousy, rage, and fanaticism of the Jews. But, seeing that they would not be appeased, and might carry their complaints against himself up to the capricious, jealous tyrant at Rome, under whom he holds his office, Pilate washes his hands in protestation of his own innocence, and gives his reluctant consent to the crucifixion of the reputed King of the Jews, the Son of God. "I am innocent of the blood of this just man, see ye to it. His blood be on us and our children." An imprecation soon fearfully fulfilled upon them.

At 9 o'clock in the morning, the time of the morning sacrifice, Jesus, the sacrificial Lamb of the covenant, is led as a lamb to the slaughter, without the city, bearing the cross upon which He is to be offered for the sins of the world; but sinking beneath the burden of the cross, a stranger from the city of Cyrene, on the coast of Libya, in Africa, an idle spectator of the scene, is compelled to carry the cross. Refusing the stupefying draught usually administered to blunt the pangs of this dreadful death, He bears our sins upon the cross, suffering the just for the unjust, that He might reconcile us unto God; the soldiers, the executioners of the suf-

ferer, dividing among themselves his garments, the poor perquisites of their dreadful office. The chief priests are standing by, and join with the careless crowd, and they that are passing by join in their mockery and railing of His sufferings. From 12 to 3 o'clock, P. M., the hour of the evening sacrifice, the heavens are shrouded in darkness, as if to hide from the avenging eye of God this scene of guilt and woe. Then at this hour of the evening sacrifice Jesus cries with a loud voice, bows his head, and gives up the ghost. Man, for whom He dies, has no apprehension, but all nature gives deep signs of woe. The earth quakes. The rocks are rent. The veil of the temple, which shrouded the holy of holies, is rent asunder; and the sepulchres of the dead are thrown open.

During these six hours, from 9 A. M. to 3 P. M., from the morning to the evening sacrifice, while the Redeemer of men hung upon the cross, in slow anguish expiring under the mighty burden of our sins, and the hidings of his Father's countenance, few were the words He spoke. On his way to the place of crucifixion, to the women who followed Him with emotions, so unlike those of the railing multitude, and weeping as they went, He said: "Daughters of Jerusalem, weep not for me, but weep for yourselves and your children," warning them of the approaching judgments which were about to fall on the devoted city and its inhabitants. When lifted up on the cross, under the first experience of that dreadful torture, He exclaimed: "Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do." To the impenitent malefactor on the cross at his side, who sought a remembrance of himself, He said: "This day shalt thou be with me in Paradise." While several women of Galilee stand at a distance, spectators of the scene. Mary, the mother of Jesus, with Mary, the wife of Cleophas, or Klopas, and Mary Magdalene, draws near the cross, in company with John. Then Jesus, beholding his mother, commends her to the filial care of that beloved disciple. This was his third utterance on the cross. Then in the last extremity of anguish, while the heavens were shrouded in darkness, and all nature gave signs of woe and of wrath divine, while the railing multitude stand in mute amazement, as if death-struck themselves, Jesus exclaims: "My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me." Again, immediately upon this complaint, He exclaims: "I thirst." That exclamation moves one of the attendants to apply to the mouth of the Sufferer a sponge dipped in vinegar. Again, on refusing the vinegar, He says: "It is finished." These propitiatory sufferings for the redemption of lost men are ended now. "The cup which my Father giveth me to drink, have I not drunk it. It is enough. It is FINISHED." Then crying with a loud voice: "Father, into thy hands I commend my Spirit," He bowed his head and gave up the ghost. These seven utterances comprehend all that remains on record of the last words of the dying Redeemer during his agony on the cross.

To hasten the work of death, that the bodies might be taken down before the Jewish Sabbath, the legs of the surviving malefactors are broken,

and death relieves them of their pangs. The body of Jesus is pierced with a lance to ensure his certain death, and blood and water flow forth, indicating that a suffusion of the heart has accomplished its work. The body is delivered to Joseph of Arimathea, an honorable counselor of the Sanhedrim, and a secret disciple of Christ, who, in company with Nicodemus, deposits it in a new sepulchre in a garden near by, guarding the door of the sepulchre by a great stone rolled against it. Several of the women, among whom were Mary Magdalene, and Mary, the wife of Klopas, lingering at the cross, were also witnesses of this disposal of the body of Jesus. The day following, the Sabbath of the Jews, was spent by the disciples of Jesus in silent sorrow and despair. At the instigation of the chief priests and Pharisees, the door of the sepulchre was sealed with the signet of the government, and a Roman guard set to bar any attempt to remove the body.

The women, latest at the cross and earliest at the sepulchre, ignorant of these precautions of the government, had made preparations for embalming the body, as the last office of affection for their Lord; and Mary Magdalene coming to the sepulchre at the faintest dawn of the first day of the week, finds the stone rolled away; and supposing that the enemies of Jesus had taken away her Lord, returns and reports to Peter and John the sepulchre opened and body removed. In the meantime the other women, the wife of Klopas, Salome, the wife of Zebedee, and Joanna, find at the sepulchre an angel, who announces to them that Jesus whom they seek has arisen from the dead, as He had foretold in Galilee, and directs them to signify to Peter and the disciples, that the Lord would reveal Himself to them there according to his word. These now return and announce to the other disciples what they have seen and heard at the sepulchre: but the disciples themselves, in their deep dejection and despair, receive these reports of the women as idle tales, and believe not. Peter and John, however, at the report of Mary Magdalene, hasten to the tomb, and, amazed and distressed at finding it open and empty, turn back again into the town, while Mary Magdalene still lingers behind at the place where last she had seen the body of her Lord deposited. Here she first beholds two angels in the tomb where the body of Jesus had lain, and then, Jesus Himself standing before her, whom she supposes to be the gardener. Jesus saith to her, Mary! and instantly recognizing her Lord, she would have fallen at his feet in joyful adoration. But Jesus charging her not to linger in any act of devotion, because He had not yet ascended to his Father, directs her also to inform his disciples of his appointed meeting with them in Galilee. Respecting her report they remain as unmoved and incredulous as by the intelligence and message of the other women. It seems good therefore to the Lord Himself personally to assure his disciples of his actual resurrection, to reassure their faith and encourage them to collect his scattered followers for the revelation of Himself to them in Galilee. To Peter, first of all, he reveals Himself in the course of that same day, to assure that fallen

disciple of his forgiveness; next, in the afternoon, to Cleopas and another disciple, also on their way to Emmaus. These immediately return and report to the ten, who had assembled in secret, for fear of the Jews, how their Lord had appeared unto them; and they, in turn, relate to Cleopas and his companions the appearance of Jesus to Peter. At the same time the Lord Himself suddenly appears in the midst of them to soothe their spirits, quiet their fears, and quicken their faith. He shows them his hands and his feet, eats in their presence, and when they have become sufficiently composed, reveals unto them the Scriptures fulfilled by his death and resurrection, and imparts unto them the Holy Ghost. Still the disciples continue at Jerusalem chiefly in the hope that Thomas, who was not present when Jesus revealed Himself to them, might be convinced of his resurrection. — On the next Lord's day, Jesus again appears to the eleven, and compels even Thomas to acknowledge him as his Lord and his God. The disciples now return into Galilee, and betaking themselves to their customary occupations for support, await the appointed appearing of their Lord. By the sea of Tiberias Jesus first revealed Himself to seven of his disciples, and again reinstated Peter as his apostle, and foretold his future martyrdom. At another time He appeared on some unknown mountain in Galilee to more than five hundred, and gave to them his great commission to go and preach his gospel to all nations, giving promise of his presence with them to the end of the world. The apostles again go from this mountain to Jerusalem, where on several occasions Jesus appeared to them. On Thursday, May 18th, He led them forth as far as Bethany, then turning up the eastern slope of the Mount of Olives, above Bethany, and there giving to them his final counsels, and charging them to remain at Jerusalem until they should receive the requisite gifts of the Holy Ghost, to be witnesses unto Him not only in Jerusalem, Judaea, and Samaria, but to the uttermost parts of the earth. He lifts up his hands and prays; and as he prays he is parted from them and carried up into heaven, and a cloud receives him out of their sight, to be seen no more on earth until, in the general judgment, He shall so come again in the clouds of heaven, when every eye shall see Him, and they also that pierced Him and all the kindreds of the earth shall wail because of Him.

Chronology of the Christian Era.—To determine the date of our Lord's advent on earth, we must first recur to the death of Herod the Great, which occurred in the fore part of April, in the year 750 of Rome (see Art. *Herod*), and four years before the customary date of the Christian era. At the beginning of March of this year, Herod took his final departure from Jerusalem. The child Jesus was presented at the temple 40 days after his birth, and at a period subsequent to this was sought by the wise men of the east while Herod was yet at Jerusalem. These data refer the birth of Christ to the first half of the month of Jan., 750. The building of the temple affords another date by which to settle our proposed

onology. This restoration of the temple occupied the space of 46 years (John 2:20) from the passover; but Herod began this work in the 18th year of his reign (Jos. *Antt.*, XV., 11, 5, between April 734 and 735. This passover therefore falls in the year 780. Deducting from this period the brief visit of our Lord at Cana, mentioned above, the time occupied in going there from Cana, from the Jordan to Jericho, together with the 40 days of the temptation after the baptism of our Lord, we reduce the date of his baptism to the beginning of Jan., 780, or the last of Dec., 779. At this time Jesus was about 30 years of age (Luke 3:23). This refers his birth back to the same season of the year, 750 or 749. The order of the classes of the priests suggests another mode of computation less reliable than the preceding. Zacharias belonged to the class Abia, the eighth of the twenty-four into which the priests were divided for the service of the sanctuary. His course at the temple occurred 15 months before the birth of Jesus, that is, in the year 748. His course in this year required him to be at the temple from the 17th to the 23d of April, and from the 3d to the 9th of Oct.; but in the winter the shepherds would not be in the fields with their flocks by night. The Talmud informs us, that the flocks, about the first of Nov., at the commencement of the winter rains, were gathered to their stalls. Assuming, with greater probability, that Zacharias was at the temple in April, 748, when the angel appeared to him, we find the birth of John the Baptist to fall in the month of Dec. of the same year, and that of Jesus in about the month of June following, 749. Astronomy is also brought under contribution to settle this vexed question of the birth of Christ and the appropriate date of the Christian æra. The wise men of the east, as astrologers, were not ignorant of the confident expectation on the part of the Jews of the advent of the Messiah, nor of the tradition of the Jews that a conjunction of the planets Jupiter and Saturn in the sign of Fishes in the Zodiac should precede the birth of Christ, as it did that of Moses, by three years. Now Kepler has shown that such a conjunction of those planets actually occurred in the year 747, and again in 748, in connection with the planet Mars. This remarkable conjunction drew the attention of these astrologers strongly to the more wonderful event which the Jewish nation were earnestly expecting. The appearance, therefore, of this phenomenon in the heavens, the star of the Messiah appearing in the heavens, they at once received it as an indication of the advent of the expected King of the Jews, and as soon as possible they proceed to Judæa to do homage to him that was born the King of the Jews, and destined to become the King of nations. Taking, therefore, these statements of these wise men respecting the appearing of the star, and adding two years or less, we find that the birth of Christ must fall within the year 749, or earlier than 750; but as stated above it would not have occurred antecedent to that same year, 749 (Compare Luke 3:23 with John 2:20). From all these considerations the conclusion is, not indeed with mathematical

certainty, but with the highest degree of probability, that Jesus was born in the summer of the year of Rome 749, instead of the common æra 752 or 753. The traditions of the Church are of no authority, for they are not agreed either in regard to the year, the month, or the day of our Lord's advent. Neither does it appear when the decree of Cæsar went forth; we only know that the actual assessment was made under the administration of Cyreneus, some years later, in 759, according to Josephus's *Antiquities*, XVIII., 1, 1.

Duration of our Lord's Public Ministry.—According to the data given above, the baptism of Jesus occurred about the close of the year 779, or beginning of the year following. The 15th year of Tiberius (Luke 3:1) must be computed either from Jan. 1st, 779–80, of the Roman year, or from the first of Nisan, March or April, 779–80, of the Jewish year. In Dec. of this year, when Jesus returned to Galilee (John 4:3), John the Baptist was living, and Jesus had not begun his own ministry when He took up that of John; but at the Passover mentioned by John (6:4), Jesus was fully engaged in his ministerial work. John the Baptist, after having been confined for some time in prison, had just been beheaded. His imprisonment, therefore, from which we date the ministry of Christ, must have occurred some six months previous to this event. Now in Dec., 780, Jesus was in retirement at Nazareth. His entrance on his ministry at the imprisonment of John must have been subsequent to this date, and may with confidence be dated from near the term of the feast of Tabernacles, in the year following, Oct., 781. About the time of the Passover, March or April, 782, John was beheaded. The feast of Tabernacles (John 7:1) and of Dedication (John 10:22) fall within this year; and at the Passover of the year following, April, 783, our Lord's ministry was ended on the cross. The public ministry of Christ in Galilee must therefore have continued but about one year, from the autumn of 781 to that of 782, when He passed over into the Pæria, and thence to Jerusalem, so that the whole course of his ministry comprised about one year and a half.

Date of our Lord's Death.—The death of John the Baptist occurred *before* the Passover, 782. Two passovers are mentioned subsequent to John's death (John 6:4 and 12:1; 13:1). His death therefore occurred at the period of the Passover of the year 783, on the 15th of the month Nisan, according to the computation of Wieseler, on Friday the 7th of April. Astronomers have shown, by careful computation, that the darkness attending the crucifixion occurred at the full moon, and accordingly could not have been occasioned by an eclipse of the sun.

The Kindred of Christ.—The genealogical tables of Matthew and Luke both give the lineage, not of Mary, but of Joseph. Our present inquiry must be limited to the *brethren* of Jesus. These are said to be James, Josès, Simon, and Judas (Matt. 13:55; Mark 6:3). Were these then in reality brothers of Jesus? The answer to this inquiry depends on the

question of the relation of James, the son of Alphaeus, to that James who was at the head of the Church in Jerusalem, surnamed *the Just*, and in the epistle of Paul denominated the brother of Jesus. For reasons which cannot here be adduced, we believe them to be one and the same. James, therefore, the son of Alphaeus, a brother of Joseph, was in reality *the cousin* of Jesus, as were also Josea, Simon, and Judas, known by the names of Lebbaeus and Thaddeus. The mother of these cousins of Jesus was Mary, the wife of Klopas (Matt. 27:56; Mark 15:40, 47; 16:1). The mother of these four sons was Mary, a sister of Mary the mother of Jesus, bearing the same name (John 19:25), as was very common with the Jews. They were accordingly the cousins of Jesus, on the part both of their father and their mother. Is it not then a reasonable supposition that Joseph, after the decease of his brother Alphaeus or Klopas, may have received the widow, his brother's wife, with her children, sons and daughters, into his own family; and that thus, from this circumstance they may, according to the usage of the country, have been denominated brothers and sisters of our Lord? But there are writers of the highest authority who maintain that these four were sons of Joseph and Mary, and brothers, in the strictest sense, of Jesus, and that James, the son of Alphaeus, was his cousin. The traditions of the Church on this subject are contradictory and unreliable. Whether other children, after the birth of Christ, were born to Joseph and Mary, does not indeed appear; but we rest in the conviction that the Apostle James, surnamed *the Just*, the head of the Church at Jerusalem, and author of the epistle bearing his name, and the apostles called also Lebbaeus and Thaddeus, author of the epistle of Jude, and Simon, carefully to be distinguished from Simon Zelotes, and Josea, were all the sons of Alphaeus, the brother of Joseph. Their mother was also the sister of Mary, the mother of Jesus. They probably lived with Jesus, in the family of Joseph, after the death of their father, and in the current phraseology of the time were known and designated as the brothers of our Lord.

LICHTENSTEIN.—*Dr. Coleman.*

Jesus Christ, the Godman.—The doctrine of the Scriptures is that the Son of God "was made flesh," or "became man," and Justin and the Alexandrians, especially Origen, having ascribed to him both the *ανδρωποτης* and the *θεοτης*, it was easy to include the two definitions in the term Godman, *θειανδρος*, *θειανδρωπος*. This, however, was not done very early. The Monothelites first borrowed it from the Pseudodionys. Areop. ep. 4, *ad Cajum*, and made use of it sneeringly in controversy; whilst the substantive *θειανδρωπος* only occurs sporadically and occasionally in the Greek patristic, and among the Latins there is no corresponding expression at all. So also in the theology of the Reformation, the term "Godman" is seldom met with. It is only in modern speculative theology that it is introduced in various senses and for different purposes, in imitation of the Klopstock poetry. Although a *vox propria*, and an expression also admitting of different interpreta-

tions, it is still, as a specification of *one person in two natures* very convenient and proper. We must only be careful in explaining it. The word can scarcely be said to be a definition. It rather *directs* to the multitude of different dogmatic definitions of the person of Christ, which have obtained scientific authority and currency in the Church, and which require further explanation.

The term "Godman" predicated of Christ expresses of itself nothing more than that he is both God and man—that the *θεοτης* as well as the *ανδρωποτης*, belongs to him. But in what way these two predicates, apparently contradictory, belong to the same Godman, and how the divinity is related to the humanity, is not seen. Our business accordingly will be to show first: the truth of the judgment contained in the word "Godman" that Christ is God and also man; and, secondly, to explain scripturally, dogmatically, and symbolically, the coexistence of these two predicates.

That Christ was truly *man* in opposition to Docetic Gnosticism, was most clearly proven by the Church fathers. The expression "son of man" which he applies to himself is not conclusive, for he uses it rather in the sense of Dan. 7:13, to show that he was come from heaven. But the whole tenor of the evangelical history is, that the birth and life of Jesus were purely human. The Scriptures do not say that he was omniscient already in the cradle, but that he increased in wisdom and stature. They do not say, with the Monothelites, that he determined by his world-governing volition to learn how hunger and fatigue and pain would feel, and that he would avail himself of his humanity for this purpose; but they speak of him as truly man, subject to all the infirmities incident to the natural life of man. His psychological life was also purely human; he experienced sorrow and joy, pain and pleasure; he wept at the grave of a friend.

But this man says of himself that he is *God*, and the Scriptures testify the same. To the Virgin Mary he was announced as the son of David (who, according to 2 Saml. 7:19; Ps. 110; and Is. 7, was the Lord God himself, the *υιός υψιστου*, Luke 1:32). He *was not begotten*, but was conceived by the Holy Ghost, and was born as man. This pre-existence of Christ is taught John 1:1, &c. It has been attempted to interpret this passage differently, and to make *ὁ λόγος* mean *ὁ λόγος του εὐαγγελίου*, *ὁ λόγος ἀκηκούσας*, which would be to say: "In the beginning was the gospel preached;" or, "in the beginning was the incarnate Jesus, whom we preach;" and all that follows would then refer exclusively to the incarnate one as such. But this interpretation has been satisfactorily refuted. As the way was historically prepared for the coming of Christ in the flesh, so it was prepared also for the apostolic doctrine concerning it, by terms and ideas already in use to give it expression. Thus John, directed by the Holy Ghost, had already taken up and applied the idea of *מֵימַר דִּיהוּה*, not indeed as understood by Philo, but as it obtained in the Jewish theology of the Targum. "In the beginning was the word;" and "in the beginning" it was

he word of God, not to the creature, but to God himself (*καὶ ὁ λόγος ἦν πρὸς τὸν θεόν* and emphatically repeated: *ὁὗτος ἐν ἀρχῇ πρὸς τὸν θεόν*). As he thought expresses itself in a word, and the word is identical with and corresponds to the thought, and yet is distinguishable from and independent of and objective to it, so the nature of God is expressed and made objective in the *λόγος*, not for the purpose of revealing himself *extra* to the creature, but at first, *ἐν ἀρχῇ*, that God might be objective to himself, and as a self-speaking and self-existing divine word might speak to God. Thus this *ἀρχῇ* is not as in Gen. 1:1, the beginning of time, but it is eternity, the beginning, which is the basis of all time.—By this *λόγος*, God made the creature, and reveals himself to the creature, and this *λόγος* was made flesh in Jesus, i. e. became man.

The Baptist accordingly announced Christ, not simply as the servant of God, promised Isa. 40, but as *ἀνέστην ἐρχόμενος* (John 3:31), and Jesus also calls himself the Son of God. At first he only speaks of the Father relative to himself, and of his relation to the Father, as the representative of mankind to God, and as the plenipotentiary and representative of God to mankind (high-priest and apostle), and only in v. 26 mysteriously alludes to his *eternal* sonship. It was at the feast of the Tabernacles that he first openly asserted his eternal divinity (John 8:38), and afterwards (John 10:30) at the feast of dedication. From these passages, we may learn how the expression "Son of God," as used by Jesus, was understood by the Jews. They understood it in a metaphysical sense, and considered it blasphemy. If they had mistaken his meaning, Jesus would have corrected them; but he admitted their interpretation, and subsequently assented to it before the high-priest under the solemn sanction of an oath. He was often greeted as the Messiah by the people, and no one took offence, but to speak of himself as the Son of God was regarded as awfully profane, a clear proof that it was more than synonymous with "Messias," and implied more than a mere resemblance, or divine approbation. The word son implies a generating activity. Elisha was called the son of Elijah, not on account of any resemblance to him, but because he became what he was by means of Elijah; and the New Test. believers are called the children of God, because they are born of the Spirit. Christ *could be called* a son of God, inasmuch as God delivered him from the birth throes of death in raising him from the dead; but he was called the Son of God before his resurrection, for the reason that he came down from heaven, i. e. because he was with the Father from eternity, as the word spoken *ἐν ἀρχῇ* from the Father to the Father, the self-expressing word (John 1:1, &c.).

Thus the Scriptures teach that the man Jesus was and is God, and of course that Jesus Christ is both God and man, or more briefly: Godman; but not as if the two predicates, the humanity and divinity, were joined together in the way of addition; as if to the color of steel we were to add the predicate of hardness. The Scriptures teach something more definite and precise—not that Christ is God and *also* man, or man and

also God; but that he is the *son of God become man*—not indefinitely as a Godman in any sense whatever; but very distinctly as the *λόγος ἐνανθρωπείς*. In this way the proposition itself leads to the question: How is the co-existence of the two predicates God and man in *one person* to be thought of? At first view it seems to involve a contradiction, and to be irreconcilable. God is eternal and infinite, man is created and finite—God is happy in Himself, active or inactive, man is capable of suffering and does suffer. How can the same person be eternal and not eternal, infinite and yet finite, happy and yet be miserable?

Such a mechanical juxtaposition of predicates and mutual attributes obtained already in the early Church, and in modern times has reappeared in various forms. In the first place, God and man are regarded as two distinct *constituent parts*, and together make up the Godman. In the crudest form it comes to this: the eternal world-ruling *λόγος*, still retaining this position, placed himself in connection with the man Jesus, and by him, as his organ, works, as the Holy Ghost worked by the prophets. Nestorius expressed it somewhat differently. He did not say: Jesus was a man bearer or organ of the divinity (*θεοφόρος*); but the "*forma servi*" in Jesus was *θεοφόρος*; the bearer of *Deus Verbum*. He never used the phrases: "Immanuel is God," "Immanuel is man," the "son of Mary is the uncreated God," &c. He would say: "Immanuel is God and man." When the crown prince becomes a general, we can say: "Charles is crown prince," and also Charles is "a general;" but not necessarily "Charles is crown prince and general." But when copper and zinc are melted together and become brass, we cannot say, "brass is copper," and "brass is zinc;" but we would have to say "brass is copper and zinc." Nestorius thought of the *Verbum Dei*, and the "*forma servi*" as two additive constituent parts, and the *forma servi*, not as pure *forma*, but as a *subsistence*. He held that the *Deus Verbum* created a *forma servi*, and joined himself to it. He may not have thought of the mode of union as that of an agent and instrument; it may have been a sort of *indwelling*, by which the *forma servi* was possessed by the *Deus Verbum*, as demoniacs are by demons; still the *λόγος* and the *forma servi*, which he creates, remain *two distinct subsistences or constituent parts*.

Another erroneous view equally proceeds from this same personification of the irreconcilability of the divine and human attributes, and seeks to get out of the difficulty by giving up the new idea of both divinity and humanity. The Godman is a mixed nature, a middle grade between God and man. He is not really true God, nor true man, but a sort of *demigod*, superior to man, but inferior to God. In the first view the ideas of God and man are preserved in their integrity, but they stand by each other, as two merely *united*, not identical *parts*. In the last their identity is maintained, but it is at the expense of their integrity. There the "Godman" is a man united to God; here the Godman is a mixed up being, consisting of divine and human properties. To this rubric evidently belongs the

view for which Eutychius was condemned. Christ, as to his inferiority, was not *ὑποτακτός* with other men.

These views at first sight appear to be opposite extremes, and are often so exhibited, whilst in fact they are inwardly allied. Both rest upon the denial of the truth that the son of God *became* man. The scriptural *ἔγενετο* (John 1:14), is not allowed its right. It is regarded as an inexplicable mystery, that he who from eternity was and is God, should enter the sphere of time and become not God, but man—be it so. It is precisely this entering of the eternal into human development, which the *Bible* teaches. He who is the author of all time and space, by an act of self-privation, places himself within the limits of time and space, of human existence, of volition and thought, of feeling and experience. Here in the idea of God is involved the conception of life and volition, and the possibility of self-limitation; not a modification in which God loses himself, but in which he holds fast to himself and can resume himself.

In the divine nature this is made possible by the *Trinity*. The triune God is he who is himself the eternally living God, and as life belongs to the eternal nature of God, so does the Trinity. God, according to his eternal nature, is He who distinguishes himself from himself, and thus the possibility of exhibiting himself in time, in this distinction from himself; i. e. to take up in himself the distinction between his supertemporal-eternal, and his inter-temporal being, is founded on his eternal nature.

In the human nature this is possible, inasmuch as *substance* and *consciousness* are not the same. No man is every moment conscious of all that he is, or that he carries within him, as the substantial contents of his spirit. Sleep, fear, insanity, sometimes entirely suspend consciousness, whilst aback of it the substantial contents of the spirit remain undisturbed and reappear when the cause is removed. Thus the incarnate Son of God, in a purely human way, could possess the fulness of the Godhead as his substantial contents without being conscious of it, i. e. without being omniscient.

The Scriptures teach that such a *becoming* man, such an entering another *mode* of existence, took place with Christ. On the one hand, they unhesitatingly speak of the eternal, and incarnate Logos by the same name. There is no more impropriety in this than in speaking of the apostle at one time as Peter, and at another as Simon. If Lucius, the king's son, for the purpose of redeeming a captive brother, were to become a slave, and called himself Caius, it would be proper to say: "Lucius became a slave," or the "king's son became a slave;" or "Caius was the king's son and became a slave;" or the "king's son is a slave." In the same way the Scriptures speak of Christ: "the word was made flesh;" "grace and truth came by Jesus Christ," parallel to the "king's son became a slave"—"Caius came and redeemed his brother." "Christ thought it no robbery to be equal with God, but took on himself the form of a servant;" parallel to Caius who laid aside his dignity as the king's son and became a slave—for Caius and the king's son and the

slave are one and the same person. It is wrong to suppose that all the passages of which "Jesus Christ" is the subject, refer to him only as incarnate, and never to him as he was before his incarnation.

On the other hand, the Scriptures teach (Phil. 2:6) that the Son of God actually exchanged the *form* of his world-ruling existence for the *form*, the *σῆμα ἀνθρώπου*. His humiliation was twofold. In the first place being *ἐν μορφῇ θεοῦ ὑπάρχων*, "he thought his being equal to God no robbery" (as when a man violently holds on to something without right)—but having a right to it, he freely gave it up. He emptied himself accordingly in taking upon himself "the form of a servant" (the form of human existence, and that too of unglorified human existence, subject to the consequences of sin), "and was found in fashion as a man." And, secondly, "being found in fashion as a man, he humbled himself even to the death of the cross."

That the Logos humbled himself and *became* man, that he condescended to the existence form of the embryonic soul of a child, that he, in whom the fulness of the Godhead in the form of his eternal presence dwelt, bodily reduced himself to a being in whom that fulness lay concealed in the form of a germ capable of development—that he became the soul of a child, the germinating centre of a human life, and as such *entered* the womb of a human mother, and constructed himself a body from earthly material—at first an animated filament that developed itself, to a body—this is the truth, which both these erroneous views equally ignore. So soon as this truth is apprehended and retained, it is impossible for us to suppose that the Logos has united himself to a man, the son of God to the son of Mary. Just as little can we indulge the equally absurd opinion that Christ is something intermediate between God and man—as to think that Lucius assumed some intermediate grade, chamberlain for instance, between prince and slave. Just as Lucius was really and truly the king's son, of royal descent and character, and as much the heir of the throne after, as well as before he became a slave, and as, on the other hand, he really and truly became a slave, and was no better off than other slaves, so Christ was still really and truly God, and also a pure and perfect man. For just as Lucius only gave up the existence and manifestation form of his royal dignity, his residence at court, and his share in the government, so Christ only gave up the "form of God," "being like God." And if he was a *sinless* man, endowed with *miraculous power*, this by no means interfered with the reality of his human nature. For sin and bondage to nature do not belong to the *substance of humanity*, but are accidents introduced by sin, and at variance with the true idea of human nature. The sinlessness of Jesus, moreover, was not in the form of his eternal *inability* to sin, but in his purely human *willingness* to sin (Heb. 2:18; 4, 15), and his omnipotence was not in the form of his eternal world-ruling power; but in the purely human form of miraculous power, the dominion over nature in particular instances and cases.

Nestorianism ignores that original funda-

ental truth of the doctrine of the Godman, and assumes that the Logos created a son of Mary and then united himself to him. Eutychianism participates fully in this view, and supposes that these two constituents of Christ upon their contact immediately unite together into one, and mutually communicate their properties (*περιχώρησις*, permeatio). In opposition to this Leo, in *epis. Flav.*, asserts with truth: *nam impie duarum naturarum ante incarnationem unigenitur Dei Filius dicitur, quam efarie, postquam Verbum caro factum est, natura in eo singularis asseritur.* And the Chalcedon synod with equal truth rejected the proposition: *χριστὸν ἐκ δυο φύσεων γεγονέναι*; and, also, *πρὸς τὸν ἐν μιᾷ φύσει εἶναι.*

This brings us to the symbolic definitions. If the Logos became man, the two attributes that he is God and that he is man, in their absolute and undiminished integrity, may and must be predicated. The Godman is God, and he is man. In the early Church, the two attributes were designated by the term of the two *φύσεις* (*ἐν δυο φύσεων ἕνω.*). Schleiermacher has correctly remarked that this terminology is not very accurate, and if we call to mind the many mistakes to which it has led in modern times, it must be admitted. "How can the divine and human be so comprehended in any one term, as if the two, mutually co-ordinate, were closer definitions of one and the same general idea." Here nature is used in the most abstract and diluted sense. A *subsistens*: the divine essence, and a not subsisting; the human *existence form*, or constitution, into which the subsisting essence enters, are comprehended under the same conception of *φύσις*. This must necessarily lead to the misapprehension of the two *φύσεις* as two subsisting things or constituents; a mistake that was obviated by the theory of the *anhypostasis* of the human *φύσις*, but that nevertheless crept in again during the middle ages, and soon became prevalent.

If we would correctly apprehend the ancient Church doctrine of the two natures, we must take *φύσις* in the abstract sense in which it was used. The divine nature consists in this, that Christ is God, the predicate "God" belongs to him; the human nature is this, that the predicate "man" is assigned to it. His divine nature is the divine essence which *subsists* in the Logos from eternity, and which in his becoming man he still *retained*. His human nature is the man's nature, or mode of being and constitution, which *for itself does not subsist*, but which as a *universal attribute* exists in all other men, and since his incarnation also in him: the *natura hominum*. To have human feeling, will, and thought, and as a human soul to animate a human body, is human nature. We must, however, never think of human nature as a *concretum*, a *subsistens*, a "son of Mary," with which the son of God united himself, or mixed himself up.

The eternal divine essence and the human constitution belong to Christ (according to the Chalced. Formul.), 1) *ἀρρίστως*, for the reason that the attributes which make up the *θεός* are not changed or modified, and those by which Christ is "man" are equally the unchanged

essentials of the nature of men—and *ἀσπύχτως*, for the reason that the first belong to him fully and unqualifiedly, and these last equally unchanged produce nothing of the mixed nature of a demigod—2) *ἀδασπίτως* and *ἀχωρίτως*, for the reason that these are not two constituents, which are joined together, and under particular circumstances might again be separated (as impossible as it would be to separate Lucius into a king's son and a slave). *Totus in suis*, and *totus in nostris*, says Leo in the *epist. Flav.*, which was received so enthusiastically in the second session of the Chalced. Synod, as a full and satisfactory exhibition of the truth, and after a most careful examination, was adopted in the fourth session unanimously as a correct expression of orthodox doctrine. *Humana augens*, he adds, inasmuch as he *nova natiuitate generatus est*, sinless, and in his person has elevated human nature, freed from the accidents of sin and death, to that glorified state which no longer veils the glory of the divine nature, but contributes to its adequate exhibition (John 17:5). *Divina non minuens*, inasmuch as he laid aside only the *forma* of the super-temporal world-ruling eternity, that he might make possible and accomplish the glorification of the divine nature in time and space.

This correct view of the old-church doctrine was however soon lost again. Had the ancient Church, in opposition to Apollinaris, maintained that it was not the Logos as such (as the world-governing I) that took the place of a human *νοῦς*, but that the Logos became man, and that the Logos become man in this way had a purely human thinking (*νοῦς*) and physical life (*ψυχή*)—the Latin church would scarcely have so mistaken it, as if the Logos had joined himself to a man consisting of *spirit, soul, and body*. Augustine (*de consecr.* 2) already says: *Christi persona constat et conficitur ex Deo et homini*; Anselm: *filius Dei hominem assumpsit*. The question between Abelard and the Lombards was precisely this: *an duæ naturæ PARTES illius personæ sint dicendæ, or, an Deus, homo factus, factus sit aliquid?* Abelard said: The Lombards indeed hesitate. Thomas says distinctly: *non est una tantum hypostasis in Christi*. Duns Scotus ascribes to the human nature of Christ a proper, if not an independent existence. This fundamental view of the middle ages, Luther also adopted and designated the divinity and humanity as two "parts" (Gross Bek v. Abdm. s. 202 der Irm. Ausq.), and upon it builds his theory of the impartation of the divine attribute to the human. The theologians of the Form of Concord still more distinctly express this view. The divinity of Christ (said Andrea at Maulbrun) *hunc hominem Christum ad dextram suam collocavit*; and the Form of Concord aff. 6, says: *Quomodo HOMO, MARIE FILIUS, Deus aut filius Dei altissimi appellari posset, aut esset, si ipsius humanitas cum FILIO DEI non est personaliter unita?* And sol. decl. ep. 8: *POST FACTAM INCARNATIONEM, non quælibet natura in Christo per se ita subsistit, ut utraque sit persona separata*. In this way the anhypostasis of the human nature is invalidated. It means nothing more than that the human nature (the "*Mariæ filius*") although itself a *subsisting concrete*,

still, from the first moment of its origin, it was so closely connected with the "*Dei filius*," that now (*post factam incarnationem*) it is no more "a particular person," but exists simply as a part of the person of Christ. As a part, as *concretum*, *hypostasis*, it is however regarded. Hence the distinct assertion of the Lutheran divines of the Form of Concord school, that the expressions "*natura humana*," "*natura divina*," concrete as well as abstract, may be used. From this the following theories may be deduced: The Son of God produces, or creates in the womb of the Virgin, "a human nature" in the concrete sense, a son of Mary, with which he at once unites himself personally. By means of this *personal union* of the Son of God with the *concretum* of the "human nature," the latter becomes possessed of the divine properties (omnipresence, for instance), although in the state of humiliation no use is made of them. Thus, in the state of humiliation the omniscient world-governing Logos is united to a not omniscient son of man in one person. In the state of exaltation, on the other hand, the "human nature" avails itself of this property, and becomes actually omniscient, omnipresent, &c.

It is evident that this theory neither conducts to a consistent nor scriptural view of the person of Christ, nor does it agree with the doctrine of the ancient Church. It contains the Nestorian fundamental view of the natures as concrete parts, together with the Eutychian addition of the mixing up of these two parts. As the medieval scholastic doctrine of the person of Christ was a relapse to the view rejected at Chalcedon, so is this ubiquistic-scholastic theory a relapse from the Reformation theology into that of the middle ages.

The age of the Reformation was marked already by a deliverance from that erroneous view and a return to biblico-patristic Christology. Zuingli, humanistically and exegetically trained and well read in the Church fathers, was unwittingly led to the correct view, when he said: Christ took upon himself *forma nostra*; or, *dignatus est ignari hominis formam habitumque inducere*. With him human nature was not concrete, but simply the human form or mode of existence. For this reason Luther and Zuingli, in their discussions concerning the person of the Godman, misunderstood each other, neither of them knowing the other's stand-point. On the contrary, Calvin, with Zuingli, entertained the Chalcedon view, and spoke of Christ assuming the nature of man, human nature abstractly understood. The son of God assumed the nature of man, and so certainly became man, that Zuingli and Calvin do not hesitate to call him already *who became man* "Christ." Christ with them is not the result of the union of the Logos with a "human nature;" but the Logos is himself Christ, inasmuch as he assumed the nature of man. That Melancthon, the "*Præceptor Germaniæ*" together with his school, appealing expressly to the Church fathers, opposed the ubiquistic theories, is too well known to be more than merely mentioned.

In accordance with all this, the Reformed and Philippistic theologians, in opposition to the Lutherans (in the narrow sense), declared

that the expressions "*natura humana*" and "*natura divina*" could only be used as *abstracta*, and made full account of the anhypostasis of the *natura humana*. They indeed corrected the equivocal use of the phrase *unio duarum naturarum*, and taught: *unio est immediata inter personam divinam et naturam humanam, mediata inter naturam divinam et naturam humanam*. The divine person assumed a human constitution. In this way, the human and divine properties are so far mediately united that they inhere in one and the same person (precisely as the properties of the king's son and a slave are mediately united, inasmuch as Lucius become a slave has the properties of both in his person). The Logos has given up not the divine nature, but the "form of God," the "being like God," i. e. the form of the world-governing, the all time and space comprehending eternity, and has assumed the time and space-existence-form of human living, feeling, willing, and thinking. He became a human life-centre, a human soul, as such entered the womb of the virgin, then formed himself a body, and then developed himself spiritually and bodily in a purely human way. For the purpose of redeeming us he assumed the constitution of human nature, subject to the consequences of sin, only that he was without the accident of sin and possessed the accident of miraculous power; and in this consisted the *status humilis*. Having accomplished the work of redemption, the human nature in him, as the first born, was freed from these accidents, i. e. was glorified from the time of his resurrection, and thus began the *status gloriæ*. Man he is and remains in eternity and lives in a visible body in heaven, that sphere of creation into which sin and death have never entered, and where an unveiled revelation and manifestation of the glory of God are possible. But in connection with the glorified human nature, there is another higher and fuller revelation of the divine nature, a full marriage of the divine *δόξα*, a participation in the world-ruling dominion of the Father (*Sessio ad dextram*), which with the unglorified was not compatible. This dominion of the exalted Christ will also be completed in the pure human form and mode of his existence. He has not given up that which is essential in human nature (the *νοῦ ἔναι*, life in an organized visible body). (Luke 24:51; Acts 1:11; Col. 3:1, 2; Phil. 3:20). He can still, in a way that to us is an *absolute mystery*, really be with and in his people, and dwell in them.

The later Lutheran theology, that of the Erlangen school, has made an earnest and commendable effort to set aside the view of the scholastics of the middle ages. Dr. Thomasius, first in 1845 (*Zeitschr. p. f. Prot. u. Kirche*, Heft 2), expresses the opinion, that the Logos, in the state of humiliation, united himself, and, at the same time, assumed the attributes of human nature. Thus the limited Logos is ever united to a "human nature" in a concrete sense. In the state of exaltation the divine nature resumes its divine attributes, and communicates them to the human nature. The view of the two natures as two parts is here still retained; but a first attempt is made to show the untenability of the Lutheran scholastic of 1577. On the other hand,

and with more energy, Dr. Hoffmann, in his "Schriftbeweis," has recently carried out the doctrine, that the Logos *became* man, only that with him, it seems to be somewhat affected by the view of the *begetting* of Jesus by the Holy Ghost. If it was the Logos, who *became* man in the womb of the virgin, he could not have been *begotten*, for he who already exists cannot be first *begotten*. So also the form of the statement: the Son of God *ceased* to be God, in order to *become* man, is absurd. He did not cease to be God, he only gave up the *form of God*. It should be the principal business of our day to rectify the doctrine of the Godman, and carry it back to its original Biblical patristic purity and distinctness. DR. EBARD.—Dr. Wolff.

Jesus Christ, His three-fold office. Eusebius, already (*H. E.*, I., 3), ascribes to Jesus the three-fold office of Prophet, Priest, and King. Calvin (*Instit.*, II., 15) treats the doctrine as a distinct topic in theology. It was adopted, also, by the Heidelberg Catechism (Qu. 31), and Reformed theologians treat of the work of Christ under this form. Of Lutheran theologians, John Gerhard was the first to adopt it, but since then it has obtained currency in that Church.—The propriety of thus contemplating the work of Christ is very obvious. For it is certain that in the O. T. prophecies the Redeemer is set forth as the perfect and complete Prophet, as the servant of God who should occupy a *prophetic, priestly, and royal* position, as the *royal seed of David*, or second perfect David, and, finally, as a *priestly King*. He himself, also, plainly assumed this three-fold character. His being *anointed as the Messiah* also involves this idea. For as Elijah was *anointed* to be a *prophet* (1 Kings 19:16), so Christ should be *anointed* by the Spirit to preach to the wretched; and as the *kings of Israel* were *anointed* (1 Sam. 10:1; 16:13; 1 Kings 1:13, &c.), so Christ was *anointed King of righteousness* (Hebr. 1:8-9); and as the *high-priest* was *anointed* (Ex. 28:41, &c., &c.), so also was Christ to be the everlasting High-priest (Hebr. 7:16).

Old Testament prophecy promises a perfect *Prophet* in the Messiah. Thus, in Deut. 18:15, the Lord approves of the awe of the people, and promises them, that as they sent Moses to Him, to *hear* the law for them, so He would send a prophet to them, whom they should hear. The God who revealed Himself in the thunder and lightning of Sinai, so that the people feared to approach Him, would *come to them* through a Prophet. Here we have the first glimmerings of the antithesis between the law and gospel, and true Biblical theology should greet and appreciate such tender intimations.—Isaiah, chapters 40-66, are but indirectly connected with this prophecy of Moses. Here it is not so immediately a *prophet*, as a *servant of God*, that is exhibited. Israel, as the servant of the Lord, designed (not prophetically, but nationally) to give light to the Gentiles, is himself blind and deaf (42:19), and needs a prophet: Isaiah toils in vain (49:4). But a future servant of God will perform both the prophetic work of Isaiah for Israel, and the national work of Israel for the Gentiles (49:6), because he will be more than a prophet, and will bear the burden of our sins

(53:4, &c.). It is an **דָּוִד** which he will bring. Hence the idea of the servant of God here includes the office of a *prophet* (ch. 49), *priest*, and *king*, the King before whom the kings of the earth shall ultimately bow (49:23).—In Deut. 18, therefore, we have the promise of a prophet, and in Isa. 40-66, the promise of a servant of God, of whom *prophetic labors, sacerdotal self-sacrifice, and royal power* are predicated.—But *royal rule* is not only ascribed to this future Redeemer as a predicate, or as the issue of his fate; but the promise of a *seed of David* is the radical form of Messianic prophecy, a seed that should ascend David's throne. Until David's time Israel was promised redemption, but (Deut. 18:15, excepted) not a *Redeemer*. Deliverance from future servitude was promised to Abraham's seed (Gen. 15); and the promise was temporally more and more completely fulfilled by Moses, Joshua, and David. This led David to think of building a temple for the Lord. He would secure the abode of the Eternal among his people, by walls of stone. But this was not God's plan (cf. John 4:23, 24), Israel was to learn that its temporal deliverances only foreshadowed the true redemption. This fact, however, was not taught theoretically, but they were to be *educated* into the idea, and to this end a *new prophetic perspective is opened to their view* (2 Sam. 7). Not David, but David's son, after David's death, should build the Lord a house, and his throne the Lord would establish forever. It is true no definite individual is here named (v. 14), but David clearly perceived that the promise pointed to an organic one (*σπέρμα*, not *σπέρματα*, Gal. 3:16), in whom it should reach its full bloom. At the same time he felt that his *sinful* race was not worthy to build a house for the Lord, or reign upon an eternal throne, and therefore uttered the significant words in 2 Sam. 7:19 (cf. 1 Chron. 17:17). David saw that the Lord was looking upon him, but that Jehovah here showed himself as a *man*, who at the same time was God. He understood that the promise to his posterity would be consummated in the manifestation of Jehovah as God and man (see Ps. 2:6, 7; 110; Matth. 22:42, &c.).—Solomon had a clear conviction that Nathan's prophecy was not finally fulfilled in him and his temple of stone (1 Kings 8:26-27), and when, after his death, the house of David, and the nation declined, the eye of prophecy was unwaveringly directed to *one definite future branch of David*, who should be the promised seed (Is. 7:14; 9:6; 10:21; 11:1, &c.). Thus *believing* Israelites were led to expect a Messiah who should combine sacerdotal self-sacrifice with his prophetic functions, and by means of both establish a kingdom of peace. To the *carnal* eye, however, his royal and prophetic characters were sundered, and the sacerdotal one wholly obscured. The carnal masses of Israel expected a worldly, temporal Messiah, who should *simply* secure to Israel temporal deliverance, and found an earthly kingdom. They considered "the prophet" as being distinct from the Messiah (John 6:14. Cf. Mark 8:27; John 1:21. Cf. 1 Macc. 14:41). Believing Jews had purer views of the promised servant

of God (Matth. 3:3; 12:18; Luke 3:4; cf. Isa. 40, &c.); and our Lord himself proved to them his claims to the three-fold character predicted of him, by his works, his sufferings, and his death.—When he went about teaching and proclaiming the kingdom of God, and confirmed his word by signs, he performed *prophetic* functions, and was so acknowledged (Luke 7:16; 9:8; John 4:19; 7:40; Luke 24:19). But the N. T. goes further than simply to claim for him a prophetic character in form, and declares that he *was*, and *is*, *the prophet*, the revealer of the Father in an absolute sense (Hebr. 1:1, &c.); the personal Word of the Father, in whom the Father *ἐν ἀρχῇ* communed with Himself (*πρὸς τὸν Θεόν*), through whom He created all things, and by whom He revealed redemption to the fallen race. Hence Christ is prophet in his very *being*; his whole person and being is *the revelation of God* (John 14:9). He is the incarnate manifestation of the *eternal law of God*, for he is *man as God wishes man to be* (Matth. 3:17; John 4:34; 5:19, &c.); and he is, at the same time, the living, impersonated *Gospel*, in whom abides the grace of God incorporate (Luke 4:17, &c.; John 1:36). Here his prophetic and sacerdotal nature become identical.—In Hebrews (7, &c.) he is set forth as the eternal *High-priest*; for he *offered himself* up, as the only ever-sufficient sacrifice, in whom all previous typical offerings were superseded and annulled. It is no objection to this view, that in other parts of the O. T. the idea of a *hostia* predominates, for this is only a *formal* diversity. For it is the clear doctrine of the Scriptures, that Jesus, *on the one hand*, absolutely met the demands of perfect holiness made upon man, and that his life was a spotless offering to God; and, *on the other hand*, that he suffered for man the penalty of death, and thus paid down to God his life a ransom (*λύτρον*) for us, which we could not have paid. Thus he vicariously (cf. Levit. 16:33) assumed our guilt and punishment, and became a *sin-offering* for us. And this sacrifice he offered not, like a common Israelite, through the mediation of an ordinary priest (for who would have been worthy to officiate here), but he offered himself, by voluntarily submitting to the death which his sacerdotal holy life *brought to him*.—But inseparable from his death is the *crown (of thorns)*, as this is from royal dignity and power. He had not denied his royalty when the people ascribed it to him (Matth. 9:27; 18:20, &c., &c.), for he was, and called himself a king (John 4:26; Matt. 22:42, &c.). But he accomplished his royal mission in a manner opposite to that expected of him by the people. Filled with the fulness of God (and therefore also of human power), in a word, the head and crown of humanity, invested with all power (for his miracles were as well the *δυνάμεις* of a king as the *σημεῖα* of a prophet), he exercised his royal authority only as the lowest servant of men, until, as the culmination of all, he received from Pilate, before whom he avowed his kingship, the crown of thorns (John 18:37; 19:2, 12–15, 21). So closely did the kingly and priestly offices approach each other. As a reward for this royal self-denial, he received a crown of glory (Hebr. 2:9; Phil. 2:

9, 10), was made head of the Church, and Lord over all (Isa. 53:10–12; Eph. 1:21, 22). But in this aspect, also, the two offices meet, for he is likewise exalted to be our sacerdotal mediator before God (1 John 2:1; Hebr. 7:25; 9:24; Rom. 8:34), pleading for us upon the ground, that we *belong* unto him (1 Pet. 2:9; John 17:6, &c.). His intercession is that of a royal priest and sacerdotal king, not that of a prophet for his disciples.

We have seen that the Bible sets forth the redemptive work of Christ under the three aspects of prophet, priest, and king, and this in a manner which shows that they are not mechanically, but most intimately connected in his mediatorial nature. Theology, therefore, is not only justified in making this a distinct category in its system, but required to do so, by the fact, that in the N. T. Redemption, in its very *essence*, divides itself into this three-fold form of operation, Christ is *the prophet*, *the priest*, and *the king*, of whom all others in the O. T. were but feeble types; and if this three-fold character was *essential* to his messiahship, it must be shown in theology, that the three offices are clearly distinct from each other, and yet combinedly *exhibit the whole work of Christ*.—But even had man not fallen (a supposition which surely involves no impossibility, excepting to the most rigid supralapsarianism) we must assume that a mediatorial office of this three-fold character would have existed. For, *in abstracto*, we must hold that even *sinless man would have had to pass through a human development*; so that we cannot avoid inquiring whether, in that case, a union of God with mankind, like that which took place at the incarnation of Christ, would not have occurred. At once to deny this would be simply to assume that sin was indispensable to the development of a degree of divine glory which could not otherwise have been revealed. Assume: no Christ without a fall, and the inference is unavoidable, that the fall was rather a happy than an unhappy event. This would sap the foundation of Christian ethics, and give pantheism the victory (see *Liebner's Christologie*, p. 180).—If the idea of a sinless condition of mankind is conceivable, we obtain that also of a *revelation of God to man*, by which man would not be brought out of error and falsehood to the truth, but out of a state of partial knowledge to complete knowledge (analogously with Jesus; Luke 2:22). Then the distinction between prophets and other men would not have arisen; every man would be a prophet, a recipient and channel of divine revelation, which would be a revelation not in words only, but of the fulness of life to the inner man (cf. Joel 3). But not a revelation to a man in a diffused mass of mankind, but to and in an organically formed organism, at the head of which would be a revealer *κατ' ἔκδοξιν*, a *λόγος τοῦ Θεοῦ*, in whom the fulness of the Godhead would be visibly revealed.—But this same supposition of man's maintained purity, also involves the idea of *the sacerdotal offering of himself to God*. For every member of such a sinless race, would have spontaneously yielded himself to God as a living personal offering; and as mankind would then not have been a confused mass, but an organic

ructure (for sin made mankind such a mass; redemption restores it to its original design ph. 4:16), this sacerdotal offering would have reached its summit in a sacerdotal head of mankind, who, as the absolute child of God, could have offered unto God the fulness of human powers.—All this would necessarily have involved the *royal dignity* of this head of mankind (Hebr. 3:1).

This is not an idle fancy. Jesus was in reality—apart from his redemptive work—in *his own nature*, such a prophet, priest, and king. Apart from his *work*, in his own *person*, he was the incarnate word of the Father, in whom the fullness of the Godhead was manifested bodily. Apart from his assumption of our guilt, he was, in his *person*, the high-priest who, in his sinlessness, presented the fulness of human abilities to the service of God. And in his own *person* he was *the man*, and therefore the *king* of the race. If, therefore, the pure *idea* of a mediator, as such, necessarily falls into these three aspects, the *work of redemption* will necessarily exhibit a parallel division. Christ, who, in his *person*, is prophet, priest, and king, performed mediatorially the functions of these offices, for man's redemption.—On this basis Evangelical theology has constructed its doctrine of the three-fold office of Christ; treats these offices, as inwardly pervading, and connected with, each other, and teaches that, even in his state of exaltation, he continues, for his people's sake, to perform them.

DR. EBRARD.*

Jesus, *Holy Child, Congregation of the Daughters of*. It exists in Rome, and was founded by Anna Moroni, of Lucca. In early youth she went to Rome, poor, and managed to amass a small fortune. In advanced life she resolved to found an institution for teaching girls such female work as would enable them to earn a livelihood. Clement X. confirmed the institution. The number of these daughters (members) is 33, corresponding with the years of Christ on earth; the novitiate lasts 3 years; the members assume the vow of poverty, chastity, and obedience. Novitiates may withdraw before taking the vow, but must leave back whatever they brought with them. Their discipline is strict; their dress a full dark brown garment and white cowl. Early in the 15th cent. there were "Sisters of the good Jesus."

NEUDECKER.*

Jesus Christ, *Orders of*, were Orders of temporal Knights in Spain, Portugal, and the Church States. In Spain the Order was founded in 1216, by Dominicus. The Knights bound themselves to practise monastic duties, and defend the Church. Honorius III. confirmed the Order, but its object and plan were subsequently often changed. It then assumed different names, and was, finally, merged into the Congregation of St. Peter the Martyr, which arose under Pius V., and consisted (as yet) mainly of cardinals and persons belonging to the Inquisition.—The Order in Portugal sprang from the Knights Templars. When Clem. V., in March, 1312, declared the Templars dissolved, King Dionysius took their part, by securing to them their possessions in Portugal. After the death of Clement, the king negotiated with John XXII.,

and, in 1317, founded, out of the Templars, a new spiritual Order of the above name. The members were called "Knights of Jesus Christ," and the secured property of the Templars was conveyed to them. John XXII. confirmed, 1319, the new Order, assigned to it the rule of St. Benedict, with some Cistercian precepts, and thought he could appoint members to it. Since 1550 the Grand Mastership of the Order was connected with the crown of Portugal. In 1789, the Order in Portugal was secularized and divided into Grand Cross, Commanders, and Knights; since then its members are chosen from the military and civil ranks. The recently deceased banker, Rothschild, belonged to the Order.

NEUDECKER.*

Jew, *the Wandering*. As a counterpart to the Christian legend, that the beloved disciple of the Lord would never die (John 21:23, &c.), we have that of an enemy of Christ, said to be doomed, under the goading of a guilty conscience, to a ceaseless wandering around the earth, until the second advent. This legend has, like all legends, assumed a variety of forms and interpretations. The oldest Christian writer who mentions it is *Matthew of Paris* (†1259). According to the account in his *historia major*, which he says he had from the lips of an Armenian bishop, who received the story directly from the Jew, his name was *Cartaphilus*. He was janitor at Pilate's palace; and when the Jews, after the condemnation of Jesus, were dragging him from the palace, this Jew struck him on the neck, and mockingly said to him: "Go on, Jesus! go faster; why linger so?" Whereupon Jesus turned upon him with a stern look, and said: "I go, but thou shalt tarry till I come again." The janitor was then 30 years old, but every 100 years he was seized with a syncope, from which, after some time, he revived, and found himself in the age and state in which he struck the Lord. Subsequently, Cartaphilus was baptized by Ananias, and called Joseph, which led to his being confounded with Joseph of Arimathea. As a Christian he was strictly ascetic, hoping by a life of penitence to secure final pardon. This wandering Jew lived in the East, in the two Armenias.—In the West the story assumed another form, and is first mentioned in the 16th cent. He is called *Ahasuerus*, and is said to have been seen in Hamburg (1547), and then in Danzig, Magdeburg, Lübeck, Vienna, Reval, Paris. His peculiar dress and manners attracted attention. Dr. Paulus, of Eizen, B. of Schleswig, heard him relate: that he was a sandal-maker in Jerusalem in our Lord's day, and was one of those who most loudly cried: "crucify him." On the way to Calvary Jesus passed his house, and leaned to rest against the door-post. But Ahasuerus, who was standing in the door, with a child in his arms, ordered Jesus off (some say struck him), when Jesus looked sternly at him, and said: "I will stand here and rest, but thou shalt keep going until the last day."—About the close of the 17th, and beginning of the 18th cent., however, the legend, in England, took its original Eastern form. A stranger showed himself, who said he was an officer of the chief council in Jerusalem, and told a story of him-

self essentially agreeing with that of Cartaphilius. Both Oxford and Cambridge sent professors to question him, and found him ready to answer them. He related many things about the apostles, Mohammed, Tamerlane, Soliman, &c., all of whom, he said, he had known. He knew the dates of all the crusades. Some thought him a deceiver, or insane, others believed him.—Whether all this is an allegory of restless scepticism, or of the wandering, and yet, in physiognomy, fixed character of the Jews, we leave the reader to decide for himself. But this fantastic legend has furnished material for many romances and poems (*Schubert; A. W. v. Schlegel; Julius Mosen, N. Lenau, &c. Quinet; Béranger; Eugène Sue. Klingemann* turned it into a drama).—(See *Dr. J. G. Th. Grässe, d. Sage vom ewigen Juden, &c., &c., Dresd. u. Lpz., 1844, 8vo.*) HAGENBACH.*

Jewish Christians; Jewish Christianity; Judaists, Judaising Christians, &c. (Ebionitism, &c.).—These terms have recently been involved in much confusion, arising from diverse and confused views of the relations of the early Church. Some (*Schwegler, &c.*) have unduly extended the application of the term Ebionitism; others (*Schliemann, &c.*) have limited the phrase Jewish Christians to those of Jewish descent, which would then include Paul and Barnabas. All difficulty will be obviated by using the phrase to designate those tendencies which at first maintained that Judaism was continued in Christianity, and then that the latter was identical with the former: tendencies which may be traced from the 1st Ep. of Peter, and the Ep. of James, down to the Ebionites and Clementines. These several tendencies appear as canonical and heretical, as a mild and then coarse form of Jewish Christianity.—Its history, in this wider sense, exhibits three periods: 1) that in which it reigned alone; 2) that of its co-existence with heathen Christianity (as a tendency); 3) its heretical period.

Primitive Christianity was Jewish; it stood in immediate union with Judaism. The question of its relation to heathenism had not yet practically arisen. Christianity was thought perfected Judaism. The Church was still a part of Israel, and all its hopes were fixed upon Israel's conversion. The congregation in Jerusalem was the chief one, but the only one to which others in Palestine held a filial relation. At its head stood the twelve apostles, called to preach to Israel. The appointment of deacons, and afterwards of presbyters, formed the first step towards independent organization. The confession of the crucified and arisen Jesus, as the Christ of God, distinguished the Church from Israel, and formed the germ of a new life and doctrine. Christians observed the law, like their Jewish brethren; they had not yet apprehended their relation to the law. They participated in the worship of the temple, but also held separate meetings, which seemed less designed for worship than to promote fraternal feelings.—When the mass of the Jews became more hostile to Christianity, and when some heathens became converts, and a congregation of these was formed at Antioch, and Paul devoted himself to the conversion of Gentiles, so

that a Gentile Christianity sprang up beside the Jewish, the relative position of the latter was essentially changed. Then came up the question of the relation of Christianity to heathenism, and Judaism. Jewish Chr. split into a milder and more abrupt tendency. The former class adhered to the law, but did not require its full observance of heathen converts (see *Apostle's convention*). The latter imposed, even, circumcision on all, and soon organized themselves into zealous opposition to Paul. They appealed to the course of James, in justification of their principles. Exclusive congregations of Jewish Christians existed, probably, only in or near Palestine. With Jerusalem for their centre, they formed a separate part of the Church, more exclusive than the Gentile portion. After the death of James and the three pillars (Gal. 2:9), we find James, the brother of our Lord, at the head of Jewish Chr. In the N. T. this milder stand-point of Jewish Chr. was extended by the Epp. of James, Jude, and 1 Peter, and by the Apocalypse, to which the gospels of Matthew and Mark must be added (see the several Artt.). All agree in regarding Chr. as Judaism perfected, and in holding forth the harmony of the O. and N. T. They also treat the whole subject in a practical way, dealing in facts, not propounding principles, and connecting everything with the person of Christ; but without going into abstractions. In accordance with the O. T. He is chiefly regarded as a King; hence great stress is laid upon the glory of His second coming, and prominence given to the last things. More distinctively James exhibits Jewish Christian doctrine in its simplest, purest form: following the sermon on the mount, he regards Chr. as the *νόμος τῶν αἰώνων*. Jude forms the transition to Peter, who stands between James and Paul. The Apocalypse stands between Jewish Chr. and the system of John.—The entire position of Jewish Chr. in that period seems to have been provisional, just as the union effected at the Apostle's convention was precursory, but finally decisive. It had either to be absorbed in the general Church, or amalgamate with Gentile Chr., or run into various sects. That Gentile Chr. would fully adopt rigid Judaism, became obviously impossible even before Paul's death.—What contributed to the suppression of Jewish Chr., was, 1) the more rapid numerical growth of Gentile Chr., and, 2) the growing obduracy of Israel against the gospel. When Jewish Christians were forbidden to take part in the worship of the temple, or when they were cut off from Israel as apostates, cannot be certainly determined. They were hardly tolerated until the destruction of Jerusalem. The time of their prohibition from taking part in the worship of the temple, must have been decisive. Many, doubtless, rather gave up the Messiah than their mode of worship. Those who adhered to Christianity would, partly, be inclined to join their Gentile brethren, but partly, also, seek to fortify themselves in their exclusiveness. The Epistle to the Hebrews (see Art.) alludes to the vacillation and apostasy of many.—The destruction of Jerusalem, especially as completed by Hadrian, and the erection of the *Ælia Capitolina*, brought about the actual decision

between these two forms of Christianity. Torn away from its ecclesiastical centre, Jewish Christianity hastened to its dissolution.—(See *hionites*). UHLHORN.*

Jezebel (זִיזְבֵּל probably an abbreviation of זִיזְבֵּל = heavenly home), was the daughter of Ethbaal, king of Sidon, who became king of Tyre after he had dethroned his brother Phelles Jos., *Antt.*, VIII., 13, 2; *adv. Apion*, 1, 18). Commercial considerations primarily induced Ahab to marry her; but she, whom Josephus calls a *δραστήριον τε καὶ τολμηρὸν*, exerted a dominant influence over her weak husband, and led him to perpetrate cruelties not natural to him. Her father having originally been a priest, she was zealous for his religion, and, being ambitious, she, like her daughter, Athaliah, formed the scheme of getting the two kingdoms to adopt heathenism, so that the united crown might descend upon her family. She pursued this scheme with great perseverance, got the king of Judah in league with Israel, her daughter married to the heir of that throne, and persuaded Ahab to build a large temple of Baal in Samaria (1 Kings 16: 32; 18: 19; 2 Kings 3: 2; 10: 25-27), and another of Ashtoreth, probably in Jezreel (1 Kings 16: 33; 18: 19). Ahab himself was drawn into idolatry, and many of his subjects followed his example, whilst others were captivated by its sensual attractions, so that the worship of God was in danger of being wholly supplanted. Impatient of opposition, Jezebel persecuted the prophets, putting many to death (1 Kings 18: 4, 13). But they would not be silenced, especially Elijah, whom she bitterly hated (1 Kings 19: 2; 18: 10). These persecutions were probably constantly kept up, although the Bible is silent in reference to individual cases. Elijah's complaint (1 Kings 19: 14) proves what a reign of terror that must have been. Jezebel was, however, equally violent and revengeful in other cases, and did not shrink from the worst means to accomplish her end, as the case of Naboth shows (1 Kings 21: 1-13), and the treachery against Jehoshaphat (1 Kings 22: 30). After Ahab's death she still pressed her schemes. But the prophets were also vigilant; and at the proper time Elisha anointed Jehu as king, who utterly extirpated Ahab's family, and the idolatries which Jezebel had introduced. Still her boldness and firmness clung to her; and when Jehu drew nigh to Jezreel, her summer residence, she tried by cosmetic arts to soften the conqueror's heart (2 Kings 9: 30), in the hope that as his wife she might play out her game. But Jehu could not be moved. She was cast headlong from the window, and her mangled body was devoured by dogs (2 Kings 9: 10; 1 Kings 21: 23; 9: 23), after having, for 36 years, perpetrated her iniquities. Her example teaches that God would not tolerate a union of Israel with the Canaanites.

VAIHINGER.*

Jezreel (LXX. Ἰζρελ. Vulg. *Jezrael*, hence later *Esdrelon*, Judith 1: 8; 4: 5; 7: 3, and in the middle ages *Stradela*) was originally a Canaanite city (Josh. 17: 16), and subsequently fell to the portion of Issachar, and is not to be confounded with the city of the same name in

Judah (1 Sam. 25: 43). The site is now occupied by *Zerin*, known during the Crusades as *parvum Gerinum* (*Guil. Tyr.*, 22, 26). The town lay in the fertile valley of Jezreel, at the point where the Tubania (Ain Jalud = Goliath's fountain), which enters the Jordan at Bethshean or Scythopolis, and the Kishon, separate. In David's time it was one of the important towns of Palestine (2 Sam. 2: 8, &c.) which remained true to the house of Saul until Ishbosheth's death. Ahab chose it as the royal residence (1 Kings 18: 45; 21: 1). Here Jehu put Jehoram and Jezebel (see Art.) and Ahaziah to death (to the last case, Hos. 1: 4, may refer). The adjacent plain was named after the city (Judges 6: 33; Hos. 1: 5; Judith 1: 8), though sometimes called the field of Dothaim (Judith 4: 5), the plain of Megiddo (2 Chron. 35: 22), or simply great plain (1 Macc. 12: 49). It stretches from Mt. Carmel to the Jordan, and is watered by the Kishon and Tubania, with their branches. It is the largest and most fertile plain of Palestine, being 24 miles long from E. to W., by 12-15 wide from N. to S., of triangular form. Esdraelon (*Campus Legionis*, from the town Ledschun, Jos., *B. J.*, IV. 1, 8, or simply *μέγα πεδῖον*, *Antt.*, XX., 6, 1), is the natural boundary between Galilee and Samaria.—This plain possesses historical importance as the highway for caravans (Gen. 37: 25) from Galilee through Samaria to Jerusalem, and as the field of many great battles (Judges 4: 7, 13; 5: 6; 6: 33; 7: 12; 1 Sam. 29: 1; 31: 2; 1 Kings 20: 26; 2 Kings 9: 15-37; 23: 29; 2 Chron. 35: 22 [cf. *Herod.*, 2, 159]; Judith 7: 3; Jos., *B. J.*, 3, 10; 1 Macc. 12: 49). The last was that in which Napoleon, April 16, 1799, with 3000 men, routed 25,000 Turks. In Rev. 16: 16; 19: 19, it is prophetically designated as the scene of the future slaughter of nations.—Although at present it has few inhabitants, on account of the Bedouins, and only Zerin, with some twenty dilapidated houses, occupies the heights of Jezreel, all travellers speak of the richness of the soil. Schubert (*Reise*, 3, 163, &c.), was delighted with it, and reminded of Ps. 65: 13. No advantage, however, is taken of its spontaneous fertility, because of the unprotected state of the locality.

VAIHINGER.*

Joab, son of Zeruiah, David's sister (1 Chron. 2: 16, cf. 2 Sam. 17: 25). In 2 Sam. 2: 13, he is first named, as captain of David's forces against Abner. But he was, doubtless, one of David's earlier adherents (1 Sam. 22, cf. 22: 3, 4, 11-18; 26: 8), or David would have entrusted Abishai with the chief command. It seems to follow, also, from his not being named in 2 Sam. 23: 8, &c., that he was then already David's general (cf. 23: 18, 24); and Amasa would have taken precedence of him, had he not been associated with David prior to David's abode in Ziklag (1 Chron. 13: 18). On account of his talent for commanding an army, David, as king, made him leader in most of his wars (2 Sam. 10: 7; 11: 1; 12: 26; 18: 14; 20: 13). In the revolt of Absalom, David assumed the chief command, partly that he might fall back on the other divisions of the army, in case of a defeat. Hence he is mentioned as commander-in-chief in 2 Sam. 8: 16; 20: 13. On account

of his fidelity to David some of his crimes were overlooked, as his slaying of Abner, Absalom, and Amasa (2 Sam. 3:27; 18:14; 19:13, and 20:10. Cf. 3:39; 16:10; 19:22; 11:15; 19:1-7; 3:27; 24:3). He combined great faults with eminent talents and virtues; pride, arbitrariness, and revenge, with firmness, fidelity, and bravery. Hence David's hesitation to punish him; and yet, that justice might be maintained, he committed the execution of the penalty deserved by Joab, to Solomon, who discharged the duty, and the more promptly, because Joab joined Adonijah (1 Kings 2:22. Cf. 2 Sam. 3:28, 29). The divine vengeance likewise overtook his posterity, as though in fulfilment of Ex. 20:5. **VAHINGER.***

Job. The book of Job is the greatest production of the ancient Israelitish philosophy (Chokmah), and as such belongs, with the three others of its kind, to the Cetubim. It bears all the marks which distinguish Proverbs, Canticles, and Eccles. from the prophetic books; it is a work of reflection and art. The prophet deals in historical facts, past or to come; this book presents an incident which lays no claims to historical actualness. The author uses an apt traditional story as a frame-work for the development of a great idea. Substantially the tradition was true, but the incident was wrought in a poetical form supplied by the writer of the book (Luther). *Res vere gesta, sed poetice tractata* (Grotius). Truth and fiction are interwoven. Prophecy, moreover, is the interpreter of Redemption, and the mediator of its progressive revelation; hence its sphere is within Israel. The book of Job presents an incident which occurred outside of this sphere, and sustaining no avowed relation to Israel. The author is consistently mindful of this; hence we do not find a single allusion to the law, the prophets, or the worship of Israel. His own position as an Israelite, the author does not deny, for in the narrative parts he always calls God, Jehovah; but he is always true to the character and relations of his hero, as being not an Israelite. Job uses the name Jehovah but twice (1:21; 12:9), Eloha, however, 41 times. Even many designations of divine attributes, common in the Thora, are not found in Job, and so, in general, of the dogmatic terminology of the Isr. religion; and only the earliest form of heathenism, star-worship (31:26-28), is named, though the expression: Jehovah of hosts, or Elohim Sabaoth, never occurs. This name belongs to the period of Isr. kings. His theme was to show that communion with God was possible on the basis of the ante-Israelitish, primitive revelation; that there, too, God continually reveals himself, in an ordinary way, through the conscience, and extraordinarily, in dreams and visions; that there, too, we meet with longings and strivings after the redemption, known to Israel by the clearer word of divine promise. The book of Job stands related to the other O. T. books, as Melchisedec to the Abrahamic covenant.

The scene is located in **יִזְרְעֵל**, a land of which we only know that it lay, as stated at the close of the book in the LXX., ἐν ταῖς ἐπείαις τῆς Ἰδουμαίας καὶ Ἀραβίας. According to Gen. 10:

23; 22:21; 36:21, the inhabitants were of Aramaic descent, and subsequently amalgamated with Nahorites and Horites; hence not Idumean, but in frequent intercourse with Idumeans of Teman (not Tema on the borders of the Nedscha and Syrian desert), and Arabians (of the Abrahamide-Arabic family Schuach), and exposed to the inroads of the Sabaeans (who probably dwelt near the Persian Gulf (cf. Gen. 10:7, 28; 25:3) and the Chassidim (either Chaldeans of Mesopotamia, or of the Chaldean mountains), who traded with the caravans of Tema and Sheba, which passed the country of Uz. — When Job lived there is not related. If those, so graphically described in ch. 24 and 30, were remnants of the subjugated Horites (which is probable), a period not antecedent to that of the patriarchs would be indicated (especially as the people of Uz were Arameans, not Edomites). There is, also, nothing in the book against the opinion that Job was cotemporary with the patriarchs of Israel; indeed the age he reached (42:16) points to a high antiquity, as well as the kind of money and musical instruments named (42:11; 30:31; 21:12; cf. Gen. 33:19; 4:21; 31:27; Josh. 24:32). A character drawn from that period, also, suited the author's purpose. Had Job belonged to a later age, his ignorance of Israel's God would have been a cause of reproach. — The book exhibits in Job a righteous man, who fell from a pinnacle of happiness into an abyss of woe; and whilst he cannot solve the riddle of his misfortunes, his friends, by their wrong views of Providence, and unkind judgment of his case, only deepen his misery. In the prologue a key to the mystery is furnished, and the result demonstrates the truth of the explanation given in the prologue. — It is impossible to understand the book, unless we remember that afflictions are set forth in the Scriptures in four leading aspects: 1) as a punishment of sin, and so dispensed by God in anger (Ps. 6:2; 38:2; Jer. 10:24, &c.; τιμωρία, poena), or for the reproof of his erring children (Deut. 8:5; Hebr. 12:6, &c.); 2) to purify the righteous, and free them more and more from evil, and so sent in love (Prov. 3:11; תּוֹכַח or תּוֹכַחָה; παιδεία, Hebr. 12, &c.; 1 Cor. 11:32); 3) to prove his people, God suffers them to be afflicted, so that thus their fidelity, earnestness, and love may testify to the power of his grace in them (Rom. 8:38, 39); 4) martyrdom (Matth. 5:11, &c.). This distinction between the several kinds of afflictions, Job's friends failed to perceive. Hence their injustice to him. His afflictions were designed to prove him; in him to illustrate the grace of unfaltering devotion to God, even under the darkest dispensations. There are afflictions of the righteous, which are neither a punishment nor a chastisement on account of sin, proceeding not from the anger, but from the love of God, the object of which is to vindicate, perfect, and reward the piety of the righteous. This is the fundamental idea of the book of Job (see Ztschr. f. Prot. u. Kirche, 1851, pp. 65-85, for details). And this was the lesson which Job finally learned from the lips of Jehovah himself, who, at the close of the book, comes forth and solves the problem, which had proven too difficult, as

well for Job as for his friends. — But before Jehovah appears to end the dispute, we meet with four discourses (ch. 32–37) of a speaker whose presence was not before indicated. His name agrees with the locality of the incident (Gen. 22 : 21; Jer. 23 : 25). He is represented as a young man whom modesty had so far kept from speaking. He rebukes Job for justifying himself, at the expense of God's righteousness, and Job's friends for having nothing to say but in his condemnation. This is in harmony with the plot. But to meet all the demands of the case, he should not only defend Job's righteousness, but also expose the false view of the friends, that afflictions were always a punishment of sin. Instead of doing this, however, he simply carries out the sentiment expressed by Eliphaz, in 5 : 17. He does not get beyond the train of thought pursued by the three friends (see *Gleiss*, Beitr. z. Krit. d. B. Hiob, 1845. *Hengstenberg*, Ev. K. Z. Nr. 16–19, 1856; *Kosegarten*, Allg. Monatschr. f. Wissensch. u. Lit., 1853, p. 761, &c.). Jerome and Gregory M. had a like unfavorable view of Elihu's discourses, the former seeing in him a representative of a false philosophy, inimical to true faith, the latter a self-confident idle babbler. It is evident that these portions of the book were written by another and later author. For although there is no striking discrepancy of matter between them and the preceding discourses, the difference in style renders it impossible that the same author should have composed them. At ch. 32 a strange spirit breathes upon us; the diction becomes forced and affected; the poetic power declines; flat tautologies abound; and we get the impression that the writer aims at what he cannot reach. Still, this section of the book must not be undervalued. It exhibits a nearer approximation of sentiment to the doctrine of the N. T. than the other portions. Its author felt a defect in the book of Job which every Christian must feel, and sought to supply this defect; and although he does it in the spirit of the O. T. times, especially of the period preceding the exile, he stands nearer the light of the N. T. than the author of the original portions of the book. If the motto of the latter might be: εὐδὴν κατὰ κράτος τοῖς ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ, Rom. 8 : 1, that of Elihu's discourses might be: κρινόμενοι ἐπὶ κυρίου παιδευόμεθα ἵνα μὴ συν ἑσὶ κόσμῳ κατακριθῶμεν. — Elihu's discourses, therefore, though not a part of the original work, form an integral portion of canonical O. T. literature. The other parts of the book remains as the poet produced them.

As to its form, this book is a *dramatic tragedy*. It is a drama. The prologue (ch. 1–3), as the first part, presents the riddle. Then in the three controversial discourses which follow (ch. 4–14; 15–21; 22–26), the plot deepens. In the fourth part (ch. 27–31), Job's monologues prepare the way for a solution. This follows, though not ἀπὸ μηχανῆς, in the fifth part (ch. 38–42 : 6). Then comes the epilogue or exodus, in which Job, needfully purified by repentance, is justified and crowned as triumphant in his faithfulness to God. — No offence can be taken at our calling a book of the Bible a drama; for this, as well as every other form of poetry, may be

exalted to such divine use. The narrative style of the introduction and conclusion, or the absence of action, constitute no valid objection to our view of the book as a drama; for although here, as mainly in Euripides, the epic form is used, the dramatic spirit predominates, and though outward physical action is here wanting, the development of actual facts is carried on in animated reciprocal discourses. In some of our best modern dramas (Goethe's Iphigenia, and Tasso) there is also but little physical action. This want is made up in the book of Job by the variety and distinctiveness of the dramatic personæ: Satan, Job, Job's wife, his three friends, all strongly drawn characters. Each of the three friends represents a different phase of character: Eliphaz, the confiding pathos of old age, and aspiration after prophetic dignity; Bildad, the moderation and caution of one less rich in thought; Zophar, vehement, but transient, passion. The dramatic art of the book is also displayed in their growing opposition to Job, as the plot advances, until he finally regards them as leagued with his foes to heighten his afflictions. — We even go further, and assert confidently that the book is a *tragedy*. Brennius, already, called it such. Job is really as tragic a hero as Œdipus. His sufferings fall upon him like a tormenting riddle. Over these he easily triumphs, until the strange admonitions of his friends render them still more inexplicable. Then a severe struggle ensues, in which he, at times, mounts to the very heavens in bold defiance, and then sinks into the depths of despondency. His temptation had invested God with a false character, and with the spectre thus raised up he contends like a Titan. Nature and grace, madness and faith, defiance and humility, fiercely struggle with each other in his soul. At length the better principles prevail. Jehovah comes forth, and the spectre vanishes. Human freedom is not destroyed; it becomes manifest that human trials are not dispensed by absolute arbitrary power, but by divine wisdom, controlled by infinite love. The hero triumphs, the idea of a blind fate is annihilated. — The dramatic skill of this book is fully sustained by the loftiest elevation of style. Though abounding in imagery and illustration, everything is true to nature, and to history. Hence the powerful impression it has always made. It was a mine of wealth for Shakspere and Goethe. Bacon of Verulam says: *Si quis eximium illum Jobi librum diligenter evolverit, plenum eum et tanquam gravidum naturalis philosophiæ mysteriis deprehendet*. Kepler, after describing the Copernican system, expresses the hope of quite different cosmological discoveries, but *non antea discenda quam librum hunc Deus arbiter seculorum recluserit mortalibus*. Goldsmith derived the fundamental thought of his "Vicar of Wakefield" from this book. Fr. H. Jacobi says of it: Whether a history or a fiction, whoever thus wrote was a divine seer.

That such a master-piece of religious reflection and creative art, could belong to no other *period* than that of Solomon, might be assumed, were it not proven from every point of view. It belongs to the philosophical literature of Israel (cf. *Delitzsch*, Hohelied, p. 9; *Bruch*, Weisheitl. d.

Hebr., 1851; Oehler, *Grundzüge d. alttest. Weish.*, 1854). As only a selection of Solomon's 3000 proverbs has reached us, so but a few works of Isr. philosophy have been preserved. The proverbs of Solomon in the book of Proverbs, and Canticles, represent the time of Solomon; the introductory proverbs (ch. 1-9) the later period of the kings; and Eccles. the post-exile period. In regard to contents, these portions exhibit a threefold progress, in form a threefold retrogression. In Solomon's time the maschil and hymn were in their highest bloom; in Prov. 1-9, already, the maschil is rhetorically analyzed, its uniformity of structure gone, and the richness of its strophic form has been diluted; in Eccles. the beauty of the old artistic form has vanished. The book of Job undoubtedly belongs to the first of these periods. On every page it bears traces of having proceeded from the gnosis of Solomon's time, as that issued from the faith of David's age. The frequent allusions to natural history, also, and indications of general knowledge, corroborate the view, that the book was the product of a period in Israel's history, when the nation, through traffic and intercourse with other people, had attained to such general intelligence. The characteristics of that period are reflected in the book.—This view is further confirmed by its doctrinal relation to the other canonical books, especially the *thora* (law). The Mosaic law by no means lays down the proposition: no suffering without the guilt of the sufferer, or, every affliction is a divine punishment of sin (cf. Deut. 8:2, 5). Had Job been an Israelite, the cases of Abel, Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, and Joseph, and of Israel itself, would have served to comfort him. This book, therefore, does not stand opposed to the *thora*, in this respect. Neither does the *thora* affirm that divine justice completes its work in this world already; it speaks expressly of a here and hereafter. All it needs is that its doctrine be developed. Such a carrying out of the doctrine we have in the book of Job (cf. 19:21-25, 26-29; and 17:16; 20:11; 21:26). The hope expressed by Job refers to a future state, beyond death, because: 1) the presumption is in favor of explaining "upon the earth" (v. 25 referring to the destruction named in v. 26), in accordance with the parallels, and not 41:25; 2) the plain sense of "after my skin," implies an incorporeal state, not mere emaciation; 3) taking the passage in connection with 14:13-15; 16:18-25, it seems proper that Job should now express the hope of justification even beyond the grave. But to assume that he referred to a resurrection of the body, conflicts with the grammatical construction of the passage (the second clause of v. 26 is not in apposition with the first), and with the import of the words used; for it is highly improbable that in using 'רָוַח he thought of a body decayed in death, and by 'גִּידָה designated a body risen and glorified; especially the ideas of infirmity and sinfulness were always associated in the O. T. with "flesh." It is not the hope of a bodily resurrection which Job here avows, but that of a future beholding of God, hence, by surmounting previous conceptions of Hades, that of a future life (see K. W. G. Köstlin, *de immort. spe quæ in libro Jobi*

apparere dicitur., 1846). The drama concludes with showing that Job was rewarded here already for his unwavering love to God. But the result does not exceed the promise of the *thora*. Altogether the book of Job furnishes no other solution of the question, why the righteous often suffer, and the wicked prosper, than that given in Ps. 37; 38; and Jer. 12:1-3. In this respect the author of Eccles. occupies an advanced position, by referring to a final general judgment. To call the book of Job, therefore, the first and last theodicy, is going too far, for a full vindication of the justice of God is impossible, without a clear perception of a future state. But the prevailing representations of that state, found in this book, agree with those of the psalms of Solomon's time, and Solomon's proverbs; there is no corporeal life beyond the present, only an existence in sheol, as a shadow of our present life. This is a strong proof of the cotemporary relation of the book to those psalms and proverbs (Ps. 88:11, &c.). And yet it breathes out longings after a higher state, just as Ps. 17:15; 49:15, &c.—The relationship between this book (including Elihu's discourses) and Ps. 88, 89, is remarkably close. Heman and Ethan, the authors of those psalms, were not David's musicians of the same names, but contemporaries of Solomon (cf. 1 Kings 5:11). The resemblance is seen not only in words

בְּעֵתִים אִמִּים אֲכַדִּין רַפְּאִים קִרְשִׁים

the last two used by no other O. T. writers), but in parallel verses (cf. Job 16:19, with Ps. 89:38; 7:7, with Ps. 89:48; 14:14, with Ps. 89:49; 14:10, with 88:5; 30:10, with 89:9; 31:34, with 89:8); here not the same expressions occur, as though the one quoted the other, but there is a resemblance which could not be incidental, but indicate a common philosophical relationship. Without, therefore, going so far as to attribute a common authorship (Heman) to the book of Job and these Psalms, we simply affirm our conviction that said book was written by one of the philosophic poets of Solomon's court, and one who had endured a spiritual experience resembling the sufferings described. (This is the result reached by Rosenmüller, Hävernick, Vaihinger, Hahn, Schlottman, Oehler, Keil, and Hoffmann).—The *place where* the book was written cannot be decided. But it is more than probable that the author had seen Egypt, from his precise allusions to Egyptian animals and mines (see Wilson, *Lands of the Bible*; Ritter, in Piper's *Jahrb.*, 1852), though the mines may have been in Arabia or even Palestine; for the author mingles figures derived from Egypt (7:12; 9:26; possibly 3:14) with others that are Asiatic (3:8, &c.), and drawn illustrations from all foreign lands, East and West.

Of all other books of the O. T., that of Job has been the last to be fully understood. The Greek Fathers had to depend upon the LXX., without being able to compare that version with the primitive text; but all the defects of the LXX. abound threefold in its version of this book,—it omits whole verses, misplaces others, and supplies blanks with apocryphal additions. Origen knew this (*ep. ad Afric.* § 3, sq.), but

had not sufficient knowledge of the Hebrew to correct the evil. And as the whole book can only be understood by ascertaining the sense of single parts, it was impossible for the Greek Fathers to master it. The enigmatical book engaged much attention; from the 2d century it was read (cf. James 5:11) during passion-week (see Harnack, *Gottesd. d. kathol. Kirche*, p. 358); but typology and allegory could not supply the lack of grammatico-historical exegesis. The Itala was more defective than the LXX. Jerome calls the book, in the Itala, *decurtatus et laceratus corrosusque*. His own independent translation was far in advance of his age, but he himself acknowledges its imperfection, in his account of the way in which he made it. He purchased, *non parvis numis*, a Jewish teacher of Lydda, then the seat of a Jewish academy, but after going through the book with this Jew, he confesses he was no wiser than before: *cujus doctrina an aliquid profecerim nescio; hoc unum scio non potuisse me interpretari nisi quod antea intellexeram*. Hence, as though he would accuse the book itself, he calls it *obliquus, lubricus, figuratus*, like an *anguilla vel muræna*. There were then three Latin versions of the book: the Itala, the Itala improved by Jerome, and Jerome's; and their disagreement caused much confusion, as Augustine complains. The Syrians were better off with their Peschito, rendered directly from the original text; but Ephraem's Comm. is like a sermon which departs far from the text, containing excellent thoughts, but not opening the sense. The following period furnished nothing better. Among its commentators we find great names: Gregory M., Bede Ven., Th. Aquinas, Albertus M., &c.; but no progress was made in the exposition of the book, for the means were wanting. A new era for it dawned toward the close of the middle ages, when Jewish converts gave impulse to the study of the Hebrew. Nich. de Lyra, author of the *Postillæ perpetuæ in universa Biblia* (completed 1330), possessed, for that period, a thorough knowledge of the original text, the necessity of which he felt, and regarded the literal sense as prerequisite to the discovery of every other. But he was too dependent on the rabbins, and hampered by the servile, unevangelical ecclesiasticism of his day. The breaking of these bonds ushered in the dawn of a true exegesis. Luther, Brentius, and other Reformers possessed peculiar qualifications for the study of the book. But even they had only presentiments of its import. Luther fully realized its difficulties. Though aided by Melancthon, and the Hebrew scholar, Aurogallus, it sometimes took them four days to get over as many lines. Jerome Weller, a man schooled in adversity, also acknowledged his inadequacy for the work, and was glad, after passing through 12 chapters, to leave the rest for others. The most comprehensive work of the Reformation on Job was Calvin's 150 sermons. The exegesis of the ante-rationalistic period surpassed the efforts of the Reformers only in philological learning; we mention Mercier and Cocceius of the Reformed Church, S. Schmid of the Lutheran C., and John de Pineda of the Romish C.; the Comm. of the last author (Madrid, 1597) is a

very learned compilation, admired and used by Protestants, but excessively jealous for the Vulgate. In the apprehension of the fundamental truth of the book, however, the commentaries of the Reformers have not yet been surpassed.—A new epoch in its exposition began with the Comm. of Albert Schultens of Holland (2 vols., 1737); he first paid due attention to the Semitic and especially the Arabic peculiarities of the book. But in proportion as that which was Israelitish was considered in connection with its Orientalisms, was its divine excellency appreciated. Meanwhile this book suffered less from the perversions of rationalism than others; there were no miracles or prophecies in it, to be explained away. Indeed as it came to be regarded as a master-piece of poetry, the exposition of it was promoted by the translations and critical commentaries of an Eckermann, Moldenhauer, Stuhlmann, &c. What advantage the Church Fathers would have taken of such a translation as that of Böckel, or the Swiss layman (Noten z. hebr. Texte d. A. T. nebst einer Uebers. d. Buchs Hioba, Basel, 1841)! Rationalism paved the way for a new period in the ecclesiastical interpretation of the book of Job. The Comm. of Samuel Lee († Dec. 16, 1852, at Barley), Vaihinger (1842), Welte (1849), and v. Gerlach (in his *Bibelwerk*, Bd. 3. d. A. T.), Hahn (1850), and Schlottmann (1851), are the first fruits of this period, rendered possible by the antecedent works of Umbreit (1824, 1832), Ewald (1836, 1851), and Hirzel (1839, 2d ed. by Olshausen, 1852): the first of which is distinguished by its enthusiasm for the lofty poetry of the book, the second by a lively appreciation of its tragical character, and the third by its healthy skill and excellent method. The translation of Köster is valuable; he first directed attention to the strophic structure of Hebrew poetry, but started an error which still prevails, by making the Masoretic verse a constituent part of the strophe. The translation of Stöckel is also meritorious, although he fell into the opposite extreme from Köster. Sommer was the first to explain the strophic character of ancient Hebrew poetry, in his *Biblical treatises* (Abhandl., Bd. I., 1846), though he makes no special application to the book of Job. The book, including Elihu's discourses, is throughout strophic, though not in the way of a servile adherence to the form, at the sacrifice of truth, or the beauty of the dialogue.

F. DELITZSCH.*

Joel, the son of Pashuel, one of the oldest Israelitish prophets, prophesied in Judah and possibly in Jerusalem itself (1:13, &c.; 2:1, 9; 4:1, 6, 8, 18–20), upon the occasion of a devastation, drought, and plague of locusts. In 1:1–2:17, he describes the desolation (in which he sees a precursor of the day of the Lord), and then the destroyer himself, adding an earnest exhortation to general fasting and prayer. The exhortation seems to have proven effectual (2:18, &c.), and hence the encouraging promises which follow (3:1–2, cf. 2 Chron. 20:1–30). Having indicated the antecedent signs of the day of terror which should overtake the foes of Israel (3:3–5), he describes that day itself (4:1–17), and refers briefly to the Messi-

anic blessings which should flow upon Judah and Jerusalem from the destruction of their enemies. — Ephraem Syrus, Jerome, &c., already, explained the locusts as a figure of future foes of the people of God, heathen forces, a view which Hengstenberg still vindicates (*Christol.*, &c., 2d ed.), but abandoned by most modern commentators (*Delitzsch*, in *Rudolb. and Gericke's Ztschr.*, 1851, p. 306, &c.; *Keil*, *Einl. in d. kanon. Schr. d. A. T.*, 325, &c.). This view conflicts with the natural impression made by the first part of the book, in whole and in part, and with the relation between the first and second part; and it is not probable that Joel, on whose horizon the great oriental powers had not yet risen, should give such a description of foes, especially as he would then repeat it in a symbolical form. There is no trace in 2: 1, &c., of anything that does not correspond with a literal sense. — The second point disputed is the period of Joel. *Credner*, *Meier*, *Hitzig*, *Ewald*, *Hofmann*, *Delitzsch*, *Keil*, &c., hold that he lived under Joah, 870–850 B. C.: *Hengstenberg*, *De Wette*, *Knobel*, &c., under Uzziah or Jeroboam II., c. 800 B. C. *Hofmann* (*Weiss. u. Erfüll.*, I., 201; *Schriftbew.*, II., 1, p. 86, &c.; 2, 491, &c.) and *Delitzsch* place him 20–30 years later than Obadiah. The external proof of this (his not mentioning the Syrian invasion, 2 Kings 12: 17; 2 Chron. 24: 23, &c.) is not conclusive, but the view is supported by the character of the whole book. Not only is no mention made of the Assyrians, but none of those sins of the nation which God punished by the Assyrian inroads, and which Amos, Hosea, and Isaiah rebuke. A better spirit still prevailed; the people listen to the warnings of the prophets, and repent. It is remarkable that Joel (4: 1–3) speaks of the impending dispersion of Israel, and division of the holy land, which was to precede the day of judgment upon the heathen, as something well known. This would seem to imply a later period for his prophecy. It only proves, however, how deeply the mind of the nation was impressed with the fundamental truths of the songs of Moses (*Deut* 32. *Comp.* Joel 4: 21, with *Deut* 32: 43). — The leading truths with which Joel enriched the treasures of Messianic prophecy, are the outpouring of the Holy Spirit and the definite allusion to the day of the Lord. — *Ewald* praises the fluent style of Joel, considering the depth and fulness of thought found in the book, and *Umbreit* the calm reflection which he combines with vividness of description. His vivid poetical delineation of the desolation of the land, and graphic description of the locusts, have been much admired. Still more impressive are his touching complaint and call to repentance, and his grand description of the holy war and judgment of God (4: 9, &c.).

AUBERLEN.*

John, the Apostle, and his writings. The most prominent of the apostles of our Lord, are *John*, *Peter*, and *Paul*. As compared with Peter, John is of a quiet, thoughtful, and receptive disposition; every word of his beloved Master he seizes, holds fast, and reflects upon; being happy in losing himself in the contemplation of the glory of the Son of Man, and in the experience of His love. The quiet peculiar majesty

and glory of Christ, as they are represented in the Gospel of John, were certainly not hidden from the other disciples; but he alone, on account of his disposition, was able to reproduce them. He possessed the nature of a living mirror, which not only received the full glory of the Lord, but was also able to reflect it. The other writers of the gospels have preserved of the acts and words of Christ, what momentarily produced the greatest effect, externally viewed, as the sermon on the mount, etc. But John discovered a glory in things to them unimportant, as the conversation with the Samaritan woman, etc., and he was able, on account of his receptive disposition, to retain and faithfully reproduce them.

On the other hand, Paul more resembles John in inwardness, than Peter does, but it is a different kind of inwardness; Paul's being dialectic, John's purely contemplative. Paul looks more at the appropriation of salvation, John at the founder of salvation; Paul at conversion, John at the fullness of life in Christ. Hence, Paul is a much milder character than the *ἁγίος* (Mark 3: 17) John. It is true, John has often been called "the apostle of love," because the word, *ἀγάπη*, is often found in his writings. But this word occurs at least as frequently in the writings of Paul, and is used by him in its relation to faith as its fruit, whilst it is used by John in contrast with hatred and wickedness. On the other hand, the passage, *Luke* 9: 51, sq., by no means justifies the inference, that he was of a violent temperament (*Lücke*, I., p. 16). He was much rather what the French expressed by the words: *il est entier*; he had no sense, no capacity for what was relative or mediating, and he was not, therefore, a *man of accommodating, or conciliatory disposition*. He was a man who is what he is, *entirely and thoroughly*, who could only have been thoroughly Christian or thoroughly Satanic. In him grace obtained a quite permanent and decided victory over natural depravity. He was trained piously from early youth by his mother, *Salome*, who (*Mark* 16: 1; *Matt.* 20: 20) belonged to the number of those who found their comfort in the promises of the old covenant, and longed for the Messiah. John was trained up by her in the fear of God, and in the hope of the salvation of Israel. So soon as *the Baptist* appeared, John connected himself with him, with all the energy of his receptive disposition. The Baptist, who was to prepare all for Christ, was specially adapted to prepare the *ἐπισκοπὸς τοῦ κόσμου*, as the instrument who would be able to catch all the rays from Christ's person. None of the other disciples apprehended the substance of the Baptist's preaching (*John* 1: 26–36) so clearly and energetically as John. The other Gospels have reported concerning the preaching of the Baptist, and only quite briefly added the notice, that he also pointed to the coming Messiah. But it is just this latter matter, that John has apprehended as the centre of the Baptist's labors, and has preserved the prophetic discourses of the same concerning the nature and sufferings of Christ, which the others have not done.

John connected himself with Christ with equal decision and absoluteness, so soon as the Bap-

ist pointed to him (John 1:35, sq.). This resoluteness exhibits itself also in his temper, so far as it was not yet entirely sanctified, or still under the influence of erroneous views. When the inhabitants of a Samaritan village would not receive Jesus, he asks, whether He would not command fire to come down from heaven and consume them. According to his *temper and temperament* he is everywhere and always *receptive*, not forward, not officious, but reserved, expectant, observant, and docile. But he is at the same time determined and decided. *He is of a yielding disposition, but he yields only to one thing, unto this entirely and unconditionally.* And because he is of such a yielding disposition, he needed this decidedness.

The same decision of character, the same incapacity to tolerate what is relative and to be in suspense, exhibits itself also in his *view of salvation*. Paul regards this as something progressive, as a contest between the old and new man; John as *the already completed victory of light over darkness*. Whosoever is born of God, he is light, and has the life, and does not sin. Paul speaks of sin as a weakness; John, although he well knew it as such (1 John 1:8, sq.; 2:1), treats more of sin as wickedness. He knew, also, that the victory of light over darkness is only won by apparent subjection and destruction, as was the case with Christ, who through death overcame death, so also in each individual and in the whole of believers (Rev. 2:8, sq.; 7:14; 20:4). But he also viewed this victory, although as regards time still future, as decided from *eternity* (comp. 1 John 4:4; 5:4, and 3:6 and 9). For John only two states of the heart were possible: for and against; and he does not bring into view the circumstances attending the transition from the one to the other. Such a temper, sanctified by grace, would never have been able to win the heathen world for Christ: John could never have done the work which Paul did, by being a Jew to the Jews, and a heathen to the heathen. But still such a person, as John was, was necessary to *preserve pure and to purify the Church*. This was his high mission; he was as well a messenger of the Judge as of the Saviour, was called by the Spirit to prophesy of judgment and to offer salvation. He was to complete the *doctrines of the other apostles*, and thus perfect the *διδασχὴ τῶν ἀποστόλων*. He had to purify the Church from primitive pollutions, and to judge rising Gnosticism. He had to judge for all coming time the abomination of anti-Christianism, in that he was called to present in the *Apocalypse* an external criterion of what was Christian and what anti-Christian. In short: *his relation to Christ was thoroughly feminine and receptive, but being filled by Christ, his relation to everything anti-Christian was thoroughly masculine, and as a raging fire.* An ancient hymn admirably describes his character in the words: *volat avis sine meta, &c.*

The apostolic labors of John, during the first thirty years after the ascension of the Lord, were, in conformity with his personal peculiarity, quiet and retired. He was the only disciple who did not forsake the Lord at his crucifixion, but remained fearless at the cross. After

the resurrection, John remained with the other disciples at Jerusalem, without, however, being prominent among the apostles. If we had not Gal. 2:9, we would not even know that John, in connection with Peter and James, was greatly respected by the Church. His labors during this period were hidden from the public eye, and had more to do with the edification of established congregations than with the conversion of Jews or Greeks. It is difficult to say how long he remained in Jerusalem. When the persecution recorded, Acts 8:1, took place, he, with the other apostles, remained in Jerusalem. But when Paul, three years after his conversion, came to Jerusalem (Gal. 1:18, sq.), in the year 40 *ær. Dion.*, he only met there with Peter and James. From this, however, it does follow, that the other apostles had then already finally left Jerusalem, for in the year 51 (Acts 15) they are all again there. Seven years later, however, in 58 (Acts 21:18), only James and the *πρεσβύτεροι* are there. The dispersion or departure of the other apostles seems to have taken place in the interval between 51 and 58. An ancient tradition (*Clem. Alex. Strom.*, VI., 5) reports of John, that he left Jerusalem twelve years after the death of Christ (45 *ær. Dion.*). In any case, he did not then go immediately to Ephesus, where unanimous tradition places him at the end of his life. Particular accounts of his residence in the interval are altogether wanting. The tradition that he went to Parthia is as groundless as that according to which he preached in India. The strongest probability favors the opinion that he went to Antioch when Paul departed on his first missionary journey (46 *ær. Dion.*), in order that he might fill the vacancy made by the departure of Paul. This much, however, is certain, that John became later, but certainly *much later*, the successor of Paul at Ephesus. In any case, this took place only at the death of Paul (64 *ær. Dion.*), or afterwards: for Paul makes no mention anywhere of John being there. But that he subsequently directed from Ephesus the churches in Asia Minor is the unanimous tradition of the Church Fathers. Polycrates, a bishop of Ephesus in the 2d cent., says, in a letter to Victor of Rome, concerning John: οὗτος ἐν Ἐφέσῳ κακοίμηται. Irenæus (*hær.*, III., 3, 4, in Eus., IV., 14, comp. Eus., III., 23) says: ἀλλὰ καὶ ἡ ἐν Ἐφέσῳ ἐκκλησία, ὑπο Παύλου μὲν τεδεμελιωμένη. Ἰωάννου δὲ παραμεινάντος αὐτοῖς μέχρι τοῦ Τραϊανοῦ χρόνων μάρτυς ἀληθῆς ἐστὶ τῆς ἀποστόλων παραδωσιως (Trajan reigned 98–117). Irenæus also says (II., 22, 5, Grabe, 162), that John lived and labored with a circle of disciples μέχρι τῶν Τραϊανοῦ χρόνων in Asia (proconsular Asia, of which Ephesus was the chief city). Irenæus is here a witness so much the more reliable, because one of these disciples of John, the martyr Polycarp, had been his teacher and spiritual father (Iren., III., 3; Eus., V., 20 and 24). Ignatius of Antioch and Papias were also among the disciples of the aged John (Eus., III., 22; Iren. in Eus., III., 39). Jerome (*vir. ill.*, 9) places the death of John 68 years after the death of Christ, consequently in the year 101 *ær. Dion.*, Eusebius in the year 100.

Moreover, tradition is unanimous, that John

was banished to the island of Patmos for a time by a Roman τύραννος. Clemens of Alexandria (*quis div. salv.*, cp. 42) relates the beautiful story of the recovery of a youth who had fallen among robbers by John as a μῦθος οὐ μῦθος, and fixes the time thus: ἐπειδὴ τοῦ τυραννοῦ τελευτήσαντος ἀπὸ τῆς Πατμοῦ τῆς νήσου μετήλθεν εἰς τὴν Ἐφεσον. He speaks here of the exile on Patmos as something known to his readers and to all the world. Origen also relates (on Matt., III., p. 720): ὁ δὲ Ῥωμαίων βασιλεὺς ὡς παραδοσὶς διδάσκει πακιδίχασε τὸν Ἰωάννην μαρτυροῦντα διὰ τὸν τῆς ἀληθείας λόγον, εἰς Πατμον τὴν νήσον. Only after this does he cite Rev. 1:9. Tertullian (*præscr. hæc.*, cp. 36) called the Roman Church happy where Paul was beheaded, and from whence John, after being wonderfully delivered out of a cauldron of boiling oil (comp. Acts 14:20; 28:5; Mark 16:18), was banished to Patmos. Irenæus (in Eus., III., 18) says definitely, that John was banished to Patmos under Domitian. Even cotemporaneous heathen writers have not omitted to relate (according to Eus., l.c.), τὸν τε διωγμὸν καὶ τὰ ἐν αὐτῷ μαρτύρια, αἵ γε καὶ τὸν καιρὸν ἐπ' ἀκριβεῖς ἐπισημῆσαντο, viz., the fifteenth year of Domitian (95-96 ær. Dion.). The year following, upon the advent of Nerva, he was permitted to return to Ephesus.

If we pass now to the *literary labors* of the Apostle John, we find them divided into two chief parts; the one part consisting of the Gospel together with the *first epistle*, which is closely related to it, the other consisting of the *book of Revelation*. Beginning with the Gospel we remark, that at the first glance we see that it is different from the other three gospels, as well in regard to *chronological order* as to the *selection of matter*. In regard to the latter, John, as is known, has much that is peculiar and new, and he only agrees with the others in a few sections (1:21-27; 6:5-21; 12:1-15, and the chief points of the history of Christ's sufferings). By omitting the history of Christ's birth he differs from Matthew and Luke; the accounts of the festival-journies are peculiar to him. That, therefore, in regard to matter he completed the other gospels, is a simple fact, and the question, whether he *intended* to do so admits of no doubt. But he also completes the other gospels in another and deeper reference. First, he alone has preserved the utterances of our Lord concerning His eternal relation to the Father and His eternal oneness of essence with the Father (3:13 and 17, sq.; 5:17, sq.; 6:33 and 51; 7:16 and 28, sq.; 8:58, &c.). Secondly, he has preserved and recorded the utterances of our Lord concerning the *mystical* life-union and communion, which exists between Him and believers (3:8; 6; 14:16, sq.; 15:1, sq.; 17:21-23). That John thus completed the image of Christ and of his doctrine given in the other gospels, resulted not merely from his individuality and personal peculiarity, but also from a need then existing in the Church.

It is well known, that at this early period Gnosticism arose in the Church, a heathen speculation, which as represented by Cerinthus, with whom John came in contact, taught, that the world was not created by God, but by a

power far removed from God; that Jesus was a son of Joseph and Mary; the æon Christ was united with him at baptism, but that previous to his sufferings the Christ departed from him, and only the man Jesus suffered. Against this form of heresy John had to contend, and that he did so designedly in his gospel, is apparent from a careful comparison of the doctrines of Cerinthus with John, 1:3 and 14 and 33-34 and 49; 3:13, 14; 5:23 and 26; 6:51 and 62; 8:58; 13:23, sq.; 17:1, 2 and 16 and 19; 18:6 and 11 and 37. The whole plan of his gospel was constructed, as he himself says, chapter 20:31, "that ye might believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God," — in other words, to refute Gnostic heresy. This plan made it necessary that he should observe a more strictly chronological order than was necessary in the other gospels.

The *first epistle* is closely related to the Gospel in language, style, tone, ideas, and manner of expression; especially remarkable, as proving this relation, is chap. 2:12-13, where he six times repeats the object for which *he writes* and *has written*, although he has as yet written nothing important. For chap. 1:1, sq., simply announces that that which was from the beginning, which he had heard, and seen, and handled of the word of life, he declared unto them. But we look in vain in this epistle for a declaration of that which he *saw* and *handled*. Immediately, in verse 4, he gives us the contents of his message, "that God is light," and connects practical inferences with it. Then begins the second chapter, in which he again explains the reason why he writes and why he wrote. From this internal evidence we are almost involuntarily forced to the conclusion, that this *first epistle* was written to accompany the Gospel, presupposing its existence in the hands of those to whom this is addressed. But whether this be so or not, it is evident from chap. 4:2, sq., that the Apostle had to contend with such as denied that Jesus was the Christ. And to lead to faith in Christ, the Son of God, he wrote his gospel (John 20:31).

As a separate article will treat of the book of Revelation, we will pass it by here without any further notice.

Thus the life, labors, and writings of the Apostle John present themselves as an organic and harmonious unity. In this congruence and harmony exists a *proof for the genuineness* of the three-named Johannean writings, which is stronger and more convincing, than any analytical and critical proofs could be. The *external proofs also for the age and genuineness of these writings* are stronger than those in favor of any other book of antiquity.

The *evidences for the genuineness of the Gospel and of the first epistle* are decisive. As the writer calls himself an eyewitness of the life of Christ (1:14, comp. 1 John 1:1), we have to choose between genuineness and wilful and conscious fraud. If we consider in addition, that the author everywhere seems intentionally to avoid naming the sons of Zebedee (1:35, 42; 13:23; 18:15; 19:26; 20:2), that he constantly designates himself as "the disciple whom Jesus loved," that whilst he always distinguishes

between the two Judas' (12: 4; 13: 26; 14: 22), and always gives Thomas his surname (11: 16; 20: 24; 21: 2), on the contrary, always calling John the Baptist only *Ἰωάννης*—all this explains itself on the supposition that John himself was the writer.

With this indirect evidence of the gospel is connected a strong, unbroken chain of external evidences (Comp. Ebrard's *Krit. der ev. Gesch.*, § 139). Already, at the time when it was not the custom to quote the writings of the N. T. by giving their titles and authors, we find a mass of undeniable reminiscences out of John. When Ignatius (*Philad.*, 7) says abruptly of "the spirit of God": *ὁ δὲν γὰρ πόθεν ἐρχεται καὶ ποῦ ἐπάγει*, it only has a meaning when viewed as referring to John 3: 8. Such reference he also has (*Philad.*, 9, Rom. 7) when he calls Christ "the door of the Father," "the bread of heaven." Polycarp (*Phil.*, 7) quotes literally the passage, 1 John 4: 2, sq. Justin Martyr is entirely penetrated with Johannean thoughts and ideas; he calls Christ the *ζῶν ὕδωρ*, the *λογος τοῦ θεοῦ*, the *μετανοήσις*, speaks of his *σάρκοποιήθηαι*, of regeneration (comp. Otto, *de Justin Martyris scriptis et doctrina*, Jena, 1841), and refers here and there to single passages of the gospel (especially to John 14: 2, 3).

Marcion's opposition to the gospel of John (*Tert. adv. Marc.*, VI., 3) shows that then it was acknowledged by the Church as genuine and canonical. Valentinus does not attempt to question its genuineness, but attempts to support his Gnostic system by allegorical interpretations of this gospel (*Tert. de præser. hæc.*, 38; Iren., III., 11, 7), and his disciple Heracleon even wrote a commentary on this gospel in this sense, of which Origen has preserved numerous fragments (*Iren. opp. ed. Massuet.*, Paris, 1710, tom. I., p. 362-378). Theodotus cites the passages, John 1: 9; 6: 51; 8: 56, *et al.* Ptolemæus (*Ad. Floram*) the passage, John 1: 3. That the Montanists acknowledged this gospel as apostolic, follows from the fact, that Tatian not only quotes John 1: 3, 5, literally, but he also made a harmony (*Diatessaron*) of the four canonical gospels (Eus., IV., 29; *Epiph. hæc.* 46), which (according to the testimony of Barsalibi, who had the same before him in a Syrian translation) commenced with John 1: 1, sq. Theophilus of Antioch (about 169) wrote a commentary on the four canonical gospels, which Jerome (cp. 53, *vir. ill.*, 25) himself read.

The heathen Celsus also was acquainted with the four gospels, and (II., 59) mentions the exhibition of the marks of the nails on Jesus, which only John reports.

Connected herewith are three proofs more. First, the testimony of Hippolytus in the work *περὶ πασῶν αἵρεσεων*, found on Mount Athos, edited by Miller, critically examined by Bunsen, and acknowledged by him, Gieseler, *et al.*, to have been written by Hippolytus. Second, the celebrated fragment of Apolinarius, in which he says against the Quartodecimarians: *καὶ λεγούσιν, ὅτι τῇ ἰδ' τὸ πρόβατον μετὰ τῶν μαθητῶν ἔφαγεν ὁ κύριος τῇ δε μεγάλῃ ἡμέρᾳ τῶν ἀζύμων αὐτοὺς ἑπαθεῖν, καὶ διηγούνται Ματθαῖος αὐτῷ λέγειν ὡς νενοήκασιν. ὁ δὲν ἀσύμφωνός τε νόμος ἢ νοήσις αὐτῶν, καὶ στασιαζέτω*

δοκεῖ κατ' αὐτοὺς τὰ εὐαγγέλια. The gospels, which seem to oppose and contradict each other, can only be the first three on the one hand, and that of John on the other—a proof that in the second half of the second century the gospel of John was spread throughout the whole Christian Church, and was received as genuine and canonical. Thirdly, Papias, already (Eus., III., 39), was acquainted with and cited the first epistle of John (*κεχρηται δ' ὁ αὐτὸς μαρτυρίας ἀπὸ τῆς προτέρας Ἰωάννου ἐπιστολῆς*).

These facts, taken collectively, overthrow the supposition that the gospel of John was composed by an imposter after the death of John, in the second century. Already, fifty or sixty years after the death of John, do we find this gospel the acknowledged and precious common possession of Christendom, and the sacredness and apostolic authority of the Johannean writings are asserted by none with more energy than by the circle which formed itself around the apostle and under his influence, of whom Polycarp and Irenæus are the most prominent.

It was reserved for later times and for rationalistic criticism to attack the age and genuineness of the Johannean writings. But up to this time they have come triumphantly out of these critical contests. The attacks of Evanson (*Dissonance of the four generally received Evangelists*, 1792), Eckermann (*theol. Beitr.*, 1795), Schmidt (*Bibl. für Krit. u. Exegese*, II., 1) were triumphantly repelled by Priestley (*Letters to a Young Man*), Simpson (an essay on the authenticity, &c., 1793), Storr and Süsskind—the attack of the frivolous Vogel (*der Evst. Joh. vor dem jüngsten Gericht*, 1801) by Süsskind and Schlecker, the attacks of Horst, Chudius, and Ballenstedt by Süsskind, Nöldecke, Wegscheider, Eichhorn, *et al.* Bretschneider himself recalled his objections (in Tzschirner's *Predigermag.*, II., 2, p. 154, sq.) after the replies of Stein, Usteri, Hensen, Crome, and Rettberg. After that, in later times, Weisse and Schweizer attacked simply the integrity instead of the authenticity of the gospel of John, Lützelberger (*die kirchliche Tradition über den Apostel Johannis und seine Schriften.*, Leipzig, 1840) and Schweigler (*über den Montanismus und die christliche Kirche des 2. Jahrhunderts.*, Tüb., 1841), seconded by Baur and Zeller, they only furnished the evidence, that, in order successfully to dispute the genuineness of the gospel of John, it is necessary first to reject the entire history of the Church and of the literature of the first two Christian centuries.

That the two other epistles, the second and third, were only admitted into the pericopes (*canones*) of parts of the early Church, is explained by their individual and occasional contents. They appear as "*ἀποκρυφόμενα*." This circumstance does not at once tell against their genuineness. But since the author calls himself "*ὁ πρεσβύτερος*," and since there was another John besides the Apostle John, who was known by the name *ὁ πρεσβύτερος* (Papias in Eus., III., 39; Dionysius in Eus., VII., 25), the supposition is probable, that these two epistles belong to him, as was already thought by many in the early Church (Eus., III., 25: *καὶ ἡ ονομαζομένη δευτέρα καὶ τρίτη Ἰωάννου, ἢ τοῦ εὐαγγελιστοῦ τογχανουρα, ἢ τοῦ ἐτέρου ομωνύμου ἱερέως*). The

similarity of style asserted by many as existing between these two epistles and the first, does not decide against the supposition; for they reduce themselves to three quotations from 1 John (2 John 5-6, comp. with 1 John 5:3; 2 John 7, comp. with 1 John 4:1, sq.; 3 John 11, comp. with 1 John 3:6) which are quite similar to the quotations from the epistles of Paul (2 John 3 and 8, and 3 John 6, 7, 8, 15), and these quotations are only new proofs for the genuineness and age of the first epistle. That the Apostle John should have experienced an opposition (not of doctrine, but of authority) such as is described, 3 John 9, is certainly not probable, whilst as shown towards the presbyter John it exhibits nothing very remarkable. The supposition, therefore, that the second and third epistles were written by the presbyter John still commends itself as the most probable.

As thus these two epistles contain an ancient testimony for the genuineness of the first epistle, as also of the gospel (comp. 3 John 12, with John 19:35), so does the appendix of the gospel (John 21) contain a similar proof. This chapter, according to verse 24, as also according to the style and treatment, was written by the Apostle John, who, however, did not append it immediately to his gospel. Only after he had received the *Revelation*, and it became thereby evident, what the Lord meant by the words: "If I will that he tarry till I come," was it added, without doubt, by the presbyter John (comp. John 21:24, with 3 John 12). And as this chap. 21 is not wanting in any MS., it must have been added shortly after the writing of the gospel, and in any case before it was widely circulated beyond Ephesus. DR. EBRARD.—Beck.

John of Avila (*Juan de Avila*), the apostle of Andalusia, in the 16th cent., was born about 1500, at Almodovar del Lampo, in the diocese of Toledo. His father sent him at the age of 14 years to Salamanca, to pursue the study of law; but as this was repugnant to his taste, he soon returned to his paternal home, and spent three years in rigorous ascetic exercises. Upon the advice of a Franciscan, his parents gave him permission to study philosophy and theology at Alcala de Henares, where Domingo de Soto became both his teacher and friend. He had not yet finished his course, when his parents died; and John, after taking orders, would have gone as a missionary to India, had not the Archbishop of Sevilla prevailed upon him to devote his energies to his own country. John now commenced preaching, in strains of fiery eloquence, in the whole province, and attracted large crowds. His popularity drew upon him the ill-will of the envious, and upon the trivial charge that he unduly exaggerated the dangers of wealth, so as to bar the gates of heaven to the rich, he was imprisoned by the Inquisition. His misfortunes did not shake his trust in God, and after his release he resumed his task, first in Andalusia, and afterwards in other parts of Spain. His sermons were composed in a figurative style, and mainly devoted to the glorification of St. Mary. We have of him: *Sermones del santissimo sacramento, de la incarnacion del Hijo de Dios, del espiritu santo, las festividades de la santissima virgen Maria*. To

the high dignities that were offered to him, including that of Cardinal, he preferred the life of an itinerant missionary. At the same time he spared no efforts to establish schools and seminaries, without which he knew his preaching would have no permanent effect on the morals of the people. Thus were founded the schools in Sevilla, Ubeda, Baeza, Granada, Cordova, and Montilla. A disease which afflicted him the last twenty years of his life, confined him to Montilla, and there he was visited by many who chose him their spiritual guide, such as John of Gott, founder of the Charity friars, Francis Borgia, Lewis of Granada, the Dominican. In this retirement he composed his "*Epistolario espiritual*." He died May 10, 1569. His life has been written by *Luis de Granada* (comp. Obras del V. P. M. Luis de Granada, T. III., p. 451-456), also by *Luis Munoz* (Vida del Ven. Varon el Maestro Juan de Avila), and by *Antoni de Capmany* (Teatro historico de la elocuencia española). Comp. *J. Shermer*, sämtliche Werke des ehrwürdigen Juan de Avila, etc., Regensburg, 1856.

WAGENMANN.—Seidensticker.

John the Baptist, the son of Zacharias, the priest, and Elizabeth, a relative of the mother of Jesus, was born six months before Jesus, in the latter half of 749 (of Rome), in the mountains of Judea; Rabbinical tradition assigns Hebron, recent authors Jutta, as the place of his birth (Luke 1:5, &c.; 26:36, 39). His birth and mission were announced and foretold by Gabriel (Luke 1). After spending a season of preparation for his great work in adjacent desert places (Luke 1:80; 3:1), he publicly entered upon his mission about the midsummer of 779, preaching repentance, and declaring that the Messianic kingdom was at hand (Luke 3:1-3; 3:23; Matth. 3:1-4; Mark 1:4-6, cf. Matth. 11:19; Luke 7:23).—In opposition to the deadness and self-righteous formalism of the Judaism of that period, we discover in John a *personal realization and self-conscious completion of the O. T. legal economy*, as this leads men, through repentance, to God, and yet, from its inability to secure true peace, leans upon a *prophecy* of the fulness of time as its divine complement. Hence, the central theme of John's preaching: "Repent, for the kingdom of heaven is at hand," was directed most earnestly against the leaders of the people, and enforced by solemn threatenings. That, however, which gave such force to this summons, as no previous prophet's appeal possessed, was the *prophetic certainty* of the Messiah's nearness. Whether he baptized from the commencement of his ministry cannot be determined (Luke 3:1, 2), but he soon employed the customary lustration, though in a manner peculiar to himself, and required those who obeyed his call to be baptized in Jordan, as a symbol of their confession of the necessity of penitent conversion. It was a baptism of repentance, for the remission of sins (Luke 3:3; Acts 13:34; 19:4; Matth. 3:11), in distinction from Christ's baptism with the spirit and with fire (Mark 1:8; Luke 3:16; John 1:26). Though no proper sacrament, and therefore inadequate to the mediation of the grace promised in Christ, it was still, as an institution for the whole nation,

nothing less than a bold declaration of general postacy from the divine basis of genuine Israelism, as an individual act, the solemn acknowledgment of personal guilt (Matth. 3:6; Mark 1:5), and, as a transaction of the Baptist, the symbolical enactment of the purity necessary to admission into the state of one expecting, and entitled to expect Christ and his salvation.—Such a preacher, in such circumstances, could not fail to produce great agitation. In consequence of the numbers he baptized, he was called the Baptist (Jos. Antt. XVIII., 5, 2). Crowds thronged around him from Jerusalem, Judea, and Perea, including many Pharisees and Sadducees (Matth. 3:5–7; 11:7, &c.). At first some thought he was the Christ (Luke 3:15), but afterwards he was regarded as a prophet (Matth. 11:9; 21:26; Mark 11:32; John 1:15; 5:33; Acts 13:25), and even after his death he was thought to have revived again in Christ (Matth. 14:1, &c.; 16:14; John 10:41). The Sanhedrim could, therefore, not let him pass unnoticed; and although he did not appeal to a higher authority, when the priests and Levites demanded his credentials, he plainly assured them that he would not desist from his work (John 1:19–28).—Meanwhile, Jesus (see *Jesus Christ*) also presented himself for baptism, and John became assured not only that the Christ was already in the midst of the people, but that Jesus was he (Matth. 3:13–17; Mark 1:9–12; Luke 3:21, &c.; John 1:32–4). Although they personally knew each other before, yet this was John's first knowledge of Jesus as the Messiah (John 1:31, 33).—The idea which John had prophetically of the person and work of the Messiah, could, of course, only be relatively more definite than that of earlier prophets, since he also had to do with one specifically greater than himself, the full revelation and development of whose character was still future. As John significantly called himself a voice (Is. 40:3), so he ever considered himself the forerunner of one mightier and worthier than himself, whom he set forth as the true founder of the kingdom of God (Matth. 3:11; Luke 3:16; John 1:2; 3:28). Indeed, in John 1:15, 27, 30, 34 (cf. Micah 5:2; Mal. 3:1), the Baptist avows Christ's pre-existence, calls him *ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ*, and then "the lamb of God that taketh away the sin of the world." Unenviably he yielded to Christ's superiority, and rejoiced in the growing brightness of the risen morning star (John 3:22–36).—When Jesus first entered upon his ministry (John 2:13, &c.), he labored for a season simultaneously with the Baptist, who gradually ascended the Jordan. John probably penetrated into the domain of Herod Antipas, and even into Samaria (John 1:28; 3:23; 10:40). That he should continue his labors after becoming convinced that Jesus was the Messiah, and should retain a circle of disciples and assistants (John 3:25; Matth. 9:14; Luke 11:1) is explained by the fact, that this fully comported with his mission as Christ's forerunner. The nation could only be successively reached by such a continued prosecution of his work. How long, precisely, he thus labored cannot be said, but hardly for more than two years. He then incurred the displeasure of Herod Antipas, and

after about six months' imprisonment (*Josephus* says in *Machabrus*), he was beheaded (Matth. 14:3, &c.; Mark 6:17, &c.; Luke 3:19, &c.; Jos., Antt., XVIII., 5, 2). It was during his imprisonment, that he sent messengers to Christ with the remarkable inquiry reported in Matth. 14:2, and Luke 7:19, a question asked, not because his previous convictions were theoretically shaken, but because, amid the gloom of his incarceration, the course which Jesus was pursuing did not seem to answer his own views and expectations (Matth. 3:12; 11:4–6). His execution occurred shortly before the miracle recorded, Matth. 14:13, &c., near the close of Christ's first journey into Galilee, and so, probably, between the feasts of Purim and the Passover of 782 (cf. John 5:35; 6:4).—Jesus himself has fully characterized John as a burning and shining light, which suddenly attracted general attention (John 5:33, 35), calls him the Elias who was to come (Mal. 1:23; John 1:21; Luke 1:17; 9:19), the greatest among those till then born of women, and more than a prophet, although the least in the kingdom of heaven was greater than he (Matth. 11:7, &c.). All previous prophecy, pointing beyond itself, reached its all-comprehending climax in John. Hence he ever remains, for each individual, the necessary transition to membership in the kingdom of heaven, though he himself did not attain to this high privilege. He was a friend of the bridegroom, but as the marriage was not yet consummated, he could not be a guest (John 3:29; 9:14; Mark 2:18; Luke 5:33). But he faithfully performed his work of urging others to the wedding, and if his nation disregarded his message, the fault lay not with him (Matth. 11:16, &c.). His disciples informed Jesus of his death (Matth. 14:12). But they had been previously jealous of the greater success of Jesus (John 3:25, &c.), and some of them, at least, in opposition to the spirit inculcated by John, maintained a separate society after their master's martyrdom (Acts 18:15; 19:1, &c. See *Johnites*).—(See WITSII, *miscell. sacr.*, II., 367, &c.; WINER, *R. W. B.*; WIESELER, *synopt. chronol.*; LICHTENSTEIN, *Lebensgesch. d. Herrn Jesu C. in chronol. Uebersicht.*, Erlng. 1856). GÜDER.*

John Buridanus, born at Bethune, in Artois, a noted philosopher of the 14th century, attached to the sect of Nominalists, was a pupil of Occam, and a member of the philosophical Faculty at Paris, where he was highly appreciated as a teacher. Little that is reliable is known of his life. It is said that he flourished under Philip of Valois about 1348; according to others, was, as early as 1320 or 1327, rector of the University at Paris, went as ambassador to Rome, quitted Paris when the Realists became dominant, and, having emigrated to Germany, assisted in founding the University at Vienna. As he is classed rather with philosophers than with theologians, we cannot here expatiate on his doctrines. With Durandus and Occam, he belongs to that period of scholasticism, in which the union of philosophy with theology commenced to relax. Like Duns Scotus he treated not only logical and metaphysical, but also ethical and psychological questions, and was particularly interested in the problem of free-

will. To the latter he owes his celebrity; he was, however, not so much concerned to arrive at a definite conclusion with regard to this problem, as to show the difficulties incident to its theoretical solution (*utrum sit possibile, quod voluntas ceteris omnibus eodem modo se habentibus, determinetur aliquando ad unum oppositorum aliquando ad aliud?*). He finally falls back on the requirements of practical life, and shields himself by theological and philosophical authorities, "*Nullus debet de via communi recedere propter rationes sibi insolubiles, specialiter in his, quæ fidem tangere possunt aut mores. Qui enim credit omnia scire et in nulla opinionum suarum decipi, futuus est.*" For an illustration of this problem B. devised the famous simile of a hungry ass, who, standing between two bundles of hay, must either starve or, without a determining reason, decide for one or the other bundle (Comp. Spinoza, *Eth.* II., p. 49, schol.). It is, however, not certain that this is actually the origin of the proverbial phrase "Buridan's ass" (see Bayle's Dictionary). B. wrote Commentaries on Aristotle's Politics, Ethics, Physics, Metaphysics, and Logic, also a book, "*super summas*," a manual of philosophy, it would seem. Complete ed. of his works: Paris, 1500, 1516, 1518; of the Comm. on Ethics and Politics, at Oxford, 1637 and '40; on Logic and Metaphysics, London, 1641. See FABRICIUS, *bibl. lat. med. ævi*; Jöcher, *Gel. Lex.*; Bayle, *Dict.* I., p. 708, sqq.; Tennemann, *Gesch. der Phil.*, Bd. VIII.; Ritter, *Gesch. der chr. Ph.*, IV. p. 604, sqq. WAGENMANN.—Seidensticker.

John Damascenus, called by the Arabs, *Mansur*, which the Greeks translate *μακρομύνης*, and by the Church, on account of his eloquence, *Χρυσορροίας*, was one of the latest eminent Fathers of the old Greek Church. We have little reliable information concerning his life, for which the legendary biography by John, Patriarch of Jerusalem, is the principal source. He was born towards the end of the 7th, according to others, in the beginning of the 8th century, in Damascus, subject, at that time, to the Saracens. His father, Sergius, a high functionary (*διοικητής τῶν πραγμάτων δημοσίων*) in the service of the Caliph Abdelmalek, engaged a learned monk, Kosmos, to instruct his son in philosophy, languages, mathematics, and theology. After his father's death, says his biographer, he was himself appointed to an important office; but a letter, forged by Leo Isauricus, who hated him for his attachment to image-worship, made him appear guilty of treasonable correspondence with the emperor, and the revengeful caliph punished him with the loss of his right hand. Addressing his prayers to the Holy Virgin, and vowing to her and to her Son his life, the severed member was miraculously rejoined to the mutilated arm. He renounced henceforth all worldly pursuits, and declined the offices which the caliph, convinced of his innocence, proffered to him. The facts of the case may have been, that the machinations of Leo Iconoclastes, against whom John D. defended the adoration of images, caused the disgrace of John at the court of the caliph, and determined him to resign himself to a monastic life. He gave all his property to his relatives, to the poor, and to churches, and en-

tered the convent of Sabas, near Jerusalem. After going through a course of ascetic practices, he spent most of his time in the quiet pursuit of letters. Once only, towards the end of his life, when the adoration of images was prohibited by the Emperor Constantius Copronymus, he left his seclusion, and defying the emperor's resentment, and the anathema of the bishops, he again became publicly the zealous advocate of image-worship in Palestine, Syria, and even in Constantinople. The year of his death is uncertain, but was between 754, when he protested against the Iconoclastic Synod in Constantinople, and 787, when the Œcumenical Council at Nice honored his memory with a eulogy. See *Leo Allatius*, *Prolegomena de Joanne Damasceno*, in *Opp. Damasc.* ed. le Quien, T. I., and *Fabric.*, *Bibl. Gr.*, vol. viii.

The most important literary achievement of J. D. is the *πηγὴ γνώσεως* (source of knowledge), comprising the following three works, the two former of which constitute a sort of introduction to the last. 1, the *Κεφάλαια φιλοσόφου*, or dialectics, treat almost exclusively of logical and ontological categories, and follow, in the main, Aristotle and Porphyry. The categories, in their application to the mysteries of Christian belief, have, in part, been remodelled, so e. g., the Aristotelian conception of Substance. 2, *περὶ αἰρέσεων ἐν οὐρονία, de hæresibus*, contains in 103 articles, a chronological synopsis of the heresies in the Christian Church, with a few articles on the errors of Pagans and Jews: the first 80 are almost verbally transcribed from the work of Epiphanius; the remainder partly treat of the heresies from the time of Epiphanius to that of the image controversies (according to Theodoretus, Sophronius, Leontius of Byzantium, &c.), and partly of fictitious sects, which merely represent possible and actual errors of belief. 3, the third, and most important work, *ἑκδοαὶ ἀρετῆς τῆς πίστεως ὁρθοδόξου*, is not so much a strict system of dogmatics as a collection and digest of doctrines, culled from the works of his predecessors, especially Gregory of Nazianzus, Athanasius, Basil the Great, Gregory of Nyssa, Chrysostom, Epiphanius, Cyril, Nemesius, and occasionally Anastasius Sinaita, Leontius of Byzantium, Maximus Confessor. For Pseudodionysius Areopagita he seems to have a particular predilection. From these various sources the book contains rather loosely connected extracts, not of tenets only, but also of exegetical and philosophical interpretations, which, being compiled from so many different authors, do not always correspond. The work is divided into 100 sections or 4 books (the latter is probably a later arrangement), and treats of the following subjects: a) *God's existence*, essence, unity, and the possibility of knowing Him. Though D. takes the ground that it is neither impossible to know God, nor possible to know Him all, that His essence is neither entirely expressible, nor entirely inexpressible, he nevertheless inclines to the transcendental character of the idea of God, assigning to human thought incapacity for its conception, and referring men, in the end, as Areopagites does, to the records of divinely revealed truth. It may be considered as a characteristic feature of John's

theology, that it principally dwells on God's metaphysical attributes, hardly touching on the ethical ones. *b) The Trinity.* Great prominence is given to the dogma of the T.; for J. D. not only repeats the doctrines of the Greek Church, as well as the arguments of the Greek Fathers, but he resumes a scientific construction of the dogma within the established creed, though admitting that there are certain bounds to the enquiry, which human reason cannot scale. Ἀδύνατον γὰρ εὐρεῖν εἶναι ἐν τῇ πύσει εἰκόνα ἀπαρράλκτως ἐν αὐτῇ τὸν τρόπον τῆς ἁγίας τριάδος παραδεικνύουσαν. The Trinity, therefore, cannot be adequately conceived nor defined. His prime object appears to be, to found the personality of the λόγος, and of the πνεῦμα ἅγιον, upon the unity of the Divine essence, and further, to describe the nature of co-existence, and of personal difference in the Triune, and the reciprocal relations of the three persons—περιχώρησις—with all attainable strictness. This he attempts to achieve rather by the negative process of excluding fallacies, than by positive demonstration. Whenever he ventures upon the latter he fluctuates between Peripateticism, tending to Tritheism, and Platonism, leading almost imperceptibly to Sabellianism and Modalism. *c) On the Creation, Angels, and Demons.* He recapitulates the doctrines, as he found them, concluding with a rather lengthy exposition of his views on heaven, heavenly bodies, light, fire, winds, water, earth, chiefly based on the authority of the Fathers. Some singular opinions of his own he attempts to support by Scriptural passages. *d) J.'s remarks on Man,* his creation and nature, contain a psychology, *in nuce*, and are taken from Aristotle, and other Greek authors, in part directly, and in part through the medium of Nemesius, περὶ φύσεως ἀνθρώπου. As a teacher of the Greek Church, he lays particular stress on the doctrine of free-will, and its efficacy for good. In this connection he also treats of Providence and predestination, following, in his remarks, Chrysostom and Nemesius. *e) The fall of man* and its consequences are meagerly adverted to in the vague oratorical manner of Semipelagian writers, no notice being taken of the great development which this doctrine had received in the Western Church. *f) The person of Christ.* Of all dogmas this is argued with the greatest fullness. J.'s observations on the personal unity in Christ's twofold nature, conceived by him as enhypostasis—not anhypostasis—of the human nature in the Logos, his interpretation of the *communicatio idiomatum* (which, however, amounts to merely a verbal one), and his comments on volition and the operation of volition in Christ, evince considerable ingenuity and dialectic skill. Nevertheless, all his scientific arguments only prove, that from the given premises—the absolute antithesis of Divine and human nature, and the preponderance allowed to the Divine—it is impossible to conceive Christ's being and life under an idea that is concordant in itself, and satisfactory in a psychological and ethical point of view. Moreover, his polemical treatment of the subject could not but impede a methodical solution of the problem. Supplementary to this exposition of Christology are his controversial tracts, against the Akephali: περὶ συνδέσμου φύσεως,

and against the Monetheletes: περὶ τῶν ἐν Χριστῷ δύο θελημάτων καὶ ἐνεργειῶν καὶ λοιπῶν φυσικῶν ἰδιωμάτων, &c.; comp. Baur, Gesch. der Dreieinigkeits, II., p. 176, sqq.; Christologie, II., p. 257. *g) Baptism* is held to be necessary for the forgiveness of sin and for eternal life. Body and soul, to be purified and saved, need regeneration, which comes from the water and the spirit. Baptism is allegorically represented as sevenfold. *h) Faith* is the acceptance of the παράδοσις τῆς ἐκκλησίας καθολικῆς, and of the teachings of Scripture; it is also confidence in the fulfilment of God's promises, and in the efficacy of our prayers. The former depends on ourselves; the latter is a gift of the Holy Spirit. On the relation of faith to works, on regeneration and sanctification, John repeats the Semipelagian views of the older Greek teachers, with still less insight than they had, into the true nature of these doctrines. His remarks on the cross, and on adoration, reflect the miraculous spirit of the times. *i) The Eucharist* is represented as the means by which God completes his communication of Himself to man, and thus restores to him immortality. John did not, however, as has been asserted, teach transubstantiation in the full acceptance of the term; for though he admits, that the Eucharist is the actual body of Christ, he does not consider it identical with that which was glorified in heaven, nor does he deem the bread and wine mere accidental phenomena. *j) On Mary, the Immaculate Conception, Relics, and the Worship of Images,* he expresses himself more explicitly in works to be mentioned hereafter. The authority for adoring the cross, images, &c., he finds not in Scriptures, but in tradition. *k) The Scriptures.* He confines himself to a few observations on inspiration, and the value of Holy Writ, repeats the canon of the O. T. according to Epiphanius, and includes in the books of the N. T. the canons of the apostles, according to the Trullan canon. While discoursing on Scripture, several questions that present themselves are incidentally adverted to, *e. g.*, the four different formulæ used in Scripture to designate Christ, the origin of evil, which can neither be assigned to God, nor to an evil principle, independent of God. He further attempts a Scriptural vindication of celibacy, treats of the abrogation of circumcision, of Anti-Christ, resurrection, and the last judgment. These are the principal contents of John's main work. He has by no means done equal justice to all its parts; while atonement, sin, grace, and the means of salvation receive only a cursory notice, the doctrines of a more speculative character, as those on God, Trinity, and the person of Christ, are treated with great diffuseness, and not without useless repetitions. His partiality to speculative doctrines in preference to those of an anthropological and soteriological character, as well as his Pelagian views on free-will, mark him as a genuine son of the Greek Church. As such he did not undertake to perfect the dogma, but received it with all the deficiencies inherent in the Greek system.—The style of his discourse, owing to the diversity of his sources, is not uniform; while, for the most part, it has strength and fluency, it sometimes lapses into rhetorical pro-

livity and affectation. Comp. C. J. LESTRÅM: *de expositione fidei orthodoxæ auctore J. Damasceno*, Upsal, 1839; and Ritter: *Geschichte der Christ. Phil.*, II., p. 553, sqq. This work acquired great authority in the Greek Church, and, after its translation into Latin, by Johannes Burgundius, of Pisa, even in the Western Church. In its Latin garb it was used by the Lombards, and later by Thomas Aquinas and other scholastics. While John is represented by some as the founder of scholastic philosophy, others, as Cramer (in Fortsetz. von Bossuets Weltgesch.), deny to him this position. Mosheim (hist. eccl. ant. et recent., p. 307) is nearly right in observing, that John unites the scholastic and didactic (i. e., positive) kinds of theology. He interweaves, as we have seen, the materials of tradition, in the case of several important dogmas at least, with dialectic comments, and his *ἱερόθεος* is the first comprehensive attempt to reduce the Church doctrine to a system. He, therefore, marks a transition from the productive period of the old Church to the scholasticism of the middle ages; but as he neither remodels the previously gathered material in a dialectic form, as Anselm did, nor employs the schematic, syllogistic method, peculiar to the scholastic writers, he cannot strictly be classed with the latter.

Besides the three works referred to, John wrote, 4) a little treatise on the *Trinity*, perhaps an extract from other works of his. 5) an *Introduction into the Principles of Dogmatics*, containing an explanation of the terms, *οὐσία, ὑπόστασις, πρόσωπον, ὁμοούσιος, εἶδος, γένος, ἄρμονος*, &c. 6) The *expositio et declaratio fidei*, found in Arabic, and given by Le Clerc, in a Latin version, is of doubtful authenticity. Of greater importance than these are J.'s polemical and apologetical writings. 7) His three *Apologies of Image-Worship*, remarkable for their frankness towards the emperor, belong to the best ever written on the subject. 8) a *treatise against the Jacobites*, a branch of the Monophysites. 9) another *against the Manichæans*, but this may be spurious. 10) A dialogue between a Christian and a Saracen. This is taken by Le Quien, to a great extent, from a book of Abukara, a disciple of J. D., who is said to have noted it down from oral instructions of his teacher. 11) The *ἱερά παράλληλα*, the most comprehensive of J.'s works, is a collection of moral and doctrinal sentences, with quotations of parallel passages from the Bible and the works of the Fathers. These quotations constitute the greatest value of the book, as among them are many from works that have been lost. 12) *Treatises* on the principal sins, on virtue, vice, fasting. 13) The *Commentaries on St. Paul*, compiled, for the most part, from Chrysostom, share the prevalent fault of those times — a too indiscriminate recourse to allegorical interpretation. 14) *Homilies, Odes, Hymns*. The homilies are insignificant discourses on festivals; the odes, composed for similar occasions, have in old and modern times earned much praise, which should, however, be qualified; neither are all of them of undoubted authenticity. A number of other writings bear the name of J. D., but, in all probability, none of them proceeded from his pen. The most in-

teresting of them is a sort of Christian novel, Barlaam and Josaphat, or Joasaph, printed in the *Anecdota Græca* ed. Boissonade, vol. IV. The first complete edition of J.'s works was projected by the Synod of the French Clergy at Paris, 1635 and 1636, but not published till 1712, at Paris, in two folios, by the joint labor of Le Quien and Leo Allatius, who augmented it with valuable prolegomena. Comp. Remi Ceillier, in *Histoire générale des auteurs sacrés et ecclésiastiques*, Tom. XVIII., p. 110–165; Fabricius, *Bibliotheca græca*, Tom. VIII.; Schröckh, *Kirchengesch.*, XX.

LANDERER.—*Siedensticker*.

John, Jacobitic Bishop of Dara, in Mesopotamia, lived during the first half of the 9th century, and was the cotemporary of Dionysius of Telmahar, to whom he dedicated his *Chronicles* (s. Barhebræus, in *Assem.*, *bibl. or.*, II., 247). He has been erroneously placed in the 8th, the 7th, the 6th, even the 4th century. A MS. in the Vatican contains three Syrian works of J.: 1, *de resurrectione corporum*, in 4 books; 2, *de hierarchia celesti et ecclesiastica*, in 2 books; 3, *de sacerdotio*, 4 books. See *Assem.*, II., 118. We find also mention of a book, *de anima* (*Assem.*, II., 219), and of an *Anaphora* (*Catal. liturg.*, in Schulting, III., p. 106, nr. 29). E. RÖDIGER.—*Siedensticker*.

John Eleemosynarius, Patriarch of Constantinople (606–616), a Saint. He received the honoring surname of Almsgiver, on account of his great beneficence and kindness towards the poor and unfortunate. He was likewise admired for his equanimity, charity, forbearance, and pious devotion. He died on Cyprus, where he had found a refuge from the hostility of the Persians, 616. His anniversary is on January 23d. E. RÖDIGER.—*Seidensticker*.

John Diaconus, biographer of Gregory, see *Gregory I*.

John, Monophysite Bishop of Ephesus, called *Episcopus Asiae*, as Ephesus was the most prominent bishopric of Asia Minor; was born at Amid, and lived, during the 6th century, for the most part in Constantinople, where he was highly esteemed at the court, especially under Justinian. This emperor, in the 19th year of his reign, gave the bishop authority to proceed against the heathens, many of whom resided in Constantinople, as patricians, grammarians, sophists, attorneys, and physicians. Phocas, who was one of these, preferred a voluntary death by poison to a compulsory conversion. On his tour through Asia, John converted 70,000 persons, and built 96 churches, mainly at the expense of the imperial treasury. This success procured him the epithets of "Apostle of the Heathens," and "Destroyer of Idols." He is probably identical with Johannes Rhetor, mentioned by Evagrius and by Theodorus Lector, and designated by the former (V., c. 24) as his fellow-citizen and relative. John is the author of an historical work, in three parts, written in Syriac, and of some importance for the Church history of the East. It was not known except by quotations contained in Dionysius of Telmahar (*Assem.*, *bibl. or.*, I., 359, sqq., 409, sqq.; II., 48, sqq., 875, sqq.), and in the *Chronicles* of Barhebræus (*Chron. syr.* ed. Bruns et Kirsch,

2; cf. *Assem., bibl. or.*, I., 312, 328, 329). Will W. Cureton discovered its third part (incomplete) among a number of Syrian MSS. in the British Museum, which Dr. Tattam and A. Pacheco had brought from the Syrian convent of St. Mary, in Egypt, 1843, 1847, and 1850. C. published it under the title: *The third part of the eccl. hist. of John, Bishop of Ephesus*, now first edited by W. Cureton, Oxford, 1853, 4°, 418 pp. It appears, that the two first parts contained, in 12 books, the history of the Church to the year 571. The third part, in 6 chapters, of which only the 2d and 3d are complete, refers to events as late as 585. The book is of great historical value, as it relates many facts, otherwise unknown, and as its author, though partial to the Monophysitic sect, speaks of contemporary events, to which he was not unfrequently an eye-witness.

LANDERER.—*Seidensticker*.

John Jejunator (Νηστευτής, the Fasting), so called on account of his rigorous ascetism; also called *Cappadox* from his native country, and *John IV.*, as Patriarch of Constantinople (582–595). He was of low extraction, and owed his elevation, as his friends said, to his piety, or, as his enemies declared, to his hypocrisy. He has become famous by his controversy with Rome about the title, which he assumed, of œcumenical patriarch (See Art. Gregory I). He died Sept. 2, 595, and has been admitted by the Greeks to the number of Saints, for his pious, exemplary, beneficent course of life. Gregory I., on the other hand, reproached him, in the harshest manner, with duplicity, pride, and falseness. The following books are ascribed to him, but their authenticity is questionable: 1. Rules on penance, ἀκολουθία καὶ τὰς τῶν ἱερομολογούντων. 2. Instructions to confessors, λόγος πρὸς τὸν μάλιστα ἱθαροῦσαι τὸν αὐτοῦ πνευματικὸν υἱόν. Both books are printed in: MORINUS, *de disciplina in administratione sacramenti pœnitentiæ*, Paris, 1651. 3. Discourses περὶ μετανοίας καὶ ὑπερηφανίας καὶ παρρησίας. 4. περὶ ψευδοπροφητῶν καὶ ψευδοδιδασκάλων καὶ ἁδίων. The latter two were formerly ascribed to Chrysostom. 5. On baptism. 6. A collection of letters, which is lost. (See Gregory *Epp.* V., 18 sqq., 43, 64, and others. *Theophylact. hist.* VII., 6. *Isidor. de script.* c. 26. *Trithem. de scr. eccl.* c. 224. *Oudin. de scr. eccl.* I., p. 1473, sqq. *Fabric. bibl. gr.* X., p. 164, sqq., and the works on Church history of Schrockh, Gieseler, Gfrörer, Kurtz. WAGENMANN.—*Seidensticker*.

John of Nepomuk (also called Johannko and Johannek in Bohemian chronicles), was the son of Welfin, a citizen of Pomuc, a small town in the Circle of Klattau, Bohemia. He took orders, and his name appears on record, Dec. 9, 1372, when he signed himself, "*Joannes olim Welfini de Pomuk, clericus Pragensis diœcesis, imperiali auctoritate notarius publicus*." In 1380 he was minister at the Church St. Galli, in Prague, also secretary and notary of the Archbishop; 1381, he became doctor of canonical law; soon afterwards, Canon, and Vicarius generalis in Spiritualibus to *John von Jahnstein*, Archbishop of Prague; in 1390, the Metropolitan Chapter of St. Vitus, in Prague, admitted him as one of its members, with the title,

Archidiaconus Zatecensis in ecclesia Pragensi. His own position, as well as King Wenceslaus' hatred for him, allow us to infer, that he took an active part in the disputes between the archbishop and the king. He was put to the rack, the king himself assisting, and then dragged to the Moldau bridge, gagged, and with his hands pinioned to his back, and his feet tied to his head, was thrown into the river, March 20th, 1393. These historical facts have been greatly enlarged and adorned by legendary additions, in the biography of John, by Bohuslav Balbinus. These report that miraculous signs attended his birth and martyrdom, and signalized the place of his burial. Various futile attempts have been made to reconcile the points of conflict between the legend and historical account. Dr. Otto Abel (*Die Sag. v. heil. Joh. v. Nep.*, Berlin, 1855), supposes the legend was invented by the Jesuits, after the restoration of Popery in Bohemia, as a popular counterpart to the martyrdom of Huss and Ziska. TH. PRESSER.—*Seidensticker*.

John of Paris. His doctrine on Communion has been alluded to in the Art. *Impanatio*. He was a Dominican, and a teacher of Divinity at Paris, in the latter half of the 13th century. In the controversy between Boniface and Philip, he advocated the cause of Philip with great zeal, going so far as to declare—which, in France, he might safely venture—that Boniface had no good title to the papal throne. He died at Bordeaux, 1506.

John I.—XXIII., *Popes*.—John I., a Tuscan, was consecrated as Roman bishop, August 13, 523. An edict of the bigoted Eastern Emperor, Justus II., against the Arians of Italy, induced their patron, Theodoric, king of the Ostrogoths, to intercede for them in Byzantium. At the head of the embassy, sent for this purpose, was John, who had to plead a cause for which he had no sympathy, so dependent was the Roman bishop on the German ruler. It is quite likely that the answer of the Emperor, seemingly favorable, was meant for deception, and that the Romans, with the Bishop at their head, instead of seeking relief from the intolerance of Greek orthodoxy, solicited aid against the Goths. After his return to Ravenna, he was cast into a prison, in which he died May 18, 1526. A Roman tradition reports, not without some complacency, that in Constantinople the Emperor bowed down before the Bishop of Rome, and that at High Mass the seat of the latter was raised above that of the Patriarch. John is numbered among the martyrs, though his miracles were never held of great account. Comp. *Muratori Script.* T. III., P. II., *Baronius*, ad h. a. *Acta Sanct.* (*Bolland.*) 27 *Maji*, *Jaffé*, *Regesta Pontif. Roman.* ad h. a. —II., a Roman, surnamed Mercurius, was consecrated Dec. 31, 532, and buried in St. Peter's, May 27, 535. —III., son of a distinguished Roman, was consecrated July 14, 560. The confirmation of his election by the Byzantine Emperor was delayed four months, and this subordination to the Greek government continued during the thirteen years of his episcopacy. He was buried July 13, 573. No important event occurred under his reign. —IV., a Dalmatian, was consecrated Dec. 25, 640. He displayed no less

zeal in founding convents and endowing the churches of Rome, than in his strife against his Greek rival. The Monothelite creed of the Patriarch Sergius, promulgated by the Emperor Herodius as Ἡρῳδῆς, was denounced by J. as heresy, and condemned by a Roman synod, 641. It is said that before his death (Oct. 12, 642), the Emperor Constans gave him the promise to withdraw the Ἡρῳδῆς, but the controversy continued under his successors (Comp. *Baronius*, *Pagi*, *Jaffé*, l. c.) — **V.**, a Syrian, elevated to the papal dignity in May or July, 685, buried Aug. 2, 686, hardly ever left the bed during the short time of his insignificant pontificate. The authenticity of the letters assigned to him, and of the book *de dignitate pallii*, has been contested. (*Anastasius* and *Jaffé*, l. c.) — **VI.**, and **VII.**, were both Greeks, and quite insignificant. The former was consecrated Oct. 10, 701, and buried Jan. 10, 705; he was defended by Roman soldiers against the Exarch, who was ordered to drive him from the apostolic See. — **VII.** (consecrated March 1, 705, buried Oct. 18, 707), is described as weak and spiritless. He did not venture to express an opinion on the Trullan canon, submitted to his examination by Emperor Justinian II., for fear of giving offence to somebody. (*Anastasius* and *Jaffé*, l. c.) — **VIII.**, a Roman, succeeded Hadrian II., Dec. 14, 872. He evinced much tact, and harbored great schemes, but was destitute of elevated motives. The spirit of his administration was in keeping with the ideas of the Pseudo-Isidorian collection, to which Nicholas I. had first ventured to appeal. John's designs found no hearty response in the little minds with whom he had to deal, and the general anarchy was inauspicious to their execution. On the other hand, the Pope, as well as the clergy, in their strife after power, were actuated only by worldly ambition, and knew no other arms than cunning and intrigue. With these they were neither able to control the rude powers which sapped the foundations of the Carolingian monarchy, nor to erect on its ruins the fabric of ecclesiastical dominion. When Louis II. died 875, without an heir to his land and crown, Charles the Bald repaired hastily to Rome, and accepted, (Christmas, 875,) as a boon of the Apostolic chair, the Imperial diadem, to which he had no lawful claim. It has been asserted by the Church Annalists, that the compact then entered into by Pope and Emperor, confirmed and amplified Pepin's donation; but, in fact, only for the surrender of Capua, can documentary proof be adduced, namely, the letter of the pope in *Mansi Concil.* xvii., p. 10, and even that is couched in ambiguous language. The Pope did not gain much by this alliance with Charles. The Emperor's intercession with the bishops of Neustria did not lead to their submission to papal authority, nor was he able to shield the Pope against the Saracens, who plundered the Campagna, and exacted of J. an annual tribute. As, after the death of Charles the Bald, it did not appear likely that the crown would pass to his descendants, the Pope, who had taken refuge in Provence, supported the pretensions of Count Boso, who was to supersede the reigning dy-

nasty (comp. the letter in *Mansi*, xvii., p. 121); but Boso became only the founder of the Arlate, while the empire and Italy reverted to the Carolingian, Charles the Fat, whom the Pope had to crown after all. The controversy with the Eastern Church, on the question of ecclesiastical jurisdiction over Bulgaria, was continued under John. He first acknowledged Photius as Patriarch of Constantinople; but, finding him little disposed to yield the disputed point, he solemnly excommunicated him. John found his death, as the *Annales Fuldenses* relate, through a conspiracy of his own curia. The assassins first tried poison; when this did not operate quick enough, they slew him with a hammer, Dec. 15, 882. We have of John VIII., 308 letters, most of which may be found in *Mansi Concil.* XVII. Comp. *Muratori* III., P. I. II., *Jaffé*, l. c. Giesebrecht *Geschichte der deutschen Kaiserzeit* I., 139-148. — **IX.**, a Benedictine, of Tivoli, was consecrated June, 893. He convened two councils, one at St. Peter's, where the wrong done to his badly abused predecessor Formosus, was redressed; the other at Ravenna, which passed an act for the better protection of Church property against thieves and incendiaries. J. displayed an honest zeal in defining the rights and regulating the discipline of the Church. He died July, 900. About his life see *Muratori* T. III., P. II., about the synods, *Mansi* XVIII. — **X.**, owed his promotion to the dissolute Theodora, who, attracted by his handsome figure, made him successively archbishop of Bologna, of Ravenna, and finally pope (May 15, 914). The profligacy of his times, especially in Rome, surpassed that of the most degenerate period of paganism. The popes were merely the contemptible creatures of the Roman nobility. John was the first pontiff that took the field against an enemy; heading some troops which he had levied in the smaller towns, he drove the gangs of Saracenic robbers from their strongholds and cavern recesses on the banks of the Garigliano. He came to a miserable end by the legitimate consequences of the same vices that had been instrumental in raising him to his high rank. Marozia, the daughter of Theodora, and her husband, Guy, Marquis of Tuscany, finding John too much in their way, thrust him into a prison, where he died either of want, or by the hand of an assassin. Comp. *Muratori*, *Jaffé*, l. c. *Bower*, *History of the Popes*; *Höfler*; *die deutschen Päbste*, I., 18. — **XI.**, a natural son of Marozia and of Pope Sergius III., was hardly 20 years old when his mother seated him on St. Peter's chair. Spiritual government was not thought of; in fact, Rome was, by all Christendom, detested like a pestiferous swamp. Alberic, himself a son of Marozia, put an end to the government of his mother, and of the Pope, his step-brother, by expelling the former and imprisoning the latter. John regained his liberty, but soon after departed life, Jan., 936. (Comp. *Jaffé*, *Höfler*, *Giesebrecht*, l. c.) — **XII.**, a son of Alberic, and grandson of Marozia, whose vices he seemed to have inherited. After the death of his father, who had lorded it over Rome, he succeeded to the dignity of Roman patrician, and in Nov., 955, after the death of Agapetus, he became

Pope, though only 16 or 18 years old. His own name was Octavianus, but, upon his accession, he called himself John XII., thus inaugurating the practice which has ever since been followed by the popes, of assuming an apostolic name. Ambitious to extend the boundaries of the States of the Church, he soon found himself involved in a disastrous war with Berenger II., and his son, Adelbert, who not only occupied the Exarchate, but, forming an alliance with the Greeks and Saracens, threatened Rome itself. In this extremity, John implored the assistance of Emperor Otho I., who crossed the Alps with a large army, and, having entered Rome, vouchsafed to the pope not only personal safety, but also his title to the States of the Church. The extent of these promises, however, has been subject to controversy, and it is not without a reason that the Vatican record, by which Pepin's donation was confirmed and enlarged, is withheld from critical scrutiny. Both Otho and the Empress Adelheid received from the Pope the imperial diadem; and, for a short time, a happy concord seemed to unite the temporal and spiritual heads of Christendom. But John had to make the discovery, that instead of an ally, he had found a master in Otho, who wielded the imperial sceptre in the spirit of Charlemagne. He used his power, however, not so much in resisting papal authority, as in curbing the insolent nobility of Rome; and John himself had to feel the Emperor's severity more as a Roman patrician than as pontiff. The Emperor took from the Pope and the higher officials in Rome an oath, that they would never enter into an alliance with Berenger or his son. But when the Emperor, in violation of pontifical prerogatives, held a synod at Pavia, 962, the Pope, who had so far concealed his rancor, broke his oath, and leagued himself with the son of Berenger. He even asked the pagan Hungarians and schismatic Greeks for aid against the Emperor. This was his ruin, for the Emperor entered Rome a second time, Nov. 2, 964: the Pope fled, and the Romans had not only to renew their oath of allegiance, but to swear that they would never consecrate a pope without the concurrence of the Emperor and his son. At a synod at St. Peter's, over which Otho himself presided, John was charged with the crimes of murder, adultery, and perjury, and summoned to appear in his defence. As he failed to obey these summons, he was deposed, Dec. 4, and excommunicated, and Leo VIII., a layman, appointed in his stead. After the Emperor's departure, John, supported by the Roman nobility, returned, and convened another synod at St. Peter's, which rescinded the resolutions of the former one. The Emperor was about entering Rome for the third time, when John died of apoplexy, while he was engaged in an adulterous intrigue, May 14, 964. He was a man of most licentious habits, associating with women of every station, and filling the Lateran with the noisy profanity of a brothel. Comp. *Liudprand, Historia Ottonis*, in *Monum. Germ. Script.* III.; *Muratori, Jaffé, Höfler, l. c.* *Giesebrecht, l. c.* I., p. 424-445. — **XIII.**, of noble family, and, previous to his election, Sept., 965, Bishop of Narni, was not consecrated till Otho's consent had been ob-

tained. The nobility, not relishing his severity, instigated a riot against him, and kept him as a prisoner. But the Pope effected his escape, and returned to the city about a year after, when the Emperor himself made his appearance, visiting the disorderly factions of the city with unmitigated severity. Having appointed a prefect as representative of his power, the Emperor went to Ravenna, followed by the Pope. Here a great and influential Council was held, Easter 967, and the Emperor guaranteed to the pontifical chair all the territory to which it had ever been entitled, including Ravenna. John crowned the younger Otho as emperor and associate king of Germany; also his wife, Theophania, the daughter of the Greek Emperor. He took pleasure in furthering the Emperor's favorite idea, to establish a mission among the north-eastern Slavonians. Died 972. — **XIV.**, previous to his elevation, Peter, Bishop of Pavia, and arch-chancellor of the Emperor, was elected, through the influence of Otho II., in Nov. or Dec., 983. But, unfortunately, his patron died at Rome Dec. 7 of the same year. Boniface VII. (see this Art.), returned in April, 984, from Constantinople, and imprisoned John in the Castle del Angelo, where he was starved to death or assassinated. (Comp. *Muratori, Jaffé, etc., l. c.*) — **XV.** His inglorious reign lasted from Sept., 985 to April, 996. Rome was, in reality, governed by Crescentius, who presided and ruled at the Castle del Angelo as Patricius. The Pope fled to Tuscany. Though he was afterwards tolerated in the Lateran, he remained destitute of all authority. By way of compensation for his lack of power, he enriched himself and his relatives with the revenues of the Church. Concerning the dispute about the bishopric of Rheims, see Sylvester II. (Comp. *Jaffé, Höfler, l. c.*). Another John XV., son of the Roman Rupertus, who is said to have been pope four months after the murder of Boniface VIII., is a dubious personage, and not recognized by modern critics. (Comp. Willman's *Jahrbücher des deutschen Reichs unter Otto III.*, pp. 208-212). — **XVI.**, Philagathos, a Calabrian Greek, Bishop of Piacenza, was supported by Crescentius, May, 997, as anti-pope, against Gregory V. He fell into the hands of Gregory's friends, and, after being barbarously mutilated, was confined in a convent. — **XVII.**, born in the March of Ancona, surnamed Sicco, followed Sylvester II. He was consecrated June 13, 1003, and died Dec. 7 of the same year. — **XVIII.** *Fasanus* succeeded him. He gave his support to the favorite plan of Henry II., to establish a bishopric at Bamberg, and made Bruno, of Querfurt, the Prussian apostle, archbishop. (*Jaffé, Bower, l. c.*). — **XIX.**, of the family of the Counts of Tusculum, procured, after his brother Benedict VIII.'s death, the papal tiara by violence and bribery, and held it with no better spirit, 1024-1033. He came near selling to the Patriarch of Constantinople the supremacy over the Oriental Church. The only remarkable event during the reign of this hated and despised pontiff, was the coronation of the Salic Emperor, Conrad, Easter, 1027. (Comp. *Jaffé, Bower, l. c.*). — **XXI.**, should have been counted XX.; the confusion begins with John XVII., who is also

counted XVIII. It is possible, that at the time of the schism, 1045, one of the anti-popes, whose own name happened to be John, was erroneously entered among the popes of that apostolical name. At all events, when Petrus Juliani, cardinal Bishop of Tusculum, a native of Lisbon, was elected pope, Sept. 13, 1276, he styled himself John XXI. He was a man of erudition, but weak and incompetent. Whether he is identical with Petrus Hispanus, the author of many medical and philosophical works, is not certain. His efforts to unite the European powers for a crusade were unsuccessful. It is said that he found his death, May 16, 1277, at Viterbo, by the falling of a ceiling. (*Bower, l. c.*)

—XXII., a Frenchman, of low extraction, cardinal bishop of Porto, was elected at Lyons, Aug. 7, 1316, after an interregnum of two years, and a stormy conclave of forty days. As his election was effected by the French party among the cardinals, the papal see was not removed from Avignon. While cringing before the French Court, he presumptuously arrogated to himself the right of deciding between the two competitors for the imperial crown of Germany, Lewis of Bavaria and Frederick of Austria. After repeated threats, he excommunicated, 1324, Lewis of Bavaria; but the latter appealed to a general council at Nuremberg, charged the Pope with heresy, and, after being crowned at Rome, he effected the deposition of the Pope by a synod. Though the Ghibelline Anti-pope, Nicholas V., who was to supersede John, could not maintain himself, the authority of the apostolical chair greatly suffered from the literary attacks which Lewis directed against it. The Franciscans sided, in this dispute, with the Emperor, the Dominicans with the Pope. The latter embarrassed his own position by holding, as a private opinion—which he had to disavow publicly—that the souls of the blessed sleep in death till the time of universal resurrection. He amassed incredible treasures by most unscrupulous financiering, and levied the annatæ with so much rapacity, that he has been erroneously considered by some as the originator of the system. He died Dec. 4, 1334. Comp. *Baluzius Vitæ Papar. Avenionens. I., Bower a. a. VIII. p. 331. Ohlenschlager. Staatsgeschichte des römischen Kaiserthums, 1755.*—XXIII., *Baldassarion Cossa*, of Naples, a man of great talents, but worthless character, had the weak Alexander V. (see this Art.), completely under his control, and was charged, at Constance, with having poisoned him. He carried his own election by the use of threats and bribes, May 17, 1410. About his journey to Constance and his deposition, see the Art. *Council at Constance*. He effected his escape from the prison at Heidelberg, humbly prostrated himself at Martin V.'s feet, and lived as cardinal bishop of Tusculum and dean of the Holy College at Florence, where he died, Nov. 22, 1419. The name of John, which seemed to augur disgrace or insignificance, has since been avoided by the popes. See John's life by his secretary, *Dietrich von Niem in v. d. Hardt Magnum æcum. Constant. Concil. II., P. XV.*

Dr. G. Voigt. — *Seidensticker.*

John Parvus, Jean Petit, born in Normandy, acquired an unenviable notoriety for defending, by order of the Duke of Burgundy, the murder which the latter had committed on the Duke of Orleans, brother of the King of France. He took the ground, which the League afterwards adopted, that putting to death a traitor was not only permissible by the law of nature and of God, but meritorious and honorable. This apology of murder was condemned by the University of Paris, and branded as heretical by the Council of Constance, 1455. Jean was expelled from the University, but richly rewarded by the duke. He died July 15, 1411, at Hesdin. Comp. *Barante, Histoire des ducs de Bourgogne, 1824, tom. III., p. 108, sqq.*

Th. Pressel. — *Seidensticker.*

John X., Patriarch of Constantinople (Beous), at first zealously opposed the union of the Greek and Roman Churches, which the Emperor Michael Paleologus tried to consummate at the Council of Lyons, 1274, but he changed his views, and was appointed Patriarch of Constantinople in the place of the deposed Josephus Galesius, 1275. His warm advocacy of the union brought upon him the hatred of its orthodox opponents. He resigned his office under Michael, whose successor, Andronicus, banished him to the neighborhood of Mt. Olympus, and soon after to the Castle of St. George, in Bithynia, where he died, 1298. His writings, a part of which Leo Allatius has admitted into the "*Græcia Orthodoxa*," mostly treat of the union and cognate questions. Gass.—*Seidensticker.*

John, Patriarch of Thessalonica, lived in the latter part of the 7th and the beginning of the 8th century. He wrote in favor of picture-worship, to which he tried to reconcile the Jews, who considered that practice a scandal. A passage from his work, which was read at the 2d Synod of Nice, expresses the same view, that the Synod sanctioned as orthodox.

Gass.—*Seidensticker.*

John Philoponus, also called *Alexandrinus*, after his native city, and *Grammaticus*, on account of his learning. About his life we have no reliable information; Ritter and Nauck place him in the 6th and latter part of the 5th century. This accords with the fact, that Ammonius Hermiæ (about 485) was his teacher, and Simplicius, who emigrated, 529, to Persia, his cotemporary; and it is likewise confirmed by a direct reference which he makes to his time (*de ætern. mundi.*, XVI., cp. 4), namely, to the year 245, ær. Dioclet., which is 529 A. D. But conflicting with this chronology is the statement of Photius (*Bibl. cod.*, 240), that J. P. dedicated his work on Creation to Sergius, Patriarch of Constantinople (610–539), and that he composed his *Διακρίσεις* on the suggestion of the same Sergius. This statement is at variance not only with the adduced evidence, but also with the facts, that John was engaged in the Aritheistic controversy (560), that he wrote against Johannes Scholasticus (565), and addressed several works to Justinian. If, therefore, he dedicated his work to a Sergius, this could not have been the Patriarch of Constantinople, but another one of the same name, perhaps as Ritter

supposes, the Monophysitic Patriarch of Antiochia. — J. Philoponus was a man of extensive learning and untiring assiduity, a skilful dialectician, and very proficient in mathematical and grammatical researches. Though holding, in the main, Christian doctrines, he did not yield a simple and unconditional assent to Church creed and tradition, and his attempts at completing, elaborating, and amending the Christian dogma by philosophy, render his position not unfrequently ambiguous and questionable. He stands on a line with Nemesius, Æneas of Gaza, Zacharius Scholasticus; and has, in spite of his literary celebrity, earned only limited applause. Nicephorus Call. (*H. E.* XVIII., 47) calls him an acute peripatetic, and admits his admirable powers in arguing, but deprecates the unsoundness of his views; Simplicius and Photius reflect upon him even in stronger terms. These strictures apply chiefly to his objectionable theory of the Trinity. Though his principal work on dogmatics, *Διατητής ἡ περὶ ἐνώσεως*, is lost, we know, by extracts, its aim and object sufficiently well (comp. LEONTIUS, *de sectis Act.* 5, *apud Galland.*, XII., 641; JOH. DAMASC., *De hæres.*, I., p. 101–7. *ed. le Quien*, NICEPH., *Coll.*, XVIII., *ep.* 57; MANSI, *Concil.*, XI., p. 301). Nature and hypostasis, he declares, are identical. A double nature in Christ is incompatible with one hypostasis. To the objection, that in the Trinity there are confessedly three hypostases, and but one nature, he replies, that in the Trinity three particular and individual existences, or hypostases, are comprised under the idea of unity, but that this unity is merely the generic term, in which the several particulars are contained, the κοινός τοῦ εἶναι λόγος. If this be called nature, the latter amounts only to a generic, abstract idea, inductively derived from particulars, but if φύσις signifies something existing for itself, it is equivalent with the particular, individual being, and therefore with the hypostasis. Applying this argument to Christ, he concludes that to the unity of his hypostasis belongs also unity of nature. This doctrine has been called the Tritheism of Philoponus. He himself disclaimed teaching three Gods, and even quoted passages of similar import from older expounders of the Trinity. But the older writers, basing their views on the realistic philosophy of Plato, understood by unity of Divine nature something *real*, something existing independently of a mere mental conception, and accorded to the doctrine of one substance or nature in the Triune the same importance as to that of three hypostases. But if the Triune, according to Aristotelian logic, denoted nothing but three individual divinities classed under one generic term, such a position not only conflicted with the established interpretation of the Trinity, but obscured and endangered the belief in God's unity. Philoponus, however, was not the founder, as Leontius states, but merely the precursor of the Tritheists. He is said to have discussed the subject of Trinity, also, with Johannes Scholasticus, and to have written for Severus, the Monophysite, and against the 4th Œcumenical Synod (PHOT., *codd.*, 55, 75; NICEPH., *cp.* 46). Of his works, which are extant, the principal one is "*De æternitate mundi*," in

which the attempt is made to establish the Christian dogma of Creation by reason alone, without resorting to Biblical authority. Philoponus joins issue both with Aristotle and Plato, but allows the former to come nearer the truth than the latter. The ideas, as creative thoughts of God, are eternal and inherent in Providence; their realization adds nothing to Divine perfection. By his *εἶς* God was eternally Creator, and his essence acquired no new characteristic by the *ἐνέργεια*. The world itself cannot be eternal, for the effect cannot equal the cause. Matter was created by God; the opposite doctrine annuls the unity of an ultimate cause.—Less than in this book have the interests of Christianity been consulted in another: *περὶ ἀστρολόγειας*, which we know by the notice of PHOTIUS (*cod.*, 21–23), of NICEPH., (*l. c.*, *cp.* 47), and of TIMOTHEUS (*de receptu hæret.*, in *Cotel. mon.*, III., p. 414, *sqq.*). In this treatise he makes an important concession to philosophy by the separation of the sensual from the spiritual creation. The rational soul is not only an *αἶθερ*, but an imperishable substance, entirely distinct from all irrational existence, in which matter is always associated with form. In consequence of this inseparable connection of matter and form the natural body is destroyed and annihilated by death. The resurrection of the body is the new creation of the body. The work: *Commentariorum in Mosaicam mundi creationem libri septem* (*περὶ κοσμοποιίας*), dedicated to Sergius (*ed. Cordarius*, Viennæ, 1630, and *Galland. Biblioth.*, XII., p. 473), was written with an apologetical aim, and is replete with physical and philosophical learning. Its object is to reconcile the Mosaic account of creation with the facts derived from our experience. It reminds of similar attempts in our times, many of which it surpasses in acumen and extensive learning. — In the "*disputatio de paschate*," printed behind the last-mentioned work, Philoponus tries to show, that Christ, on the 13th day before the lawful pascha, partook with his disciples of a mystical repast, not of a real lamb. Nauck has rejected this book without a sufficient reason, as "absurd jargon." Though in the manuscript of Cordarius no name is attached to it, and in the *Bibl. Coisl.* *ed. Montf.* that of John of Damascus, a reference at the close of the treatise (Usteri, p. 121) to the Hexaëmeron of Philoponus, makes it probable that the latter is the author of the book. Usteri has made use of it in proving the authenticity of the fourth gospel (*Commentatio critica, in qua evg. Joh. genuinam esse ostenditur*, Turici, 1823), and has appended a reprint of it, in Greek, to his dissertation.

We merely mention: *περὶ τῆς τοῦ ἀστρολόγου χρήσεως* (*ed. Hase*, Bonn, 1839), *περὶ ἀγαλμάτων* against JAMBlichus (*Phot. cod.*, 215), and his grammatical works: *Συναγωγή τῶν πρὸς διάφορον σημασίαν διαφόρως τινουμένων λέξεων*, *Περὶ διαλέκτων*, *Ἰονικὰ παραγγέλματα*, and the Commentaries on Aristotle, published at Venice, 1509, 1534, 1535, etc. There is no collective edition of J.'s works. Comp. FABRICIUS, X., p. 639, *Harl.*; BRUCKER, *Hist. Phil.*, III., p. 529, *Lips.*, 1743; RITTER, *Gesch. d. Phil.*, VI., 500; WALCH, *Hist. der Ketzereien*, VIII., p. 693; J. G. SCHARFENBERG, *De Johanne Philopono*, *Lips.*,

1768; *Trechsel*, in *Stud. und Kritiken*, 1835, p. 95, sqq. The works of Bauer and Meier, and Nauck's art. in *Ersch and Gruber's Encyclop.* GASS.—*Seidensticker*.

John Presbyter. In a celebrated passage, quoted by EUSEBIUS (*H. E.*, III., 39), Papias declares, that in forming his Christian convictions he had consulted teachers of truth, such as had imbibed the precepts which the Lord entrusted to faith, and which, therefore, proceeds from truth itself. "But if," he adds, "any of them had communication with men of earlier times (*τοῖς προπυρίτοις*), I enquired of them, what Andrew, Peter, or Philip, or Thomas, or John, or Matthew, or any other of the Lord's disciples had said (*ἔλεγον*), also, what Aristion and the Presbyter John, the disciples of the Lord, tell (*λέγουσαν*). For I thought, I could not profit so much by books as by living and enduring discourse." Eusebius calls attention to the double occurrence of the name John, once in connection with Peter, James, and Matthew, where it evidently denotes the apostle; the second time with Aristion, when it is qualified by the term: *ὁ πρεσβύτερος*. There could be no doubt; then, he thinks, but that another John existed, a teacher of Papias, who, without being counted an apostle, still might be called a disciple of Christ. This passage, Eusebius continues, also confirms the report, that two men in Asia Minor, with the name of John, had intimately associated with Christ, and that, at Ephesus, there were two graves inscribed with the name of John. Eusebius very probably owes this observation to DIONYS. ALEX. (*ap. Euseb.*, VII., 25), who, upon this occasion, makes the same surmise, as Eusebius, about the origin of the Apocalypse. In *Constit. apost.*, VII., 46, also, mention is made of a second John, Bishop of Ephesus, and successor to the apostles, who had been appointed by the Evangelist John.

There are many difficulties, which involve the person of this Presbyter John. 1) Papias calls him *πρεσβύτερος*, using the same term that only a few lines before occurs in the meaning of "older." The question now is, whether it here designates the office of presbyter. Credner insists, that the word must have the same signification in both passages; but it is more likely that *πρεσβύτερος* is used in contradistinction to the *ἀπόστολος*, and refers to the public character of the man. 2) It is neither asserted by Papias, nor repeated by Dionysius and Eusebius, that John was presbyter at Ephesus, and again, the report about two Johns being buried at Ephesus, was even primitively not generally believed. Comp. JEROME: *de viris illust.*, cp. 9, "*Johannis Presbyteri—cujus et hodie alterum sepulcrum apud Ephesum ostenditur, etsi nonnulli putant, duas memorias ejusdem Johannis evangelistæ esse.*" 3) It is, further, surprising that no mention of this presbyter is found in the oldest records. Neither Polycrates nor Irenæus know of him. The latter, in fact, not only ignores Presbyter John, but he calls Papias, together with Polycrates, the pupils of John the Evangelist. Here is then, evidently, an error on one side, and it is not likely that Papias or Eusebius committed it, while Irenæus, who is fond of ascending to the highest authorities, may have

confounded the two namesakes, who were contemporaries, and of whom the greater, by his eminence, obscured the fame of the other.

The fact, that there existed in Asia Minor another John, the teacher of Papias, who belonged to the wider circle of Christ's disciples, would be of little relevancy, had this John Presbyter not at various times been deemed the author of several books in the N. T., which are called after John, but cannot with certainty be attributed to the Evangelist. With regard to the two shorter letters, JEROME (*l. c.*) says: *Reliquæ autem duæ—Johannis presbyteri asseruntur*. Of modern critics, Grotius, Beck, Fritzsche, Bretschneider, and Credner have advanced the same opinion. The dubious position of both letters in the oldest canon, and the circumstance, that the author simply calls himself *ὁ πρεσβύτερος*, seem to favor this theory. Nor can it be urged against it that John Presbyter would not have spoken so authoritatively in the immediate neighborhood of the Apostle John, for the latter may at that time have departed life, which, indeed, as Credner remarks, can be inferred, with some probability, from the use of different tenses (*ἔλεγον* and *λέγουσαν*) in the passage of Papias. On the other hand, the very close connection that exists between the longer and the two shorter epistles of John, is, certainly, a strong argument in favor of the same author. As to the epithet, *ὁ πρεσβύτερος*, there is no good reason why the apostolical head of the congregation should not have applied it to himself, and its omission in the first epistle is accounted for by the absence of any superscription at all. Of greater importance is the attempt to claim for John P. the authorship of the Apocalypse. Anciently this hypothesis was favored by Dionysius (*Euseb.*, VII., 25), and by Eusebius (III., 39). Even more confidently has modern criticism of the Apoc., on the impulse of Lücke and Bleek, returned to this supposition. De Wette and Neander do not oppose it. The era of J. P., his Asiatic associations, his eminent position, but especially the chiliasm of his pupil, Papias, well agree with it. Bleek adverts also to the circumstance, that Aristion and Presbyter, as teachers of Papias, were probably employed near Hierapolis, not far from Laodicea, to which city one of the seven letters of the Apoc. is directed. Though these reasons are not sufficient to establish probability, and though the exceptions that Hitzig takes against this view are worth considering, it is at least an hypothesis justified under the critical difficulties of the question. Comp. Lücke, *Comment. zum Evang. John.* 3d ed., I., p. 27, sqq., and his *Versuch einer vollst. Einl. in die Offenb. Joh.*, 2 ed., II., p. 896, sqq.; Bleek, *Beiträge*, p. 192; Guericke: *Fortgesetzte Beiträge zur Einl.*, p. 4, sqq., and his *Gesamtgesch.*, p. 47; also the articles of Jachmann and Wieseler, in *Pelts theol. Mittheilungen*, 1839 and '40, and Grimm in *Ersch and Gruber, Encyclop.*

This is the place where we may briefly advert to the fabulous person of *Prester John*, of so much renown in the middle ages. From the 12th to the 13th century, rumors of a Christian king-priest in Asia were repeated by Latin and Oriental writers, and generally believed in

the West. *Johannes quidam, qui ultra Persidem et Armeniam in extremo oriente habitans rex et sacerdos cum gente sua Christianus est sed Nestorianus* (Otto von Freisingen, VII., ep. 33). So firm was the belief in his existence, that Pope Alexander III. sent from Venice, 1177, an apostolical letter to this presumed Joannes Rex Ind. In the 14th century Presbyter Johannes is heard of in Æthiopia. More than once he is called a Nestorian, while it is well known that the Nestorians extended their influence far into Asia. One of their patriarchs in Bagdad, with the name of Joan, is said to have been in communication with a king of the Kerait, who had been converted. The Portuguese historian, Joao de Barros, tells positively, that, among the Tartars, there were Christian princes belonging to the Nestorian sect, who were called by the heathenish Tartars, Vang-Khan, and, by their own subjects, Jovano, corrupted from Jonas. All this seems to indicate an early spread of Christianity among Eastern nations, but the name of "Presbyter John" is not accounted for. Whether the Nestorian patriarch, Joan, gave his name to the Tartar prince whom he baptized, or whether Joannes Rex is to be derived from the Chinese title, Vang-Khan, or whether, as J. J. Schmidt suggests, the high regard in which John the Baptist was held in Central Asia, among the Christian Zabians, led to the adoption of that name, remains a matter of mere conjecture. Comp. *Ersch and Gruber, Encycl.*; *J. J. Schmidt, Forschungen im Gebiete der älteren Bildungsgesch. der Mongolen und Tübeter*, Petersb., 1824, p. 162, *Ritter, Erdkunde von Asien*, I., p. 283, sqq. Gass. — *Seidensticker*.

John of Salisbury (*Sarisberiensis, Salisb., Severianus, Parvus, Petitus*), was one of the most distinguished thinkers, writers, and churchmen of the 12th cent. Born (c. 1110,) at Salisbury, in humble circumstances, he went to France, c. 1136, and enjoyed the instructions of such men as Abelard, William de Conchis, and probably Carnotensis (*Metalog.* I. 5; II. 10). By learning and teaching he not only acquired the literary treasures of his age, but unusual familiarity with ancient lore. In Paris he received the doctorate, and publicly lectured. After spending some years with his friend, the Abbot Peter, of Moutier-la-Celle, he returned to England, with recommendations from Peter, and Bernard of Clairvaux, was made chaplain to Archb. Theobald of Canterbury (1151), and rendered him and Becket important services. On a commission to Rome, 1156, he took occasion to speak plainly to Hadrian IV. of the corruption of the Church and the papacy, though he warmly vindicated the unity and liberty of the Church, and the rights of the episcopate, against all secular encroachments. Hence, he recognized the claims of Alexander III., stood firmly by Becket, as archbp., to his martyrdom, and afterwards procured his canonization (1173). After serving Becket's successor, Richard, for some years, he was appointed (1176) B. of Chartre, and worthily discharged the duties of this office until his death, in 1180 (others say 1181, or Oct. 24, 1182).—John of S. also occupies an important place, for his age, as a writer. Besides his valuable letters to popes, bishops, &c. (302

epp. ad diversos, ed. Masson. Paris, 1611; 7 epp. in Duchesne; and 93 epp. in the corresp. of S. Thom. Cantuar.) he wrote: 1) *Policraticus s. de nugis curialium et vestigiis philos. libri VIII.* (Ludg. 1691); 2) *Metalogicus*, l. IV. (Ludg. 1610; Amst. 1664, in the *bibl. Patr. Lugd. T. XXIII.*), an exhibition of true and false science; 3) A poetical sketch: *Entheticus de dogmate philosophorum*. These are his chief productions. In addition, he wrote: *Vita ac Passio St. Thomas (Becket)*, *Vita Anselmi*, (in Wharton's *Anglia sacra*) a *penitential*, treatises *de malo exitu tyrannorum*, *de statu Rom. Curie*, *de mathematica*, *speculum rationis*, *spec. statitice*. The latest ed. by J. A. Giles, Lond., 1848, 2 Parts. — Reuter (*l. c.*) says he neither had the acuteness of Abelard, the profoundness of Anselm, nor the beautiful symmetry of Hugo St. Victor, though he somewhat resembles each. He excelled in a critical talent, and possessed great learning. — (See *Hist. de la France XIV.*, 89 sqq.; *Du Pin, Nouv. bibl. IX.*, 167; *Schlosser, Vincenz v. B. II.*, 64; *J. Schmidt, Joan. Parv. Sarisb., &c.*, 1838; *H. Reuter, J. von Salisb., Berl.*, 1842; *H. Ritter, Gesch. d. Philos.*, Bd. VII., 605, &c.). WAGENMANN.*

John Scholasticus, also called Climacus, distinguished himself, during the second half of the sixth century, as a monk and zealous promoter of monastic life. He became abbot of a monastery at Sinai, where he died about 606, aged almost a hundred years. He received the name Climacus from his treatise *καίμαξ τοῦ παραδισίου*, *scala paradisi*, which aided the development of ascetic mysticism in the Greek Church. It is a sketchy description of those states of the soul, and physical transitions, which are gradually to purify man and to lead him to the highest point of Divine life. The object of the work is not entirely theoretic and contemplative, but just as much practical, wherefore it is not to be wondered, that this treatise was celebrated among Greek monks for centuries, and was widely circulated. It was first published in Latin: *ex Ambrosii Camaldulensis versione Venet.* 1531, 1569. *Colon.* 1583, *cum enarrationibus Dion. Carthus.* *Colon.* 1540, 1601, also an *editio Græcobarbara maximi Margunii*, *Venet.* 1590. The Latin text *cum scholiis Johannis de Rhaitu* (which is to have occasioned the writing of the *scala paradisi*), also in *Bibl. PP. max. Lugd. X.*, p. 390.—By the same author there yet exists: *Liber ad religiosum pastorem, qui est de officio cœnobiarchæ* ed. Matth. Rader. *Monach.* 1606, 1614, *cum scholiis Eliæ Cretenensis*. Both together in *Johannis scholastici, qui vulgo Climacus appellatur, opera omnia gr. et lat. interprete Matthia Radero Lutet., Paris*, 1633. Comp. besides the notices in *Cave*, and *Oudin*, and *FABRICII, B. G. VIII.*, p. 615, ed. I.; concerning his life: *DANIELIS Monachi vita Johannis Climaci gr. ex M. S. FLORENTINIS—in actis SS. Antv. d. 30. Mart.* p. 835.

GASS.—Beck.

John Scholasticus, the patriarch, was born in the village of Sirimis near Antioch. In this city he became advocate and presbyter, and then held the office of an apocrisiarius at Constantinople. In 564 he was made patriarch, in the place of Eutychius, by the Emperor Justinian.

All that we know of John in a theological view is, that he wrote an address on the Trinity, which was opposed by John Philoponus (*Phot. Cod.* 75). This Scholasticus was more distinguished as a canonist. As presbyter at Antioch, he made a *Collectio canonum*, in which he embraced 85 so-called apostolical canons. A second collection, *Nomo-canon*, is also attributed to him, which also contains civil laws, and other *Capita ecclesiastica*. Both these collections are found in Latin and Greek in H. JUSTELLI's *Bibliotheca juris canonici* (Par., 1662, Tom. II., pp. 499, 603, 660. GASS. — Beck.

John St., Knights of (*Johannitæ. Fratres hospitales s. Joh., Milites hosp. s. Joh. Hierosol., Hospitalarii*), or of Rhodes, or Malta, an order which originated, 1048, in the association of a number of merchants of Amalfi, for the protection of pilgrims to Jerusalem. There they built, at the sepulchre of Christ, not only a church, but a monastery, under Benedictine rule. In a short time a hospital for poor and sick pilgrims was added, as also a chapel (St. John's), and the monks were called Johnites and Hospitaliers. Then, under Abbot Gerhard Tonque, Paschal II. (1099) granted it a special constitution, and Godfrey of Bouillon gave it large possessions. Gerhard's successor, Raymond du Puy (de Podio), who called himself *Custos* or *Procurator*, extended (1118) the duties of the Order by obligating the members to fight against infidels, and divided the society into three classes, knights, priests, and serving brethren, all which soon merged into a spiritual order of knights (warriors), ruled by a *Magister hospitalis*. The Order speedily acquired influence, power, wealth, and special privileges from the popes, and secured possessions, exempt from feudal claims, in almost every country. This prosperity soon worked the degeneracy of the Order, and unhappy feuds arose between it and the Templars, so that Alexander III. had to interpose. In 1187 the Order transferred its seat to Ptolemais. In 1241 new strifes broke out between it and the Templars, and this, with its spirit of self-aggrandizement, led to the loss of Palestine. When Ptolemais was taken by the Sultan of Egypt (1291), the Order made Limisso, in Cyprus, its seat, but in 1309 it took Rhodes, and held it until 1522. From the courage with which the Turks were repelled in 1311, 1312, the Grand Master bears the title F. E. R. T. (*fortitudo ejus Rhodum tenuit*). The Turks continued dangerous foes, twice besieging the island (c. 1450 and 1480), and taking it in Oct., 1622. The Grand Master Villiers then went to Candia, Sicily, and Rome, and the Order had no settled place until Charles V. gave them (1530) the islands Malta, Gozzo, Comino, and Tripoli, on feudal tenure, binding them to resist the Turks and pirates, protect Tripoli, annually furnish the governor of Sicily with a white falcon, acknowledge the king of Spain as patron of the Bishop of Malta, and restore Malta to Naples, should they ever retake Rhodes. From this time they were called Knights of Malta. The Reformation subjected them to some heavy losses. Henry VIII., of England, confiscated their estates there, and a like misfortune befel them in the Netherlands, North

Europe, and Germany. In 1586 Soliman II. besieged Malta, but was repelled. They retained Malta until the French revolution; in 1798 it was betrayed by some knights into Napoleon's hands. Ferdinand of Naples, the last Grand Master who resided in Malta, then went to Trieste, and laid down his office. The Order elected Paul I. of Russia in his place, though the Pope objected, as Paul belonged to the Greek C. In 1799 Max Joseph abolished the Order in Bavaria. In 1800 the English got possession of Malta, but by the Peace of Amiens they were to relinquish it; they failed to do so, however, and by the Peace of Paris, 1814, had their claim to it confirmed. In Germany and Italy the Order rapidly declined, though in 1826 the Pope allowed them to hold a chapter in Ferrara. In Prussia it was abolished, and its property confiscated, 1810–11, but in 1812 a decoration of the Order was instituted for the nobility, under the king, with the title Prussian Knights of St. John. The cross of the Order was retained, but decorated with four crested Prussian eagles, and a crown; on the left breast the knights wear a quadruple white cross. The old Order was restored, Jan. 6, 1853. In Austria, also, the Order ceased; in Bohemia it still continues, and in Russia is under the protectorate of the emperor. The seat of the chapter was at Catania, Sicily. Recently commanderies of the Order have been re-established in the Lombardo-Venetian territories.—During its bloom the Order consisted of seven nations or tongues, which sent delegates to the Chapter: 1) Provence, with the Grand Commander as President of the Treasury; 2) Auvergne, with the Marshal of the Order, who commanded the land forces; 3) France, with the Grand Master of the Hospital; 4) Italy, with the Admiral; 5) Aragonia, Navarra, and Catalonia, with the Grand Conservator; 6) Germany with the Grand Commandery of the Order; 7) Castile and Portugal, with the Grand Chancellor. To these, 8) England was previously added, with the Commandant of the Guard and Cavalry; its place was taken (c. 1795) by Bavaria, whilst Poland and Lithuania were first made a Grand Priory, and then the Russian branch. Each nation, again, was divided into priories, districts, and commanderies. The highest office of the Order was that of the Grand Master of the Hospital at Jerusalem, and Guardian of the poor of Christ; the Grand Master was chosen from the Chapter, which was his council. He enjoyed many important privileges; hence the government of the Order was partly monarchical, and partly aristocratic. The conditions of admission required noble descent, the payment of a large sum, and a participation for a time in contests against unbelievers; but the Pope or Chapter General might dispense from these. The age of sixteen was required. At seventeen the novitiate began, at eighteen the vows were taken. Only such as had entered without a dispensation could acquire office; these were designated, Knights of Righteousness; those admitted by dispensation, Knights of Grace. Although mainly composed of Roman Catholics, and specially favored by the Pope, Protestants and Greek Christians were also admitted. In all

spiritual matters the Order was subject to the Pope, in temporals it had sovereign power. Its coat of arms was a silver, octagonal cross, in a red tunic, with a crown encircled by a rosary, and a small Maltese cross below, with the inscription: *Pro fide*. In time of peace the knights wore a long black cloak, with a white octagonal cross on it, and on their breast. In war their dress was a red tabard with a simple cross on the breast and back. — (See *N. Niehammer*, *Gesch. d. Maltheserord. nach Vertot*, Jena, 1792, 2 Th.; *W. F. Wilke*, *Gesch. d. Tempelherrenord.*, Lpz., 1826, I., 82, &c.).

NEUDECKER.*

John's Fire was fire kindled, anciently by almost all nations, and still, in some places, on the eve of the anniversary of John the Baptist (June 24), in open air, on hills or mountains, also in streets and market-places, with various attendant usages. The fire was kindled by the friction of pieces of wood, young persons then ran around and through it, all kinds of flowers, herbs, garlands, &c., were thrown into it, priests blessed it, the surrounding crowd sang and shouted, a wheel of straw was fired and rolled down a hill, cattle driven through the fire, torches were carried through the fields, &c. &c. The fire was thought to possess virtue to heal or ward off diseases (epilepsy, &c.), conflagrations, lightning, witches, and to secure fruitfulness. The origin of the custom cannot be certainly ascertained, but it unquestionably is connected with the fire and sun-worship of the ancient heathen Arian nations (reminding us of the Indian Agni, the Persian Mithra, Vestal virgins, and the Roman festival of Palilia), as the Celts, Germans, Slavi. It is probably associated with the idea of the summer solstice, the season of exposure to diseases caused by extreme heat, of ripening harvests, and also of the longest days and shortest nights. — Though the Church was cognizant of the relation of the summer solstice to John's-day, it at first zealously denounced the heathen customs of kindling fires, &c. (*Augustine hom. de S. John, sermo 8; Conc. Constant., a. 680, can. 65*); but the Romish spirit of accommodation soon yielded to popular feeling, and attempted to invest those customs with religious significations. Theologians of the 12th and 13th cent. already (*JOHN BELATH, summa de div. offic.,* and *DURANDUS, rationale div. off. 7, 14*) refer John's fire to John 1: 8, &c. Others trace the fire to a legend of the burning of the relics of the Baptist in Sebaste, and the dancing to that of Herodias, &c. These explanations, however, spring from a desire to disconnect the custom from all relationship with old heathen usages. During the last few centuries this, like many other popular heathen practices, has either been prohibited or gone into disuse. — (See, besides general works on eccl. archæology (as *Rheinwald*, p. 246) — *PACIANDI, de cultu S. Joh. Bapt. antiq. christ. Rom.*, 1758; *DE KHAUTZ, de ritu ignis, &c.*, Vindob. 1759; *Ersch and Gruber, Encycl. II.*, 22, p. 265; especially *J. GRIMM, D. Mythol. p. 578, 81, 83, &c.* Collections of German traditions and customs by *Kuhn, Panzer, Meier, Schmitz, Wolf, &c.*)

WAGENMANN.*

Joktan, a Hebrew Shemite (Gen. 10: 25; 1 Chron. 1: 19), the progenitor of thirteen nations in Arabia, whither his tribe emigrated before Abraham's time (Gen. 10: 26–30). This earlier emigration is implied in the statement that Peleg's family did not emigrate until in the fourth generation. As Abraham is called a Hebrew (Gen. 14: 13), we may suppose, with Ewald (*Isr. Gesch. 1, 337*), that the Joktanites also went by this name, changed however, from עֶרְכָּא to עֶרְבָּא, with allusion to the steppes they inhabited (Is. 21: 13). The etymology of the name Joktan is truly Semitic, or like primitive Hebrew, but it was subsequently arabicised, hence the Arabs call their progenitor *Kachtan* (= Joktan). They unanimously pronounce the Joktan Arabs the true aborigines of Arabia, who occupied the southern peninsula, and possessed Yemen and Arabia Felix. In Yemen, S. of Mecca, on the Red Sea, there is a district still called *Kachtan*, in which Edrisi, the earlier Arabian geographer, locates a town called *Beischat-Jaktan*. Even the sepulchre of Joktan is still pointed out near Keschin (*NIEBUHR, 2, 287, &c. Pocock, Spec. hist. Arab., p. 32*). Northern Arabs are thought of less pure Arab blood, the Ishmaelites excepted. The descendants of Joktan, therefore, early settled that part of Arabia (Felix) to which the proximity of the sea, and a fertile soil attracted them. Were the inhabitants of Arabia better known, the tribes mentioned in Gen. 10: 26–29 might still be found there, for their different clans set great store upon keeping distinct. — (See *ALB. SCHULTENS, hist. imperii vetust. Joctan. in Arab. felice ex Albufeda. Haderov.*, 1786, 4to.)

VAIHINGER.*

Jonah, the Prophet. The small prophetic book bearing this name is distinguished from all the other prophetic books in this, that not *prophecy*, but the *prophet*, is the chief subject of it. The leading contents of Jonah's preaching in Nineveh is mentioned in only a few words, chap. 3: 4. It treats mainly of the personal history of the prophet. This is also unique in its character. In the first place, his mission was an extraordinary one — to go as a stranger and preach repentance to distant, proud Nineveh. Then this mission, as appears to us, could not have been entrusted to one more unworthy, for he was cowardly and fled. By a wonderful discipline he was arrested and changed. He went to Nineveh, preached, and — contrary to his expectation — the city repented, and was saved. If he was previously faint-hearted, he now became insolent. That Nineveh was not destroyed offended him, and besides, that the vine which gave him shade should suddenly wither, filled him with chagrin, and he wished to die.

There is scarcely a portion of Biblical history that, since Lucian (*Ver. hist. L., I., p. 94, sq.*, ed. Reitz), has been and is still more ridiculed, than this. Since the rise of Protestant criticism, the most diverse attempts have been made to discover the ideal sense (since the real was subject of ridicule). Besides the attempts to apprehend only portions of the narrative as symbols of some kind of an idea, even a historical one (as *ex. gr.* already, Abarbanel regard-

ing the sleeping of Jonah (1:5) as hinting, that the following is to be understood as a dream, and *Clericus* (Biblioth. anc. et mod., XX., 2, 459), supposing that by the whale was signified a ship with the sign of a whale), or to obtain another than the normal grammatical sense by philosophical explanation (*Anton*, in *Paulus N. Repert.*, II., p. 36, sq., translates 2: 1, *בִּטְחָן הָיָה* "on the belly of the whale"), there are many others who regard the whole either as a myth, or tradition, or as an allegory. Those who affirm the mythical character of the portion point to the myth of Hesion and of Hercules, the latter of whom sprang into the throat of the sea-monster which threatened the former, and after three days' abode came forth unharmed (*Diodor. Sic.*, IV., 42; *Apollod.*, II., 5, § 9-12). Others refer to the myth of Andromeda (*PLINY*, *H. Nat.*, V., 14, 34; IX., 4; *Strabo*, XVI., p. 759). *Baur* (in *Illgen's Zeitschr.*, 1837, VII., p. 201, sq.) discovers in Jonah even the sea-monster, Oannes, which taught the Babylonians art and manners (*Beros.* in *EUSEB.*, *Chron.*, I., 20, sq.; *Richter*, p. 48). — The number of the allegorists is, therefore, very large. They are most completely enumerated by *P. Friedrichsen*, *krit. Uebersicht der versch. Ansichten von d. Buch Jona nebst einem neuen Vers. üb. dass.*, Lpzg., 2. Aufl., 1841. I mention only the learned *Hermann von der Hardt*, who attempts to demonstrate in numerous treatises (*Jonas in carcharia.*, Helmst., 1718; *ænigmata Jonæ*, 1719; *ænigmata prisci orbis et al.*), that the history of the prophet is an allegorical shell for the history of the kings Manasseh and Josiah. The view, that the history is a national Hebrew tradition of the prophets with historical kernels, not to be more closely defined, and with didactic objects in view, is at present most widely accepted by the representatives of modern criticism. Of these we mention *B. Knobel*, *Proph. d. Hebr.*, II., p. 369, sq.; *Winer*, *Realw. s. v.*; *Ewald*, *Pr. d. A.*, B. II., p. 554, sq.; *De Wette*, *Einl.*, p. 358, sq.; *E. Meier*, *Gesch. d. poet. Nat. Lit. d. Hebr.*, p. 503, sq. — For all those, to whom Christ is the Son of the triune God, the centre of the Scriptures, and as well as the security and touch-stone for the truthfulness of its historical narrations, for all such the words of the Lord, *Matt.* 12: 39, sq.; 16: 4; *Luke* 11: 29-32, contain an incontrovertible guarantee for the reality of the facts contained in the book of Jonah. By this is by no means said, however, that Christ also guarantees the form in which the present book of Jonah relates the facts.

That Jonah (*יְהוֹנָתָן*, *Iōnās*) is identical with Jonah, son of Amittai of Gath-hepher, mentioned, 2 Kings 14: 25, is not to be doubted. This being so, then we know that Jonah belonged to the kingdom of Israel, and when he lived. For Gath-hepher was in the tribe of Zebulun (*Josh.* 19: 13), and 2 Kings 14: 25, takes us back at least to the time of the second Jeroboam, who reigned, 825-784. Accordingly Jonah was a cotemporary of Joel, Amos, Hosea, and (if we do not err) Obadiah. At the same time it is to be well observed, that this historical fact explains Jonah's mission to Nineveh. For Assyria was then on the point of elevating itself to the

government of the world. The kings of Israel had already placed themselves under his protection (*Hosea* 5: 13). How proper was it not now, that the Lord should give this mighty nation, which was to exercise so great an influence on the destiny of the theocracy, a presentiment of his power and glory!—how encouragingly must not this have reacted on Israel, and how humiliating the example of penitent Nineveh for impenitent Israel! There is great difference of opinion as to the time when the book of Jonah was written. The interpreters of it waver between the time of Menahem (771 A. C.) and the Maccabees. Comp. the introductions and especially *Delitzsch*, *über das B. Jona in Rudelb. u. Guer. Zeitsch.*, 1840, II., p. 112, sq.

The most important modern treatises on Jonah, besides those named, are: *Grimm*, *der Pr. Jonas übers.* with *Nügelbach's* annot. *Düsseldorf*, 1798; *Goldhorn*, *Exkurse zum B. Jonas. Ein Beitrag zur Beurtheilung d. neu. Erkl. d. Pr.*, Lpzg., 1803; *Hitzig*, *die 12 kl. Pr. erkl.* (im kurzgef. Hdbch.), 1838; *Krahmer*, *A. W.*, d. B. *Jonas hist. krit. untersucht.* *Quedlinburg*, 1846; *Schreg*, *die kleinen Propheten übers. u. erkl.*, *Regensburg*, Manz, 1854.

E. NÜGELBACH.—Beck.

Jonas, Bishop of Orleans (Aurelianensis), one of the most distinguished princes of the Frankish Church in the 9th century, succeeded *Theodulph* (821), and held the See under *Lewis the Pious* and *Charles the Bald*. He attended the *Paris Council* of 829, and died 844. In his *de cultu Imaginum* (publ. Colon., 1554, 12mo.; also in *Bibl. max.*, XIV., 167, &c.), written by command of *Lewis*, he advocates a medium position between that of *Claudius* of *Turin* (see Art.) and of image-worshippers. He seems, despite his learning, to have shared many of the prejudices of his age, as well as in regard to the efficacy of the sacraments, and rights of the priesthood, as to image-worship and relics. He also limited the atoning virtue of Christ's death to sins committed before baptism; subsequent sins had to be washed out by a baptism of tears and blood (cf. his *Libri tres de instit. laicali*, in *D'ACHERY*, *Spicileg.*, I., 258, &c.). Instead, however, of a merely outward righteousness, he demanded a radical change of heart, condemned the moral laxity of his times, and deplored the decline of discipline. And yet he treats ethics in a very external way, as appears from his enumeration of eight mortal sins (I., III., c. 6). Finally, he wrote a work which *D'Achery* entitled (*Spicil.*, I., 323, &c.): *de institutione regia*; it is a letter of counsel, &c., to the young king, *Pepin*, and contains precepts which the *Paris Council* of the following year adopted (cf. *SCHRÖCKH*, *K.-gesch.*, XXIII., 294, 416, &c.).

HAGENBACH.*

Jonas, Justus (originally *Jodocus*), was born at *Nordhausen*, June 5, 1493. In 1508 he went to the *University of Erfurt*, to study jurisprudence. There he became intimately attached to *Eoban Hess*, the poet, and by his advice visited *Erasmus*, with whom he afterwards maintained a correspondence. Meanwhile he obtained the degrees of *Mag. Art.* and *Doct.* of civil and eccl. law; also a canonry at *St. Severus Church*. But he, too, had been deeply

impressed by Luther's movement, and in 1519 devoted himself to theology. Erasmus, in a letter of July 1, 1519, warmly encouraged him in this (Vol. V., 27 of the London ed.). Luther, also, expressed his joy that Justus had formed this resolution (Letter of June 21, 1520). In 1521 he entered into the closest fellowship with Luther, accompanied him to Worms, and soon became provost of the cathedral at Wittenberg. On Sept. 24 the University made him a licentiate, and on Oct. 14, 1521, a Doctor of Theology. Thenceforth he toiled in Wittenberg as one of the most zealous promoters of the Reformation. His great gift was *eloquence*; Melancthon calls him *orator*. As he had declined the professorship of canon law, properly connected with the provostship, his labors were divided between preaching and theological lectures. In 1529 Mathesius heard him expound some Psalms and the Catechism. Among the addresses of Melancthon, we have two of J.'s academic lectures: "*de gradibus in Theologia*," and "*de studiis theologicis*." He also co-operated in the translation of the Bible, furnished a metrical version of Ps. 124 ("Wo Gott der Herr nicht bei uns hält"), and in 1523 wrote in defence of the marriage of priests. He translated many of Luther's and Melancthon's Latin works into German, and the reverse. He, with Agricola, were appointed to prepare a Catechism (see *Schneider's krit. Ausg. d. kl. Kat.*, XX.). In all the great movements of the Reformation he took part, and his legal knowledge was of great service. In 1527-8 he served as Visitor, in 1529 was on Luther's side at Marburg, and his letters on this occasion are a valuable historical source. In 1530 he aided Mel. in finishing the *Augustana*, and he attended the Frankfort convention of 1538. — His removal to Halle in 1541 gave a new turn to his life. Archb. Albert of Mayence had grown weary of his opposition to the Reformation there, and Justus with Andr. Poach were called thither by evangelical citizens. On Good Friday he preached his first sermon at St. Mary's, and soon after was chosen minister and superintendent; the same year, yet, the Ulrich Church embraced the gospel. Justus then prepared a concise liturgy, which was used, unaltered, for a century. But he did not succeed in driving the monks from Halle. He kept up an active correspondence with Luther, whose letters to him are most valuable. Justus was present at Luther's death, and followed the corpse to Wittenberg, preaching funeral sermons at Eisleben and Halle. It was a heavy blow for him also; his sorest troubles then commenced. He was commanded by Duke Maurice (Nov., 1546) to leave Halle; Christ. Türk, the Chancellor of Maurice, hated Jonas; Jonas had, also, expressed himself violently against Charles V. When John Frederick took possession of Halle, Jan. 1, 1547, Jonas returned for a short time; but after the battle of Mühlberg, he, with his pregnant wife, and seven children, had again to flee, in great terror (see *Voigt's Briefwechsel d. berühmten Gelehrten mit Herz. Albrecht*, 341, &c.). He labored for a time in Hildesheim, but never again found a permanent home in Halle. After tarrying awhile in Weimar and Jena, Duke John Ernest called him,

1551, as court-preacher to Coburg, from which place he arranged the eccl. affairs of Regensburg. After John Ernest's death, he was appointed, 1553, superintendent at Eisleben, where he died, Oct. 9, 1555. He was thrice married. His eldest son was drowned in the Saal; his son Justus became involved in the affair of Grumbau, and was executed (June 20, 1567) at Copenhagen. — The best old work on Jonas is the *Comment. histor.-theologica de vita et obitu Justi Jonæ*, by LAUR. REINHARD, Weimar, 1731; G. CH. KNAPP, *Narratio de J. J.*, 1817, then improved in Knapp's *Script. varii argumenti*, Halle, 1823. His writings have never been collectively published. SCHNEIDER.*

Joppa (more properly *Jopa*; modern name: *Jāfa*, not *Jaffa*), so-called from its lofty situation, its steep and somewhat terraced streets, on the termination of a long ridge. Some old writers thought it an antediluvian town (*Mela*, 1, 11; *PLIN.*, *H. N.*, 5, 14). It has great antiquity, and is associated with many old heathen and Christian traditions, as the myth of Andromeda (*Jos.*, *B. J.*, III., 9, 3; *Pausan.*, IV., 35, 6; *Hieron. ad Jonam.*, c. 1, 3), the legend that Noah there built the ark, &c. It is situated on the Mediterranean, at the S. end of Sharon, and has a much frequented but dangerous harbor (*Jos.*, *l. c.*), but still the best along that part of the coast. Located near Lydda (*Acts* 9: 38), 150 stadia S. W. of Antipatris (*Jos.*, *Antt.*, XIII., 15, 1), 9 miles W. of Ramleh, and 36-40 N. W. of Jerusalem, it always was the port of the last city, a mountain road from which ended at Joppa. Hence it was the chief commercial town along that coast. Before the exile the Israelites never got possession of it, hence it is rarely named in the O. T. It lay near Dan, but was held by the Phœnicians (*Movers*, *Phœn.*, II., 2, p. 176, &c.), and said to have been founded by them, as from it they carried on a brisk inland trade with the Israelites (2 Chron. 2: 15; cf. *Ezra* 3: 7). At Joppa, *Jonah* (1: 3) took ship in his flight from the mission to Nineveh. Jonathan and Simon Maccab. (2 Macc. 12: 3, &c.) took it from the Syrians and fortified it (1 Macc. 10: 74, &c.; 12: 33, &c.; *Jos.*, *Antt.*, XIII., 14, 4; *do.*, 9, 2). Afterwards Pompey attached it to the province of Syria (*Jos.*, *Antt.*, XIV., 4, 4), but Cæsar restored it to Hyrcanus (*Jos.*, *l. c.*, XIV., 10, 6), then Herod, and next Archelaus obtained it, and finally, it was again attached to Syria, and formed a separate toparchy of Judea. — At Joppa Peter restored Tabitha to life, and had his remarkable vision (*Acts* 9: 35; 10: 5, &c.; 11: 5). After Cestius laid it waste, in the Jewish war (*Jos.*, *B. J.*, II., 18, 10), it became a refuge of Jewish pirates (*Strabo*, XVI., p. 759), until Vespasian took it (*Strabo*, III., 9, 2). He erected a castle there, and the town was speedily rebuilt. In the course of succeeding centuries it was often destroyed and rebuilt, and especially during the Crusades frequently changed hands. It was early made an episcopal See, as is shown by signatures of the Councils of Ephesus, 431, and Jerusalem, 536. Baldwin I. fortified it, as also did Louis IX. of France, whilst the Mohammedans often laid it waste. But its advantageous location still secured its resuscitation. — The

modern city lies in lat. 32° 3', 6'', and long. 32° 24' (from Paris), and has about 5000 inhabitants (*Lynch* says 13,000), four-fifths of whom are Mohammedans. It is governed by a Mutesellim, under the Pacha of Jerusalem. No ancient ruins are found there. Though unattractive, with its wall and ditch, one gate on the land side, another opening toward the sea, three monasteries (Greek, Latin, and Armenian), five mosques, one synagogue, a small Prot. congregation, and several schools—the site is beautiful, with its fertile adjacencies, and the temperature delightful, the thermometer rarely falling to the freezing-point, and the heat being moderated by the sea-breeze. Fruits abound, its watermelons being especially sought after. The orchards are separated by cactus hedges, 15 feet high, and one of them, not the largest (*Lynch*), contained 2500 orange, and 1500 citron trees. In 1799 it was sacked by Napoleon. It is still visited by Turkish, English, and Austrian steamboats, carrying tourists and pilgrims to Jerusalem. — (See *Reland*, *Palæst.*, p. 176, &c., &c.; *Winer's R. W. B.*; *Ritter*, *Erdk.*, XVI., 47, &c., &c.; *Lynch*, *Exped.*, &c.; *Tobler*, *Topogr. v. Jerus.*, with a view of Joppa). *RÜRTSCH.**

Jordan, the יַרְדֵּן, always with the article, it occurs only twice, Ps. 42: 7, and Job 40: 23, without it (concerning the etymology see *Geenius*, *Thesaur.*, p. 626), Ἰορδάνης, Ἰορδάνος, in *Pausan.* V. 7, 3, the greatest, indeed the only river in Palestine, for the other waters of this country are only brooks, wādi's. In the Bible the Jordan is mentioned on the following occasions, apart from the geographical references, as beyond Jordan, at the Jordan, etc.; Lot's choice of the plain of Jordan (Gen. 13: 10, 11); Jacob's passage through the Jordan to Mesopotamia (Gen. 32: 10); the refusal of the tribes of Reuben, Gad, and half of Manasseh to pass over the Jordan (Num. 32. Joshua 1: 12–18; 22: 1–10); its passage in a miraculous manner at Jericho (Joshua 3: 4); it is mentioned in the Book of Joshua as the boundary of the following tribes: of Reuben (13: 23); of Gad (13: 27); of Judah (15: 5); of Ephraim and Manasseh (16: 1, 7); of Benjamin (18: 12, 20), of Issachar (19: 22); of Naphtali (19: 33, 34). Generally it constituted the boundary between the Eastern and Western tribes (22: 25). It is also mentioned, in connection with important events, in Joshua 22: 10; Judges 3: 28, 7: 8, 12: 5, 6; 2 Sam. 19: 19; 2 Chron. 4: 17; 2 Kings 2: 8, 14; 14: 5, 10–17; 6: 2–8. The prophets praise its beauty (Jer. 12: 5; 49: 19; 50: 44; Zech. 11: 3). In the Apocrypha it is mentioned 1 Mac. 5: 24–54; 9: 42–49. In the N. T., finally, it is the scene of the labors of John the Baptist, and of the baptism of the Lord (Matt. 3: 6 sq.; Mark 1: 5 sq.; Luke 3: 3 sq.). The present course of the Jordan has been, in later times, as exactly determined, especially by Molyneux and Lynch, as any of the better known rivers of Europe. Its course embraces the middle part of the remarkable chasm in the Syrian plateau, which extends from the mouth of the Orontes to the Red Sea. It has its sources at the southern slope of Lebanon and at Hermon. Josephus

B. J., I., 21, 3; III., 10, 7; IV. 1, 1) mentions two Jordans, the one taking its rise at the Paneion, the other, called the "little Jordan," at Dan or Daphne. Both are the brooks which now rise at Bānjās (*Cæsarea Philippi*, see Article) and Tell el-Kādhi (*Dan*, see Article), and unite about three English miles south of Tell el-Kādhi. The third and most important source of the Jordan, which arises from Hāsbeiah, Josephus does not mention at all. This takes up many smaller streams from the west and pours them into the sea *Hūleh*. This sea receives besides many streams from the eastern and western mountains, especially in its north-west corner, in 'Ain el-Mellābah.

This is the sea *Merom* (מֵרֹם) of the O. T., Josh. 11: 5, 7. Josephus calls it Σαμπαζωνίτις or Σαμοζωνίτις λίμνη (comp. especially *B. J.* IV. 1, 1). Concerning it and the sources of the Jordan, see, in addition to the works to be mentioned hereafter: *Maj. Robe*, Country around the sources of the Jordan in *Robinson's Biblioth. sacr.* Vol. I., 1843, p. 9–14. *W. M. Thomson*, The sources of the Jordan, the lake el-Hūleh and the adjacent country, with notes by E. Robinson. The same, Vol. III., 1846, p. 186–214. Extracts from *Dr. H. Hänel's Reisetagebuch* in: *Zeitschr. der D. M. Gesellsh.*, Bd. II., 1848, p. 427–431. *Wilson*, the Lands of the Bible, Vol. II., p. 161–180. The Jordan proceeds from the southern extremity of the sea in slow, and then from the bridge of Jacob, in rapid falls through a strip of high, unfruitful table-land, to the sea of Tiberias. The sea Merom is about 100 Paris feet above the level of the sea; the sea of Tiberias about 300 feet below it, so that the stream has a fall of 400 feet in the space of about nine miles. About one and a half miles below the sea Merom an old basalt bridge of three arches, yet in good condition, crosses the stream, called *Dachir Beni* or *Benât Jákûb* (bridge of the sons or daughters of Jacob), so named after the legend, that Jacob here crossed the Jordan on his return from Mesopotamia, Gen. 32: 22; 33: 17, 18. This bridge was built after the crusades, and probably simultaneously with the erection of the numerous khans on the great caravan-route from Egypt to Damascus. Besides this, no other bridge crosses the Jordan, but there are fords, of which mention is made already in Judges 3: 28; 12: 5, 6. Concerning the basin of the sea of *Genesareth*, see the respective Article. From this point the Jordan has been navigated twice its whole length, first in August, 1847, by Lieut. Molyneux, whose expedition to the Jordan and the Dead Sea appeared in the *Journal of the Geogr. Soc.*, Vol. XVIII. 1848., p. 108 sq.; then by the American expedition under Lieut. Lynch, see *Narrative of the United States expedition to the river Jordan and the Dead Sea*: New York, 1849, 8vo., partly also in his official report to the Senate of the United States (30th Congress, 2d Session, Executive, No. 34, Feb., 1849), and enlarged as *Official Report of the United States Expedition to explore the Dead Sea and the river Jordan*: Baltimore, 1852, 4vo. From the sea of Genesareth to the Dead Sea the stream is called *Urdunn*, or *es-Scheriâ el-Kebir*, and flows rapidly in a tor-

uous channel with a fall of about 1000 feet. This channel Lynch found sometimes broad, sometimes narrow, sometimes shallow, then deep, at the entrance into the Dead Sea, 180 yards wide and three feet deep. The water is cloudy, of a clay color, but sweet and refreshing, and has a rapid current, so that often some of the pilgrims, who yearly bathe in it on Easter Monday, in commemoration of the baptism of Christ, are drowned. This bathing-place is opposite Jericho. It is a general opinion, that of old the Jordan overflowed its banks, in the spring, like the Nile. Such an overflow does not occur now, and there probably was never anything more than the swelling of its waters after the spring rains, comp. Josh. 13:15; 1 Chron. 13:15; Sir. 24:36 (26). At the entrance of the Jordan into the Dead Sea ("the end of the Jordan," Josh. 15:5; 18:19) the plain of Ghôr is a salt-marsh. The opinion that the Jordan, in ancient times, again flowed out of the Dead Sea, and through the Wâde el-Arabah to the Gulf of Ailah, is contradicted by the structure of the ground, for the Wâde el-Arabah rises again from the Dead Sea, on far southward to the water-shed, and then falls into the Red Sea. But that the stream, in ante-historical times, may have had this course, is more than probable, comp. Ritter, Erdkunde XV., p. 770 sq.

Finally, we have yet to mention the more important tributaries of the Jordan. On the east side, from north to south, are: 1) the *Hieromax* of Pliny, *H. N. V.* 16, not mentioned in the Bible; in the Talmud *Jarmoch*, whence by the more ancient Arabic geographers (*Edrisi ed. Jaubert. I.*, p. 333. *Abulfeda ed. Reinaud*, p. 48. *Merâsid III.*, p. 339) Yarmûk, now Scherîât el-Mandhûr, from the resident Menadhere-Arabians. It rises in Hauran and Jaulân (Auranitis and Gaulonitis) and empties into the Jordan about six miles below the sea of Genezareth. 2) The Wâdi Zerka, the Jabbok of the O. T., see the Article. Among the brooks which flow in on the west side, is the Cherith of the

O. T., נַחַל כְּרִית, where Elijah was concealed, and fed by ravens, 1 Kings 17:3-7. Robinson (*Pal. II.*, p. 534, sq.) and Wilson (*The Lands of the Bible II.*, p. 5) find it in the Wâdi Kelt, although, according to the words of the Bible ("Get thee hence and turn eastward, i. e. from Samaria"), the *Wâdi Fâri'a* may also be meant, which, farther upward, somewhat south from where the Jabbok empties on the east side, falls into the Jordan. Concerning the Jordan, comp. in addition to the Travels (especially Robinson II., 498-509, III., 559-569, 603-621), and the works named above, especially Ritter, *Der Jordan und die Beschiffung des Todten Meeres. Ein Vortrag.* Berlin, 1850, 8vo. *Erdkunde Bd. XV. 1*, p. 152 to the end. ARNOLD.—Beck.

Jornandez (called, in Gothio, *iburnaups*, *Ibornaud*, *eberkühn*, also *Jordanus*, *Jordanes*, probably his monastic name), furnishes in his book the only, scanty, account we have of him. He lived c. 550, and was a Goth by descent, and in sentiment. His grandfather, Peria, was a notary of Prince Candax, and J. held a like office, but he does not say under whom; but most likely at

the court of the Alani. Like most other Ostrogoths, he was a zealous Catholic. Subsequently, he became a monk (*de Getar. s. Gothor.*, &c., c. 50; cf. Du CANGE, *s. v. conversio*). He was still a monk, probably in an Italian cloister, when he began his history of the Getæ. He seems afterwards to have become a bishop; at least mediæval writers often call him such. But where he resided, or had his See, is unknown. Some think at Ravenna, because he so vividly describes it (*l. c.*, c. 29); but it had no bishops, but archbishops. Nothing else is known of him; not even whether he died before his friend Vigilus (†555).—Two of his works remain: *de origine actunque Getarum*, or *de Getar. et s. Gothor. origine et rebus gestis* (c. 551), and *de regnorum et temporum successione*, or *Jordani episcopi liber de origine mundi et actibus Romanorum cæterarumque gentium*, or *De gestis Romanorum* (c. 552). The former is dedicated to a friend, Castilius, the latter to Vigilus, whom Grimm supposes to be the Pope of that name (538-55). The former closes with the death of Vitiges (542, or 543), but adds a statement regarding Germanus (†550, or 551). Though the latter work is a compilation, it is important as furnishing portions of books since lost, and valuable accounts of eastern and northern countries. J. Grimm, and Krafft (*K.-gesch. d. germ. Völker*, I., 1, 77, &c.) have vindicated his view of the identity of the Goths and Getæ. Should this opinion prove correct, his history would greatly add to our knowledge of German antiquity. Cas- sel, however (*Magyar. Alterth.*), and H. v. Sybel (*Ed. Schmidt's Ztschr. f. Gesch. Wiss.*, 1846, Bd. VI., 516, &c.) have questioned it. Among the sources from which J. compiled was Cassiodorus's *de origine actunque Getarum*, in XII. *columnis*, which has been lost. It was scarce even in J.'s time; he obtained the use of a copy for only three days, though he had before seen it. J. acknowledges that he quoted much from memory, adding matter of his own. The fragment from O. wears a mythic character. Another source used by J. was a collection of traditions by Ab- lavius (probably of the 5th century), also lost. They relate to the 2d-5th centuries, and were in the form of myths and songs. Other sources were Tacitus, Strabo, Claudius Ptolemæus, Pompon. Mela, both the Dions (whom he thought but one person), Pomp. Trogus, Symmachus, Dex- ippus, &c.—The other work of J., consists, be- sides original matter, of almost literal extracts from Florus, Marcellianus, Comes, *Eusebii chron. lib. post Hieron. interp.*, &c. It is of little value.—J. modestly disclaims all pretensions to learn- ing, and his works exhibit no erudition. Grimm pronounces him a wretched compiler. His style is partly obscure, heavy, and labored, though copyists may deserve some blame for these faults. His historical, as well as geographical statements, are often unconnected and confused. Facts and perversions are often mixed up, with- out his seeming to see the contradiction. Wri- ters and subjects are confounded, important matters omitted, and insignificant things en- larged upon. And whilst he usually follows authorities in a servile manner, at times he makes arbitrary alterations.—Whatever minor objects he may have had in view in writing these

works, the main one was evidently to extol the Gothic nation, and, above all, the royal family of the Amali. He was an Ostrogoth, and related to that family. And his partisan aversion to the Arians renders his statements in regard to them unreliable.—The works of J. seem also to have had a political aim, viz., to effect a closer union between the Romans and the Goths, by showing that both had long been friends and confederates, and that the hope of both nations rested in the perpetuation and closer cementing of the bonds which united them.—(Upon the editions of these works, cf. J. A. FABRICII, *Bibl. Eut.*, lib. III., c. 17, T. I., p. 660, and T. III., p. 251; BÄHR, *Gesch. d. Röm. Lit. Suppl.*, 1 Abth., p. 134.—Monographs: D. G. MÖLLER, *Diss. circ. De Jornande*, Altdorf, 1690, 4to.; DU BUNT, *Abhh. d. churf. bair. Akad. d. Wiss.*, 1763, Bd. I., 97; S. FREUDENSPRUNG, *comm. de Jornande*, Monaci, 1837; *Akad. d. W.* 5, März., 1846; *Ak. d. W. zu Berl.*, 1848, phil. u. hist., Abhh., p. 1–60; H. DE SYBEL, *De fontibus libri Jordanis, De or. actuque Get.*, *Diss. inaug.*, Berol., 1838.) J. WEIZSÄCKER.*

Joseph, of Arimathea, a rich man (Matt. 27:57), a disciple of Christ, but prevented by fear from publicly confessing him (John 19:38), was an honorable counsellor (Mark 15:43), and was born in Arimathea. The form of his name does not point to Rama in the tribe of Benjamin (Josh. 18:25) not far from Gibeah and Geba (Judges 19:13; Isa. 10:29; Hos. 5:8), but much rather to Romathaim (רֹמַתַּיִם, 1 Sam. 1:1), which took its name from the two parts of which the town was composed, and was situated in the land of Zuph, whence it had the surname Zophim, 1 Sam. 1:1, sometimes also called simply Rama, 1 Sam. 1:19; 7:17. Josephus calls it (*Antt.* V., 10, 2) Ramatha, *Will. Tyr.*, p. 785, *Ramula juxta Liddam*, the Arabs (*Abulf. tab. syr.* p. 79) Ramlath, now Ramla.—Joseph has been regarded (by Erasmus, Michaelis) as a counsellor in his native town, as a municipal counsellor at Jerusalem (Grotius), also as a counsellor of the temple (Lightfoot); but, from Luke 23:51, it appears that he had a voice in pronouncing judgment on Christ, consequently he was a member of the chief council. He therefore lived in Jerusalem, where he had a piece of ground in which was a tomb hewn out of the rock (Matt. 27:60). The question concerning the situation of this tomb is connected with the question concerning the situation of Golgotha, for it was not far from this, John 19:42. See the *Art. Sepulchre*, the holy, at Jerusalem. The tradition (comp. ASSEMANI, *bibl.* 3, 1, 319) that Joseph was one of the seventy disciples, and the other report (ITTIQ,

diss. de pat. ap. § 13, p. 21), that he first preached the gospel in England, are simple fables.

VAHINGER. — Beck.

Joseph, the son of Jacob, by Rachel, became especially endeared to his father on account of his pious spirit, integrity, and filial devotion to his aged parent, which exhibit him in strong contrast with his ruder brothers (Gen. 30:22, &c.; 37:2, 3; 39:9; 41:16; 42:18; 45:8; 50:19, &c.), and won for him favor with God and man (39:2, 21; 41:37, &c.). The vanity he seems at first to have displayed, and subsequent severity (KURTZ, *Anc. Cov.*) were but transient spots in an otherwise pure and noble character. To this excellence of character was added the gift of prophecy (37:5, &c.; 40:5, &c.; 41:1, &c.). This made him (like Daniel) a worthy representative of Israel among the heathen, and secured for him political honors. As a statesman he exhibited extraordinary talents, but ultimately retired in faith with his family, from civil functions, within the sacred circle of his father's house (48:1, &c.; 50:24, &c.; Hebr. 11:22).—The interesting history of Joseph is so familiar, that we may omit details. Its significance may be contemplated in a three-fold aspect. First, as it concerned himself, it furnishes one of the most beautiful and instructive illustrations of a special Providence (50:20). It is this, connected with the attractive character of Joseph, which has made his story so generally popular.—In regard to his family and nation, the history of Joseph shows how the Lord transplanted the house of Jacob to Egypt, that it might there enjoy the most favorable opportunities of growth and development into a nation (45:7; cf. Ps. 105:17, 23, &c.). This could not have so readily been secured in Canaan, where the descendants of Abraham would have been more exposed to the seductions of heathenism, and wasting conflicts. In Egypt a fertile district was assigned them, and yet it was arranged by Joseph's wisdom, under Divine guidance, that they should not only be geographically separated from the natives, but kept still more distinct by their occupation, herdsmen, which was an abomination to Egyptians. There, likewise, by proximity to the most cultivated nation of that period, Israel might appropriate many of its elements of civilization, and yet be surrounded with guards against prevailing idolatry, until, after passing through the needful process of national growth and training, they would be prepared to occupy the promised land.—The Church has always regarded Joseph and his history as typical of Christ. To urge the analogy in reference to single points, as that Joseph was sold for twenty pieces of silver, that he also had two malefactors beside him in his

* They are the following: the *Get. hist.* alone: *Edit. Aug. Vindelice.*, 1515, fol. ap. J. Stiller, together with Paul Warnefrid *de gest. Longob.* An impr. ed. by Fornerius, from a cod. *Ms. Pithoei*, in his *opp. Cassiod.*, Par., 1588, fol.; Ed. ex recognit. Bonavent. Vulcanii, Lugd. Bat., 1617, 8vo. (copied from Fornerius); BRONSKIUS, in *opp. Cassiod.*, Genév., 1650, a new rev. of Fornerius's ed.; H. GROTIUS, *de reb. Goth.*, &c., Amstelod., 1655, 8vo. A reprint of Fornerius.—Ed. GAZIUS, 1679, *Notomag.*, fol., vol. I., ex., p. 379, commended by Muratori as the most accurate; Ed. MURAT.,

Scriptt. rerr. Italice. Mediol., 1723, T. I., fol., follows Garet's ed., with the readings of a *Cod. Ambros.*—Both histories: FRID. SYLBURGIUS, *Hist. Rom. scriptt.*, Francof., 1588, fol.; *Corpus hist. Rom. scriptt. lat. vet.*, Genév., 1609 et 1652, fol., T. II.; JAN. GRUTERUS, *hist. Augusta Scriptt. latt. minores.*, Hann., 1611, fol., ex *cod. Palat.*; FRID. LINDENBROGIUS, ed. *Hamb.*, 1611, 4to., much better than previous ones, collated with a *cod. Palat. et Ardebatens.*; *Bibl. Patr. Max.* (Lugd.), T. XI., p. 1052, &c., reprint of the ed. *Grut.*

deepest sufferings, one of whom (the chief butler) found favor, &c., would be of small moment. But in a deeper sense the type holds good; indeed, Joseph's history may be styled a graphic delineation of the essence of all typology. He has, as a type, nothing to do with the promise, therefore he is the more significant. It belongs to his historical position, that his life exhibits certain principles of the kingdom of God, which, in the nature of the case, had their highest fulfilment in Christ. And, in this more comprehensive view, the details of his life, considered as ordered by God, acquire importance, by directing attention to the inward relation of the type to the antitype. Notwithstanding Joseph's importance, he does not become a fourth patriarch, along with Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob. With these the patriarchate, with its covenant and promise, closes. A new phase in the history of revelation begins with Joseph; he left the narrow family circle in which he grew up, to open fresh paths for the kingdom of God, just as Christ left the sphere of the Old covenant in order to establish the New. And this occurred in both cases according to the same laws of development. To Joseph's time the ungodly elements (Ishmael, Esau) were excluded from the holy family; now, when the family is to become a nation, all the sons of Jacob remain within its sphere, within which the antagonistic elements show themselves, first among the twelve progenitors of the tribes, then in the nation at large—the opposition between the true spiritual and the carnal Israel. In this fact we find the real essence of the typical relation of Joseph to Christ. "In the person of Joseph God most beautifully delineated Christ and his kingdom in a bodily form. The sum of the figure is: 'As Joseph's brother did to him, so do the Jews unto Christ.'" (Luther). The righteous man in whom the true character of Israel is depicted, is hated by the fleshly majority of his brethren, sold, delivered to the Gentiles; among these, too, must he suffer, because he condemns their sins. But the way of suffering leads to glory, and this proves of primary advantage to the Gentiles, because Israel rejected him. Only after a long time Israel is driven to repentance by the judgment of God; then he whom they rejected reveals himself as their brother, pardons them, and bestows upon them abundance of blessings. Thus the type points still to the future.—(Cf. HEIM, *Bibelstunden*, p. 540–9; VITRINGA, *obs.* s. VI. 21; KURTZ, *Sacred History*, p. 94). As the history of Joseph is so closely interwoven with that of Egypt (see *Art.*), other accounts of him, besides the biblical, merit notice. All these concentrate in the history of the Hyksos (cf. KURTZ, *Old Cov.*). *Josephus* (*c. Ap.* I., 14, 26, quotes two passages from MANETHES *Ægyptiaca*, which he supposes refer to the arrival and residence of the Israelites in Egypt, and to their departure from the country. He also cites (*l. c.*, 32) Cheremon's account of the withdrawal of a large number of diseased persons from Egypt, under the leadership of the scribes, Moyses and Josepos, whose Egyptian names were Tisithes and Peteseph. JUSTIN likewise correctly relates (*Hist.*, XXXVI., 2) some leading incidents in Joseph's history,

and calls Moses his son. *Hengstenberg*, *Hofmann*, *Delitzsch*, and others, agree with *Josephus* in considering the Hyksos (=Shenherd-kings, or captive shepherds) identical with the Israelites. Hengst. and Delitzsch think Salatis means Joseph (cf. Gen. 42:6). Del. even assumes that the Isr. ruled for a time in Egypt, but this is untenable. And as the Hyksos certainly were dominant, and even Manetho clearly distinguishes between them and the leprous people mentioned, whom the Egyptian tradition identifies with the Jews, most scholars now consider the Hyksos identical with one or several of the Pharaoh dynasties, and suppose they obtained dominion in Egypt about the time Jacob and his family emigrated thither, and that Ex. 1:8. refers to their expulsion.—(For authorities, see *Art. Jacob*). AUBERLEN.*

Josephus, Flavius, the well-known Jewish historian. I. *The leading facts of his life.* Related, through his father, to the priesthood, and through his mother to the royal family of Asmoneans (see *Maccabees*), he was born A. D. 37, the son of Matthias Ephias (hump-backed), and a daughter of Jonathan the high-priest (*Autobiogr.*, 1; *Antt.*, XVI., 7. 1; *c. Ap.*, I., 10). In early youth he showed great talent (this may be an imitation of Luke 2:46, 47), and was destined for the priesthood, and hence successively joined the Pharisees, Sadducees, and Essenes, and then spent three years with the recluse, Banus. But a man of his active, practical, ambitious spirit preferred the popular, dominant sect of the Pharisees, to either the speculative Sadducees, or ascetic Essenes; to it, therefore, he adhered, so far as he could consistently with his Hellenist culture and tastes. In 63 (almost simultaneously with Paul, and with like adventures. *Life*, 3), he visited Rome, became acquainted with Nero and Poppea (a patroness of Judaism, *Antt.*, XX., 8. 11), who dismissed him with rich presents. Not long after his return to Judea, the insurrection (66) of the Jews against the Romans broke out. He joined it, and received command of Galilee, and for some time operated there energetically, but when Jotapata was taken he surrendered himself to the Romans. (*Life*, 87–4). His prophecy of the future greatness of Vespasian saved his life, and secured the favor of V. and Titus (*B. J.*, III., 8, 9; *Suet.*, *Vesp.*, 5; G. OLEARIUS, *dissert. de vatic. Jos. de Vesp.*, Lps., 1699, 4to.; TH. A. STROHBACH, *Diss. de Jos. Vesp. imp. prædic.*, &c., Lps., 1648, 4to.). In honor of them he took the surname *Flavius*. He was at the destruction of Jer., accompanied Titus to Rome, where, under imperial patronage, he devoted himself to study (*Life*, 75, &c.; *c. Ap.*, I., 9, 10.) After Domitian's death he seems to have withdrawn from the court. He was still living in the 5th year of Trajan (A. D. 103), but hardly survived him.—II. His still happily extant works are: 1) *The wars of the Jews* (περί τοῦ Ἰουδαίου πολέμου or Ἰουδαϊκῆς ἱστορίας περί ἀλώσεως), in seven books, originally written in Syro-Chaldaic for Jews in Asia (*Pref.*, 1, 2). This is lost, for the Hebrew translation, made from a Latin version in the 9th cent., by a Jew in France, could not long pass for the original (see *Ersch* and *Gruber*, *Allg. Encykl.*, II., 23, 184). This Greek work, de-

signed for the Emperor, and educated persons (Life, 65; c. *Ap.*, I., 9). was written in Rome, not before 75, and as the account of an eye-witness, is inestimable. A Latin abstract, attributed to Hegesippus, is added to the works of Ambrose of Milan. 2) *The Antiquities of the Jews* (*Ἰστανή Ἀρχαῖα*), in 20 books, published in a. 94, contains their history from the creation to Nero's 12th year. His main source was the O. T. for earlier times, and for later periods Nicholas of Damascus (see MÜLLER, *Fragm. Hist. Gr.*, III., 342, &c.). His chief aim was apologetic (see Pref., VIII., 4, 3; XII., 2, 3, 1). Both works roused violent opposition; the former especially from Justus of Tiberias, to whom the 3) *Autobiography*, is a reply. It appeared as an appendix to the *Archæology*, but at least seven years after it. 4) *Against Apion* (see Art.), two books in vindication of the antiquity and nobility of the Jews. Whether, 5) the work, *Εἰς Μακκαβαίων λόγος*, &c. (which appears as 4 Maccab. in many ed. of the LXX.), was written by Jos. is not certain. 6) *Περὶ πατρός* is certainly spurious (*Phot. bibl. cod.*, 48). Jos. intended writing four books on "God and his nature," and a work *Upon the laws* (*Antt.*, XX., 11, 2; III., 5, 6; VIII., 10). That *Upon Customs* (IV., 8, 2), and the contemplated *Αἰτιολογία* (I., 1, 1; cf. Pref., IV.; I., 10, 5; III., 6, 6) were probably never completed.—III. The personal character of Jos. was not very elevated. He owed his prosperity as much to selfish craft as to real talents. Many Pharisaic faults are obvious in him (cf. *Ullmann*, *Stud. u. Krit.*, 1859, 4, p. 809–44). The old Jewish heroism had degenerated in him into artfulness and cunning. Still he remained a genuine Jew, and ranks with Philo as the chief apologist of Judaism. His *credibility* as a historian is unquestionable; only in a few cases national prejudices or personal interest may have led him astray. The works of fiction he cites, he thought authentic.—For strictly *theological* purposes, his works yield but little. As a Jewish theologian he forms a sort of transition to modern Judaism, combining rabbinical superstition and pharisaic scrupulousness with bold rationalism. He had no truly religious apprehension of the O. T. In many respects he is the counterpart of Philo. For the archæological, geographical, and historical explanation of the Bible, however, the works of J. are invaluable.—Concerning the noted allusion to Christ (*Antt.*, XVIII., 3, 3), it is evident that none but a Christian could have written it, and J. was as far from being such as a thorough Jew and Pharisee of that day could be. And yet Jos. must have made some allusion to one who occupied so prominent a place in the closing history of his nation; and if he had said nothing about Christ, there would have been no reason for inserting such a paragraph, as Christians of the 1st and 2d centuries would not have thought of looking to Jos. for a historical confirmation of their system. Most probably Jos. spoke of Christ as a sorcerer and *μαγός*, and approved of his crucifixion, and this was modified by a Christian hand, with the retention of some original phrases. Doubtless Jos. reckoned among the misfortunes which befel the Jews at the time of Pilate, the dissensions caused

among his people by the influence and labors of Christ, not their crucifixion of him. For Jos. must also have had the operations of Paul in view. He might still have disapproved of the execution of James (XX., 9, 1), especially as James was an observer of the law of Moses.—Early Christian copyists not only avoided J.'s unpleasant allusions to Christ by modifying his statements, but sometimes by an entire omission of the passage. The silence of *Photius*, in the paragraphs upon Jos., and his remarks upon Justus of Tib. (*bibl.*, § 33), are proof that *Antt.*, XVIII., 3, 3, was not in his copy of Jos. It is probable that J.'s real opinion of Christ is given in *Antt.*, XVIII., 3, 4. That loathsome narrative, which is not most distantly connected with the Jews, is his version of the supernatural birth, which formed a fundamental fact in Christianity, and he designed thereby to expose the Christian faith, on this point, to contempt. It is the earliest trace of the blasphemous Jewish story of Jesus being a son of Panthera (cf. *Origen*, c. *Cels.*, and *Sepher toledoth Jeshua*).—On this subject see *FABRIC.*, *bibl. gr. ed.*, Harl., Bd. V.; *HAVERCAMP*'s ed. of *Jos.*, II., *App.*; *HASE*, *Leben J.*; *WINER*, *R. W. B.*; *EWALD*, *Gesch. Christus*, 1855; *LAMBECIUS*, *Bibl. cæs. Vindob.*, VIII., 10, &c.).—Literature: Best ed. of Jos., HUDSON, 1720; *HAVERCAMP*, 1726; *W. DINDORF*, *Par.*, 1845, '47, 2 Bde., Roy., 8vo.; *IMM. BEKKER*, *Lpz.*, 1855, '56, 6 Bde., 12mo. The best ed. of the *B. J.*, is that of *CARDWELL*, *Oxf.*, 1837, 2 Bde. (Lat. and Greek). Translations: *COTTA*, *Tüb.*, 1736, fol.; *B. J.* and *Life*, *FRIESE*, 1804; *GFRÖRER*, 1836. In English, *WHISTON*, best ed., *Philad.*, 1859, 4 vols., roy. 12mo.; *R. TRAILL*'s *B. J.*, *Ja. Taylor*, 2 vols., roy. 8vo., *Lond.*, 1851). *H. PARET*.*

Joses (a transformation of *Joseph*), a brother of Jesus (*Matth.* 13: 55; *Mark* 6: 3) see Art. *James in the N. T.*, and *Jesus Christ, Life of*.—Another Joses is mentioned, *Acts* 4: 36. A more correct reading would be *Joseph* (see *Barnabas*).

Joshua.—This name designates one of the most prominent persons of the O. T., viz.: the son of Nun of the tribe of Ephraim, the minister and companion of Moses (*Ex.* 24: 13), who, at the command of Jehovah, was entrusted with the leadership of Israel (*Num.* 27: 18–23), not, however, until trial had been made both of his courage (*Ex.* 17: 9–13) and of his faith (*Num.* 14: 6–9, 24). He was solemnly consecrated to his office by the laying on of hands by Moses (*Num.* 27: 18–23; *Deut.* 31: 14, 23). From this time forward, Joshua pursued his course with a firm step, and he belongs to the few persons of the O. T. whose official conduct is without reproach. A twofold work rested upon the successor of Moses and the finisher of his work: first, the conquest and extermination of the Canaanite nations, and then the division of the land and securing its peaceful possession (*Josh.* 1: 1–6, comp. 22: 4; 23: 5, 14, comp. *König*, *alttestam. Studien* I, 10, 11), and it is just this which Joshua accomplished. Three times Joshua's personal appearance decided the battles of Israel against his enemies (*Josh.* 10, 11). After these victories he divided the country between the tribes of Israel and marked the limits

of each (11:23; 13; 21 chaps.). He also gave the people rest by bringing the tabernacle permanently to Shiloh (18:1, comp. 1 Sam. 3:21), and thus fulfilled the prophecy of the dying Jacob (Gen. 49:10). Joshua was thus honored, because he alone was obedient to all that was commanded him (11:15), and, with his house, remained steadfast when a general apostasy threatened (24:15. Cf. 24:20-24; 23:31; Judges 2:7).—The earlier miracles wrought under Joshua are not as immediately connected with his person, as those of Moses with his. But in his *name*, already, lay a promise of special Divine aid. This aid was granted at the Jordan and at Jericho (3:11, 13; 4:18; 5:13-15), but most wonderfully at the battle of Gibeon (Josh. 10:11, 12). There, at the word of the man whom God chose for Israel's saviour, the natural order of things was made subservient to the destiny of Israel. J. did not fully complete the work begun by Moses. The accounts in 13:1-6; 18:3; 11:22, are not contradictory. The conquest of Canaan was real and total, and the whole of it was divided among the tribes, as directed; but this occupation did not involve the full subjugation of all the hostile nations separately. The subordination of J. to the high-priest, and Israel's vacillation, lay in his way (Numb. 27:24; Josh. 19:51; 18:3; 24:19, 23).—But though the character of a perfect successor of Moses was not realized in Joshua, we look for its completion in another Joshua (Saviour), given and named by God himself (Matthew 1:21. See *Jesus Christ*). An interesting extra-Israelitic notice of Joshua's history is found in Procopius and Suidas, see *Bochart, Geogr. Sacr.*, p. 520. *Fabricius, Codex pseudepigraph. I.*, 889-894. *Bertheau, israelitische Geschichte*, p. 271. For the interpretation of the Book of Joshua we recommend: *Josuae Imper. historia illustr. ab And. Masio*: Antwerp, 1574; a still very useful work; *König, Alttestamentl. Studien 1: Heft*, 1836. *Keil, Commentar über das Buch Josua*: Erlang., 1847.

BAUMGARTEN.—Beck.

Joshua, The Book of, opens the series of historical books of the O. T., which represent, in a continuous succession, the period from the death of Moses to King Jehoniah. Modern criticism has endeavored to invalidate the integrity of this book also, but without success. The only apparent contradiction in it has been explained in the preceding article. Against a dismemberment of the book, König, Hävernicks, and Keil have satisfactorily demonstrated its closely connected character. That many and grand miracles appear in the history of Joshua, has its simple explanation in the fact, that it treats of a new beginning and course in the history of the people of Israel. So also each and all the accounts of miracles in this book can be easily understood from their divinely ordered connection. Moreover, it must not be overlooked as a historical mark of these reports of miracles, that the wonders of Jehovah appear here quite palpable, that they were to introduce and start the new life and labors of Israel. As regards the author of the book, the Talmud, and, last of all, König, regard Joshua as such. That Joshua really wrote his memoirs, is de-

clared, Josh. 24:26. The last address of Joshua shows how deeply he was impressed with conviction, that the nation was still far from its destiny, and we can with certainty receive this report of Joshua's prophetic view of Israel as historic truth. Then, also, there was a necessity for Joshua to record the events of his life for the future, and it is also easily conceivable that he should append his memoirs to the law. There are also certain marks in the book itself, that point to synchronism or a high antiquity. Here belongs the עֲבָרָנִי, 5:1 (comp. 4:23; 5:6, the designating Sidon as עֲבָרָנִי, 11:8, whilst Tyre is prominent later; the old limitation of boundaries, 11:17; 12:7, the absence of Bethlehem among the cities of Judah (see König, p. 75). Meanwhile, since the book itself reports the death of Joshua, it, in any case, did not come from the hand of Joshua in the form in which we have it now. The additions of the second hand explain also the variations in Numbers 15:20-32; 19:15, 38 (comp. *Hävernicks Einleitung. III.*, 55).—Besides the canonical book of Joshua there is also a Samaritan chronicle with the same name, which, however, contains great variations from, and extensions of, the original history. *Chronicon Samaritanum arabicum ed. Joh., Juynboll, Lugd., Bat., 1848, 4.*

BAUMGARTEN.—Beck.

Josiah, the fifteenth king of Judah, son and successor of Amon, reigned 31 years, 639-609 B. C., and distinguished himself by his piety and zeal for the honor of God. Two parties, one adhering to the ancient religion and policy of Israel, the other favoring heathenism and foreign alliances, had long predominated in the land. The former, truly national party, which was well-nigh suppressed under Manasseh and Amon, obtained ascendancy over Josiah in his earlier years (2 Kings 21:16; 24:4. Cf. Jer. 1-6; Zephani.), and so prepared the way for a reformation. Josiah began to reign in his 8th year, and during the guardianship of his mother, the priesthood and some true prophets may have had influence upon his education, as was the case with Joash (2 Kings 11:2), but it was, more probably, the better spirit which had sprung up in Israel, that mainly led him, in his 20th year (not 18th, as in Kings. See *Movers, Untera. u. d. Chronik*, p. 334, &c.), to restore the pure worship of God. His solicitude to repair the temple (2 Kings 22:3-7; cf. 2 Chron. 34:8-12), presupposes a removal of idolatry, and had not this been previously done, the people would not at once have made a new covenant with Jehovah (2 Chron. 34:3-7). External causes also prompted Josiah. The Scythians invaded Palestine, probably in the 13th-18th year of his reign (Jer. 6:3-6, 21-25. Cf. *Ewald, Gesch. Isr.*, 3, 388, &c., 480), and the prophet called the nation to repentance. At the same time Nabopolassar founded the Chaldean monarchy, and if Judah should endure threatening storms, internal union was necessary. Happily the prophets were then laboring to revive the law. The Scythians may not have besieged Jerusalem (as *Ewald, l. c.*, 392, sup-

poses from Ps. 54), but that they took some fortresses appears from the example of Askalon (Zeph. 2: 4-7: *Herod.*, I., 105), and from the change of the name of Bethshean to Scythopolis, they seem for some time to have overrun Palestine. PLINY (*H. N.*, V., 16, 20), says they built that city. Jeremiah, also (6: 6), expresses fear for the city, lest these northern hordes should sack it. From 2 Chron. 34: 3-7, we learn how much Josiah had to do to exterminate idolatry, as also his efforts to extend the reformation over the kingdom of Israel, to restore his dominion to its original limits. The work of preparation having been completed, Josiah, in the 18th year of his reign, sent a commission, with Shaphan at its head, to Hilkiash the high-priest (2 Chron. 34: 8, 9; 2 Kings 22: 3), to receive from him the money collected for repairing the temple. Whilst engaged at this Hilkiash found the books of Moses, and gave them to Shaphan to read. Shaphan handed the roll to Josiah, who was deeply moved by its contents, and sent to Huldah, the prophetess, for counsel (see *Pentateuch*). The event acquired great importance from the fact, that the Pentateuch was thenceforth publicly acknowledged as a part of the Biblical canon.—A general convocation of the people was now ordered (cf. Ex. 24: 78; Josh. 24: 25; 1 Chron. 15: 12; Neh. 9: 18), for the threefold purpose of preparing them for the passover, of reading to them the law, and obtaining their general assent to the extermination of idolatry (cf. 2 Chron. 20: 29, &c.). And, as Josiah saw that Israel was without a ruler, he formed the bold purpose of bringing that kingdom also into his reformatory measures, and under his dominion (2 Chron. 34: 33; 2 Kings 23: 15-20). This he undoubtedly attempted more than once, and was thereby involved in frequent conflicts with adjacent nations, as appears from the fierceness of the Ammonites, Moabites, and Edomites against Israel (Obadiah; Jer. 48, 49). This protectorate extended to Naphtali (2 Chron. 34: 6), and seems to have induced many Israelites to participate in the solemnities at Jerusalem (2 Chron. 34: 9; Jer. 31: 5, 6).—With this zeal for the restoration of piety, Josiah combined a firm purpose to re-establish law and social order in his kingdom (Jer. 22: 15, &c.). But corruption was so prevalent and deeply rooted, that no general, permanent change could be effected; the reformatory movement proved to be but superficial, and Jo-

siah was mercifully taken away by death, before the inevitable ruin came. In the 31st year of Josiah's reign Pharaoh-necho, king of Egypt, set out upon an expedition against the Chaldeans. He sent his army by way of the Mediterranean to Akko, and perhaps a part to Joppa, that from thence he might march them across to the Euphrates (cf. *Herod.*, II., 159). Josiah seems to have had nothing to fear from this movement, as the Egyptians would pass through the upper portions of the kingdom of Israel; and they did not think it necessary to ask his permission to do this, as that kingdom was supposed to belong, then, to the Assyrians (2 Chron. 35: 21). But Josiah, who had obtained quiet repossession of that country, thought otherwise. He saw, too, that it was incompatible with the interests of his kingdom, to allow the Egyptians a firm foothold in the adjacent north. Should the Egyptians return victorious, it would be much more difficult to withstand them; should they be defeated, the Chaldeans might demand satisfaction of Josiah for allowing them to pass quietly through his domains. These considerations seemed to require him to oppose the progress of the Egyptians. But his previous good fortune may also have awakened in Josiah a desire to increase the power of his kingdom, and make it rank with Egypt and Chaldea. His policy was unquestionably correct, and had his plan succeeded, the kingdom of David would have reached its culmination. But the spirit which animated Josiah was lacking in the nation, and the people were too depraved to carry out his grand scheme. Josiah, however, supposing himself strong enough to cope with Pharaoh-necho, and probably encouraged by favorable predictions, went forth to meet the Egyptians on the plains of Megiddo (Esdraselon), and whilst fighting courageously in the front ranks of his army, fell in the battle. He was carried to Jerusalem, and there died of his wounds (2 Chron. 34: 28; 35: 24; cf. Zech. 12: 11; 2 Kings 23: 30, says on the field of battle). Great lamentations followed his death, and were annually repeated (Jer. 22: 10). With his death the last support of the kingdom was gone. The great importance of this battle may be judged from the words of Herod., II., 159: *Καὶ Σύροιαι περὶ ὃ Νεκὺς συμβαλὼν ἐν Μαγδόλῳ ἐνίκησε· μετὰ δὲ τὴν μάχην Καδύτιν πόλιν τῆς Συρίας εἰούσαν μεγάλην εἶλε.*

VAHINGER.*

THE NEW YORK PUBLIC LIBRARY
REFERENCE DEPARTMENT

This book is under no circumstances to be taken from the Building

[illegible]

